

## Book Reviews

in local communities where preventoria were built, they were deemed a great achievement, as their national proliferation in the 1920s demonstrates. Supported by the National Tuberculosis Association and other enthusiastic child-savers, these institutions were established throughout the United States by many different agencies.

Initially, the preventoria were rooted in the prevailing scientific understanding of TB, but, as Connolly argues, once established, they proved rather resistant to changes in medical science as well as to new social welfare practices. By the 1930s, many experts concluded that the removal of children from their homes had few health benefits, rather the opposite. The scientific rationale underlying the preventorium crumbled as case finding and prevention of infection rather than resistance-building were employed as prophylactic strategies. Many preventoria were closed or reoriented to other fields in the wake of the new antibiotic therapy in the 1940s; even so, some continued to offer a mix of fresh air and moral uplift as a solution to the medical and social problems of indigent children. Ultimately, keeping the institutions running and beds occupied proved more important than assuring the scientific soundness and social adequacy of preventorium treatment; fittingly, it was financial, not medical considerations that led the last ones to close in the 1960s. Avoiding moral judgement, Connolly carefully historicizes the preventorium and employs an emic perspective on the child-savers' engagement: the preventorium may have seemed like the most humane choice, given the alternatives of orphanage, juvenile asylum, or even homelessness threatening indigent children with tuberculosis in the family.

The analysis is grounded in the international scientific context, but the focus of the book is national, concentrating on US developments. I miss a systematic comparison of the US preventorium and its European counterparts: were they the same or different institutions? Nevertheless, the book is highly recommended for everyone interested in the

history of tuberculosis and children's health. The focus on prevention of paediatric tuberculosis, and on an institution far less studied than the TB sanatorium, makes this book a welcome addition to the historiography of tuberculosis. The author's engagement in current debates on children's health makes the sound historical analysis also highly relevant for today's concerns in preventive and public health.

**Teemu Ryymin,**

Stein Rokkan Centre for Social Studies,  
Bergen

**Alice Boardman Smuts** with the assistance of **Robert W Smuts, R Malcolm Smuts, Barbara B Smuts, and P Lindsay Chase-Lansdale**, *Science in the service of children, 1893–1935*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2006, pp. xiv, 381, £20.00, \$32.00 (paperback 978-0-300-14435-2).

As Alice Boardman Smuts points out, while there have been scholarly studies of American movements such as child guidance, child development, and what she describes as the "sociological study" of the child (essentially, the work of the US Children's Bureau), these have previously been "limited to the development of one or the other of the three child study movements . . . over a shorter time span or to the history of individual child study organizations". Her aim is thus to "view these three new approaches to scientific child study not as isolated efforts but as related parts of a single broad movement" (p. 4). Equally, and correctly, she notes the appeal to "science" which so characterized movements like child guidance in the inter-war period (p. 7), a time when science held a high intellectual and cultural status, and when the branch of medicine which underpinned child guidance, psychiatry, was seeking to establish its own scientific credentials in line with those purportedly attached to, in particular, biomedicine. And again quite correctly, the author stresses the role of American

philanthropic bodies such as the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial and the Commonwealth Fund in promoting this supposedly scientific study of the child (p. 9).

The book proceeds more or less chronologically, and is divided into three parts. The first, covering the period from the early 1890s to 1910, deals with topics such as G Stanley Hall and the Child Study Movement. As Smuts reminds us, at least in the early part of his career, Hall was regarded as a “bold innovator, the apostle of scientific psychology, pedagogy, and child study, the esteemed founder of a psychological laboratory, professional journals, and new institutions” (p. 42). The second section, embracing the years 1910 to 1921, discusses, *inter alia*, the founding of the US Children’s Bureau and the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station. The latter is noteworthy not least because, as the author suggests, its aim was to study “the development of normal children” and as such its establishment marked a “crucial turning point in the history of scientific child study” (pp. 117–18). The final section carries the story through the “Children’s Decade” of the 1920s and concludes with the fate of the Children’s Bureau during the early New Deal. While there is an epilogue which briefly discusses what subsequently happened to the various movements dealt with, there is no conclusion gathering together the book’s themes, which is rather disappointing.

Even so, in certain respects this is undoubtedly a highly impressive piece of work. The author has succeeded in bringing together a huge volume of material and the juxtaposing and inter-weaving of the various child study movement histories is in places extremely illuminating. The book is also clearly laid out and well-written, and for all these reasons will almost certainly serve as an important research resource and reference point for some time to come.

None the less, it does have drawbacks. Perhaps because of the volume of material involved, analysis too often gives way to narrative and description. Although the author

is clearly aware that these are not unproblematic ideas, there is no extended discussion of, for example, what might constitute the “normal” in child development, nor, indeed, of what was “scientific” about the various movements under discussion or that they might want to view themselves in this particular way. And while it is possible to see an argument for American exceptionalism, was it really the case, as Smuts claims, that there were “no counterparts in Europe for the reform-minded scientists, women social reformers, and parent-education enthusiasts who led the child study movements in this country” (p. 10), or that there were no community child guidance clinics in Europe until 1929? The educational psychologist William Boyd and the psychiatrist Emanuel Miller, just to take two British examples, were both running child guidance clinics before 1929 (and without the aid of the Commonwealth Fund) as well as contributing more generally to child study.

Ultimately, then, this is a book which provides an important starting point for further research projects rather than one which has the final word to say on the movements it so admirably describes and whose histories it so carefully narrates.

**John Stewart,**

Glasgow Caledonian University

**Susan P Mattern,** *Galen and the rhetoric of healing*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008, pp. x, 279, £36.50, \$55.00 (hardback 978-0-8018-8835-9).

This is a sprightly book, with a misleading title. It situates Galen within the agonistic culture of his day by means of a detailed investigation of the 358 or so cases mentioned in his works (to which one might add the reminiscence of the case of Pausanias at AA XV.4, and that of the philosopher at *De motibus dubiis* 7.24). The author focuses on Galen’s attempts to gain power, success, and control over his patients, whose social