chapter 7 were printed out of order. While this flaw may only be a careless oversight, it adds to the reader's confusion, which is already significant.

In conclusion, Engelmeier and O'Connell, the editors of this book, define dilated cardiomyopathy as distinct from ischemic cardiac disease. They claim that its incidence is increasing, and that it is quite probably linked to myocarditis. They then include papers from studies which do not discriminate between the ischemic and dilated forms of cardiomyopathy, thereby undermining the presumed importance of their book. For this reason, I do not recommend the volume.

HAL BARRON
Medical Student
Yale University School of Medicine

The Pasteurization of France. By Bruno Latour. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1988. 273 pp. $30.00.

It is a complex world, and the human mind is simple: we tend to simplify our environment through generalizations and categorizations. In similar fashion, we simplify history by dwelling on dates and facts and by attributing major events and broad trends to the actions of a few individuals. The Franco-Russian wars of the early nineteenth century, including the battles of Moscow and Tarutino, have often been attributed to the journeying of a single man, Napoleon, and his "Grande Armée." Indeed, we often speak of the "Napoleonic Era." Latour points out the manner in which Tolstoy reacted against that simplification, noting how Tolstoy's monumental War and Peace was an attempt, in a mere eight hundred pages, to "give back to the multitude the effectiveness that the historians of his century placed in the virtue or genius of a few men." Likewise, Bruno Latour points to the recurrent fallacy in the history of science of "the great man... alone in his laboratory, alone with his concepts... he revolutionizes the society around him by the power of his mind alone." This reductionist scenario is far too simple; it ignores the broad forces and movements in science and in society which both influence the revolutionary and which implement his "revolution." In The Pasteurization of France, the author critically examines the myth of Pasteur, a myth in which Pasteur is the leviathan who conquers the world of microbes and, with his Germ Theory, single-handedly brings the French people and the world into the Modern Age.

The Pasteurization of France is presented in two parts. The first consists of three major chapters and begins with the story of the rise of the hygienists in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Latour sets out to prove that the microbiological revolution (to borrow a political term) which occurred in the nineteenth century was not the result of the genius of one lone scientist (Pasteur). Rather, the myth of Pasteur, which the author refers to as the "Pasteurian hagiography," was invoked by the hygienists to gain power. Thus, the microbiological revolution was not a product of Pasteur, but rather, "Pasteur" was a product of the microbiological revolution. Latour writes that "the complete hybridization of hygienists and Pasteurians multiplied the power of both." For the hygienic movement, the move to clean up cities, provide clean running water and "flushing systems to evacuate excrement" now had a prophet. For the Pasteurians, there was an increase in publicity, power, and public funds. Finally, for Pasteur
himself, the grand showman of Pouilly-le-Fort, the glory-seeking egotist, there was a form of scientific apotheosis.

The author's ideas are refreshing and innovative, and he is not afraid to bring our reductionist views of history crashing down around us. His style is often muddled and obscure, however, and he is difficult to follow. The book abounds in comments such as the following: "For me, the most incomprehensible thing about the universe is that anyone should regard as incomprehensible the nevertheless simple way by which we make it comprehensible." In addition, Latour is often carried away by his ideas and opinions. His enthusiastic style is reminiscent of the great microbiologist Paul Ehrlich, who, when developing new ideas and speaking with younger colleagues, would often run out of blackboard space. He would then proceed to scrawl on the laboratory benches, and, when these had been exhausted, would begin to write on his listener. Unlike Ehrlich, however, Latour is cocky and overconfident and in several places invents hypothetical Pasteurian quotations. Thus, at one point he writes: "As Pasteur might have said: 'Chance favors only well-prepared laboratories.'" At another point he writes, "If Pasteur had written a work on the sociology of the sciences, he might have entitled it 'Give me a laboratory and I shall raise the world.'"

Chapter two concentrates primarily on the question: "What is a Pasteurian?" The author demonstrates that, while "Pasteur" may have been an historical construct, the "Pasteurians" were a real group who followed "attenuated microbes . . . could pass from the preoccupations of one of these three great groups [the physicians, the hygienists, and the biologists] to those of others." The Pasteurians were not solely interested in the doctor-patient relationship and treating the sick (as were the physicians), were not solely interested in the poor classes, filthy hovels, and designing better drainage (as were the hygienists), and were not solely interested in the characteristics of a new bacillus (as were the biologists). The Pasteurian was involved with all three. Through all three worlds, he followed the same agent: "the cultivated-microbe-whose-virulence-they-varied."

Chapter three ("Medicine at Last") deals with Pasteur's influence on medical practitioners, and hence medicine of the day. The author notes that "the doctors whom he [Pasteur] needed to extend his influence were not as obliging as the hygienists, who elected him to be the leader of their movement so as to make their own conviction efficacious." Initially, Pasteur's "takeover" of medicine was a mere illusion.

The second half of this book, entitled "Irreductions," is markedly different from the first. It encompasses Latour's notions of the relationship between "force" and "reason," and so it resembles a philosophical treatise rather than a history of science. This part consists of a series of short statements, organized by a cryptic numerical system. In general, it is extremely obscure, and, in its attempt to be transcendental, it resembles Lao Tzu's Tao Te Ching, without the latter's clarity of thought.

As a whole, this book is refreshing and offers a new view of Pasteur's contributions. Its major drawback is its dense and obscure style, and, for this reason, I would recommend it chiefly to the patient reader with a strong a priori interest in Pasteur and the history of medicine.

ELAN DANIEL LOUIS
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