

between “the normal and the pathological” (pp. 3, 44, 74, and 135) and ultimately depicts senility as the definitive diseased Other from which we can reconstruct a historicized “normal” selfhood. Before we can be sure that such evidence posits an authentic expression of a normal Other, it seems reasonable, if not imperative, to examine how people understood the decline of their “physical self” in the presence of a “normal” mind as well. Here a comparative approach measuring discourses of senility against similar ones readily available for such physical diseases as multiple sclerosis or dystonia would have been useful and might well have demonstrated that the discourses of senility were indeed unique. As rendered in this account, however, we cannot be certain.

Nevertheless, Ballenger can be congratulated for a truly fascinating exploration of ageing and senility. This book will appeal to physicians and historians, and the author (or the publishers) should consider marketing it to a broader public audience.

Stephen Casper,
University of Minnesota

Wolfgang U Eckart (ed.), *Man, medicine, and the state: the human body as an object of government sponsored medical research in the 20th century*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft, Band 2, Stuttgart, Franz Steiner, 2006, pp. 297, €43.00 (paperback 978-3-515-08794-0).

After *Useful bodies* (2003, edited by Jordan Goodman, Anthony McElligott and Lara Marks) and *Twentieth century ethics of human subjects research* (2004, edited by Volker Roelcke and Giovanni Maio), the present volume is the third collection of essays in a short time that explores the “dark side” of human experimentation in the past century through a range of case studies. As in *Useful bodies*, the focus is on the social and political contexts that facilitated unethical trials on human subjects, and as in the Roelcke/Maio volume, historical

and ethical assessments are often coupled (cf. my reviews in *Med. Hist.* 2005, **49**: 221–2; 2006, **50**: 254–5).

However, Eckart’s collection provides more than just an extension of current knowledge about twentieth-century abuses in human research. Arising from a Heidelberg conference in 2003 as part of a larger project on the history of the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, DFG) between 1920 and 1970, this book contains several contributions that investigate in detail the dynamics created by state funding for certain areas of medical research, especially during the period of National Socialism. This applies in particular to Volker Roelcke’s paper on the psychiatric genetics of Ernst Rüdin, Karl Heinz Roth’s essay on German aviation medicine, Marion Hulverscheidt’s account of malaria research, Alexander Neumann’s discussion of nutritional physiology and Gabriele Moser’s article on Kurt Blome and cancer research in the Third Reich. Moreover, the DFG’s role in redefining and reconstituting anthropology and human genetics as academic disciplines in Germany after the Second World War is analysed by Anne Cottebrune. Revealing as these discussions are regarding the funding drive behind those research fields and its ethical implications, they would have been more useful to a broader readership if the volume had included a background contribution on the institutional development of the German Research Foundation in the relevant period. Also, the English of some of the papers by German authors would have benefited from more careful copy-editing.

Other papers add details of the medical atrocities committed in the concentration camps of Nazi Germany, for example of the experiments in Natzweiler with chemical warfare agents and of the notorious hypothermia experiments in Dachau. This is complemented by a contribution on Japanese biological warfare research on Chinese prisoners in Harbin during the Second World War. Till Bärnighausen, author of this latter paper, examines for the Japanese experiments the ethical question that has been

discussed in the late 1980s and early 1990s with regard to the Nazi concentration camp trials: whether the immorally obtained data from those experiments may ever be used for scientific purposes. The international dimension of human subject research and abuse in the twentieth century is further highlighted by contributions on vaccination experiments on Senegalese infantrymen in the French army between 1916 and 1933 (Christian Bonah), on metamphetamine tests in the German *Wehrmacht* (Peter Steinkamp), on the Tuskegee syphilis study (James H Jones), and on American cold war research on flash burn in preparation for a feared nuclear attack (Susan Lederer).

The general conclusion that arises from all these papers is obvious: war, racism, and scientific opportunism were the key factors that led, often in combination, to exploitation of human subjects and disregard for consent (even where and when official guidelines on information and consent requirements had been issued, as in the German Reich in 1931). Beyond this insight, what can the future historiography of human experimentation contribute? Paul Weindling's essay, focusing on the victims of Nazi medical experimentation, rightly complains that most of the historical research in this area has been perpetrator-oriented so far. His call for more attention to be paid to the fate of human subjects mirrors, perhaps unwittingly, recent trends in philosophy towards a patient- or victim-centred conception of ethics. Finally, David Rothman, reflecting on the debate of the 1990s about the standards of human trials on AIDS treatment and prevention in developing countries, makes clear that the achievements of ethical codes, such as those of Nuremberg and Helsinki, are under threat in contexts of socio-economic hardship. Historical analysis, one may conclude, may well warn against an ethical relativism that is prepared to compromise on standards of human subject research in situations of poverty and medical need. Eckart's volume has made a significant contribution to this historical enterprise.

Andreas-Holger Machle,
Durham University

Rafael Huertas, *El siglo de la clínica: para una teoría de práctica psiquiátrica*, Historia y crítica de la psiquiatría series, Madrid, Frenia, 2005, pp. 297, €15.00 (paperback 84-609-4361-5).

The history of psychiatry has been approached from a myriad of perspectives and intellectual settings. Social history, conceptual history, intellectual history or history of ideas have all played an important role in defining historiographical trends. From the history of institutions to the history of illnesses, from the perspective of patients to the constitution of concepts and theories, they all have shed light on one of the most thought-provoking issues of modern times. Accepting the value of history of science as an epistemic tool, *El siglo de la clínica* rests on a complex middle ground between historical knowledge and psychiatric practice. The historiographical framework chosen by Rafael Huertas provides what he calls, a "theory of practice", an expression indebted to the sociology of Pierre Bordieu that Huertas uses to link the production of theoretical discourses with diagnostic and therapeutic needs. Since the emphasis of the book lies on those conceptual tools that played an important role in clinical activity, the reader will find here neither a purely conceptual history of psychiatry, nor a history of diagnosis or therapeutic practices, but rather a history of conceptually relevant tools used by clinicians during the nineteenth century, from the beginning of the alienist discourses at the end of the eighteenth century to the description of schizophrenia in 1911.

The book, focused mainly on the French psychiatric tradition, contains four sections: 'The medicalization of madness'; 'The somatization of the soul'; 'At the borders of alienist orthodoxy' and 'Therapeutic dilemmas'. In all four, Huertas pays attention to the social conditions behind the contents of psychiatric production and to what he considers the two most recurrent issues in the conceptualization of psychiatry: the multiple versus the singular conceptualization of mental illness, and the natural versus the