

leading to a valorization of “basic” research and a schism between academic science and the drug industry (which hired many more scientists and internalized their own “R & D pipelines”). The three actors in today’s familiar “triple helix” thus took on distinct identities and division of labour. The apparent post-war schism, however, reflected mainly the formal, public face of universities and state science agencies; behind the scenes at the “grassroots” level, many scientists continued the same type of consultancies and pre-clinical project collaborations with drug firms as before the war.

This measure of continuity in collaborations between drug firms in both countries and pre-clinical researchers is contrasted with the situation with clinical researchers. The post-war period, we are told, saw the rise of a new type of clinical collaborator, such as Henri Laborit, who contributed greatly to Rhône-Poulenc’s development and early testing of chlorpromazine, and Michael Johnstone, who worked closely with ICI in the early testing and marketing of its Halothane anaesthetic. Before the war respectable clinical researchers did not work so closely with drug firms, according to Quirke. Here I would have to question whether the evidence really justifies such a conclusion, since the researcher-corporation arrangements surrounding the clinical testing of pre-war drugs, for instance the sulfa Septoplix, or Antergan, are not examined in sufficient detail for comparison. In the United States during the 1930s, I have found that many eminent medical academics worked closely with drug firms, both in running clinical trials designed by the firm and in more intimate “friendly expert”, consulting-type relationships. They simply did not advertise that closeness. But this quibble is not entirely fair to this fine, readable book, since, in concluding, Quirke herself calls for more research on the history of clinical collaboration.

That Britain and France have so much in common, regarding the pre-war style of pre-clinical collaboration and its post-war transformation, is itself an important finding

of this book. And it offers “much more than discussed here, such as stimulating discussions of the war’s impact on the scientific institutions of Britain and France, and the political functions of post-war rhetoric of scientific decline on both sides of the Channel. Historians of medicine and of science may find the book a little frustrating for its limited detail on the clinical context and the internal logic of the drug development stories. However, given the inevitable trade-off of detail against brevity and scope, this may have been a wise choice. With its accessible style the book is likely to appeal to a wide range of historians, and business and policy scholars also.

**Nicolas Rasmussen,**

University of New South Wales

**Timothy Boon**, *Films of fact: a history of science in documentary films and television*, London and New York, Wallflower Press, 2008, pp. xi, 312, illus., £16.99 (paperback 978-1-905674-37-4).

*Films of fact* by Timothy Boon mends what, up to now, has been a gaping hole in both history of science and media studies—an examination of the specific historical circumstances that determined how, in the twentieth century, science, technology, and medicine were presented to the British public in the form of the moving picture. Boon is Chief Curator at the Science Museum, London, and has published extensively on science, technology, medicine, and film. He persuasively argues that any appreciation of the contemporary public understanding of science requires knowledge of the specific circumstances directing the century-long liaison between science and the moving picture. His book amply demonstrates the intricacies of that two-way relationship as played out in twentieth-century Britain. *Films of fact* is structured chronologically, beginning with the one-minute film, *Cheese mites*, first shown in London in 1903 and proceeding

through seven chapters to end in 1965 with the popular British television programme, *Tomorrow's world*. Each chapter addresses a non-fiction genre (in some cases genres), analysing the larger scientific, technological, social, and cultural forces in play at the time. Through core chapters 2 to 5, Boon adroitly weaves the career of the eminent British filmmaker Paul Rotha. In each chapter, Boon presents his own insightful reading of key films and television programmes, the end result being a comprehensive analysis of science in British non-fiction film.

'Science, nature and filmmaking', the first chapter of the book, deals with the beginnings of scientific film in the 1890s as an experimental instrument for scientific and medical research. It goes on to map the science film's move to theatre and music hall, where film techniques developed in the laboratory, such as microcinematography and slow motion, were presented to the general public in the form of "actualities", combining the instructional capacities of images with their power to amaze. The next four chapters are devoted primarily to the documentary genre and Rotha's key role in the development of scientific documentary. In the inter-war years, documentary was constructed by film pioneers such as Dzega Vertov, John Grierson, and Rotha, as a distinctive medium linking science and technology to the citizen and the state in such a way as to reveal the deeper social and political reality underlying the world of appearances. The documentary, utilizing the analytically sophisticated and emotionally literate film technique of dialectical montage, presented to audiences a highly aestheticized account of the ability, power, and responsibility of human beings to transform their world. However, Boon argues that documentary was shaped as powerfully by forces concrete and historical as by the idealist(ic) vision of its founders.

In the ensuing chapters, Boon ably supports his argument through his examination of the interface between documentary and the social relations of science, the effect of the Second World War on documentary film production,

and the stylistic evolution of the genre through the 1950s and 1960s. His lucid analysis of the development of the documentary mode through its specific historical relationship to science and technology cannot be summarized in a short review. However, one point (of many) worth noting is Boon's warning that scholars' too strict adherence to formalist definitions of documentary often obscure the historically contingent relations—between technology and work, science and citizenship, rationality and response—that determine documentary's iconographic approach to its subjects. The final two chapters of the book document the growth of science in television, a process which variously continued, abandoned, subsumed, and superseded the subjects, techniques, genres, and politics of non-fiction film. A decreased stress on the social relations of science, an increased emphasis on representations of basic science, and the portrayal of science as a way of life and a culture in its own right are some of the trends highlighted by Boon in his analysis of the move to the new medium.

Though *Films of fact* confines itself to British non-fiction film, the scope of its analysis makes it essential reading for historians of science and technology who wish to utilize film, and, by the same token, for media studies scholars who seek engagement with the scientific and the technological.

**John Tercier,**

University of California San Francisco

**Helen Bömelburg, *Der Arzt und sein Modell. Porträtfotografien aus der deutschen Psychiatrie 1880 bis 1933*, Medizin, Gesellschaft und Geschichte, Band 30, Stuttgart, Franz Steiner, 2007, pp. 238, €38.00 (paperback 978-3-515-09069-8).**

This book investigates how photographic portraits of psychiatric patients generated concepts about mental illness that were then diffused into society. Bömelburg argues that psychiatrists had a marked interest in visually