

work of Franz Boas in creating a new field of cultural anthropology. They argue, convincingly, that Boas has often been overlooked as an explorer, and one who helped to develop a novel area in anthropology.

The final two sections, while divided, actually examine the role of individual explorers in the West. Gunther Barth investigates the search for a Northwest Passage by Mackenzie and by the Americans, Lewis and Clark; Albert Furtwangler centers his chapter on the two notable American explorers of the western United States; Matthew Godfrey looks at the work of an amateur ornithologist, Robert Ridgway; and Donald Worster offers a short piece on Powell and the Mormons. But aside from Worster's contribution, none of these articles offers anything new or exciting. Indeed, all of them could have benefited from paying closer attention to recent literature on western exploration involving their protagonists. A fifth contribution, by Brad Hume, has the same essential character; his attempt to depict exploration as a 'science of place', is simply too jargon-ridden and theoretical to contribute anything meaningful to the volume.

Despite the unevenness of the volume (perhaps the editor should have been more selective in choosing articles for inclusion), there is much of value in *Surveying the Record*. Indeed, the volume provides a compelling argument for more work on the subject of exploration and empire, not just in the North American context. Certainly, the legacy of Wright, DeVoto, and Goetzmann that is nicely laid out at the volume's inception, will be enhanced as more scholars direct their attention to the field.

KEITH R. BENSON, *Green College UBC, 6201 Churchill Green Park Rd., Vancouver, BC, V6T 1Z1, Canada.*

PEDER ANKER, *Imperial Ecology: Environmental Order in the British Empire, 1895-1945*, Cambridge, Massachusetts / London: Harvard University Press, 2001, vii + 343 pp., illus., £41.50.

This instructive and award winning book examines the development of ecology as a flourishing discipline within the confines of the British Empire. The author admits at the very outset that his intention is not to present a comprehensive history of ecology. Instead, he describes his goal as being to deploy new research materials to explain how elements of botany evolved into the discipline of human ecology.

But, why did ecology develop so dramatically as a discipline? Anker suggests that its rather striking level of growth within the territories that constituted Britain's empire during the late nineteenth and first half of twentieth centuries can be put down to be activities of competing groups of energetic, influential and often single-minded academics and political figures. He highlights the fact that these individuals coalesced themselves into groups that developed in the 'north' and 'south' of the Empire, stretching from the 'far icy north of Spitsbergen to the very southern tip of Africa at Cape Town'. Anker shows that this 'north-south dimension' is crucial to his understanding of official and academic debates – often very bitter in nature – about ecological research and, ultimately, about the scientific administration of a huge and an enormously varied empire.

This in all likelihood explains why the assertions put forward by these academics were taken so seriously by those wielding political power (or, indeed, those interested in getting access to political power in the long run). Seen from another perspective, the unity of the different groups scholars/politicians that Anker tells us about is perhaps explained by a

shared keenness to seek out new tools for understanding the links between nature and society, which, in turn, was based on a concerted search for setting up new management policies for the Empire's natural resources and controlling its inhabitants in particular ways. Significantly, this effort at strengthening social control involved not only the indigenous populations within Britain's vast and varied imperial territories, but also their white settlers; an important point often ignored by some historians of science and medicine who base their studies on a pre-determined use of Michel Foucault's work (while Foucault's work is exciting and important, I have found the not uncommon tendency to almost blindly transpose its insights to the study of colonial contexts far less convincing).

According to Anker, all these trends caused the development of a 'tripartite ecology of nature, knowledge and society'. He studies these trends through the growth and running of two major patronage networks, whose influence was based on their ability to make research money and opportunities available to ambitious academics (and willing followers). Here the role of individuals like Jan Christian Smuts is highlighted, who, as a botanist and leading political figure, was able to develop a relatively small but significant patronage network in the southern part of Empire – Anker describes his politics of holism and his theory of 'idealistic ecology', which was put forth as a solution to a host of problems (happily, the darker side of Smut's ideas is not ignored in the book – mention is made about how Smuts used his ecological ideas to justify the framing of a racist charter of human rights in the post-World War Two era). At the other end were ranged the British ecologists, with Arthur George Tansey as their main representative. His theories are described as having been 'mechanistic', where great attention was given to controlling imperial material and human resources.

Anker argues that by the end of the 1930s these competing patronage networks began to put forth strikingly different ecological theories, which, over time, began to contend vigorously for political and academic space, as well as for limited amounts of research funding. In this context, he refers to the work of Smut's protégé, John Philips, who entered into protracted debates with Tansey; these are identified as being the most important in the period surveyed (mention is also made of the work and the influence of another Smuts follower – John William Bewes). The author makes a very important point here. While all these individuals and the patronage networks they led disagreed about ecological theories and the location of human beings in nature, they seemed to agree about one important point – the need to carry out research and develop generalisations that might be useful for the management of the Empire (while there was disagreement about how it be managed well, there was a consensus that imperial rule needed to be scientifically organised). That said, members of both groups continuously drew upon a range of other disciplines to justify their stances; the discipline of psychology was notable in this regard (by no means a static discipline itself). In this regard, Tansey's contribution is underscored. The fact that he was Freud's student and influenced by him is pointed out, as is the fact that he wrote widely about the human nervous system whilst developing his ideas about an eco-system. Reference is also made to the point that Julian Huxley drew upon many of these ideas, which is significant as he apparently made an effort to deploy some of these ecological theories whilst acting as the first Director General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (this aspect is dealt with in the last chapter of the book, which I enjoyed reading the most).

One of Anker's main goals in writing this book was to make writing on ecology interesting to readers. He achieves this goal resoundingly. The research conducted is impressive, both with regards to its depth and range. If I had to make a general criticism, it would be that I was slightly confused by his treatment of South Africa's changing political position during the period under survey and the impact that these developments had on intellectual life. I cannot

help but ask, for instance, if the growing levels of political independence in South Africa did not encourage its academics and politicians to disagree with the metropolitan view and highlight their differences/uniqueness in publications distributed/read internationally? Also, as a South Asianist, I wonder how intellectuals in colonial India – an extremely important part of the British Empire – responded to these debates. After all, India had a wide range of political and educational links with South Africa (the Bombay medical schools, for example, reserved seats for South African medical graduates). Did these cause the idea developed by Smuts and Philips to gain wide currency in India, or did Tansey and his metropolitan colleagues hold greater sway in the sub-continent? Alternatively, did Indian nationalist organisations, which had a large number of scientific and medical personnel in their ranks, prefer to oppose the metropolitan view? Or did they choose to refute the views of both networks of patronage and develop their own formulations?

I hasten to add here that it was obviously not possible for Anker to cover all these issues, which are very complex themselves (they could easily be developed into another monograph, I suspect). But then again, his ability to raise questions in the reader's mind is a major strength – he has certainly encouraged me to conduct research on new themes. I am no doubt that others will find this work as useful and enjoyable as well.

SANJOY BHATTACHARYA, *The Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at UCL, Euston House, 24 Eversholt Street, London NW1 1 AD, UK.*

REBECCA SCHWOCH, *Ärztliche Standespolitik im Nationalsozialismus. Julius Hadrich und Karl Haedenkamp*, Husum: Matthiesen Verlag, 2001, 437 pp., € 66,00.

Die Medizin im 'Dritten Reich' ist schon seit längerem Gegenstand der Sozialgeschichte. Die Rolle der Ärzteschaft war dabei bis vor wenigen Jahren noch wenig erforscht. Neben der Regionalstudie von Cécile Mack zur badischen Ärzteschaft im Nationalsozialismus liegt jetzt mit der Dissertation von Rebecca Schwoch ein weiterer wichtiger Beitrag zu diesem Themenfeld vor. Mit Julius Hadrich und Karl Haedenkamp, die während des Nationalsozialismus keine Führungspositionen bekleideten, aber durchaus bedeutende Stellungen innehatten, wählte die Autorin zwei beispielhafte Vertreter des nationalkonservativen Teils der deutschen Ärzteschaft aus, deren Tätigkeit bereits in der Weimarer Republik einsetzte, und die auch nach 1945 Schlüsselpositionen besetzten. Der Nationalökonom Dr. rer. pol. Julius Hadrich (1891-1983) arbeitete als Syndikus bei verschiedenen ärztlichen Verbänden, leitete die Statistische Abteilung des 'Hartmannbundes' bzw. der 'Kassenärztlichen Vereinigung Deutschlands'. Dr. med. Karl Haedenkamp (1889-1955) war Schriftleiter des 'Deutschen Ärzteblatts' und als Kommissar zur besonderen Verwendung in der Abteilung des Reichsarbeitsministeriums zuständig für die 'Neuregelung' der Kassenzulassung nach 1933 und damit auch für den Ausschluß jüdischer und politisch unzuverlässiger Kassenärzte.

Die Arbeit beginnt mit einer gelungenen Zusammenfassung der Entstehung und Entwicklung der Sozialversicherung, der Verbände der Ärzte und Krankenkassen, wobei die Konflikte zwischen Ärzteschaft und Kassenverbänden eine wichtige Rolle spielen. Der persönliche und berufliche Werdegang der beiden Protagonisten, die aus unterschiedlichen Gründen 1937 (Hadrich) und 1939 (Haedenkamp) entlassen wurden, wird in zwei Kapiteln dargestellt. Wichtig war hier die Frage, ob ihre Entlassungen aus dem Widerstand gegen das NS-Regime resultierten.