

Apuntes 80 (2017). doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21678/apuntes.80.912>

ROMERO, Ana Lucía, 2016, *Entre pipetas, bisturíes y pacientes. La investigación clínica en la Argentina: la tradición Lanari*, Buenos Aires, Biblos. 229 pp.

Entre pipetas, bisturíes y pacientes. La investigación clínica en la Argentina: la tradición Lanari is a study that falls within a dynamic area of investigation which is expanding in Argentina: social research on science and technology. Without doubt, Lucía Romero's book (a synthesis of her doctoral research) is a model for future research that focuses on scientific work in a peripheral country.

One of the successful aspects of this study is the choice of a research institute as the object of analysis: the Instituto de Investigaciones Médicas between 1957 and 1976, a period when its director was Dr. Alfredo Lanari. The analysis of 20 years of work at a research center permitted the exploration of trajectories, knowledge, local and international impacts, scientific networks, recruitment mechanisms, and achievements. The importance of studying this institute lies in the fact that it was a center of research on local and international clinical medicine.

Until the establishment of the Instituto de Investigaciones Médicas, clinical medicine in Argentina had concentrated primarily on healthcare and curing disease. The creation of the institute was a milestone in the history of medicine in Argentina in at least two ways. First, because it initiated scientific research in clinical medicine; this was a repercussion of a set of higher education reforms and fell within the framework of a better relationship with the United States. Nevertheless, the existence of networks with other areas of the world was not mere imitation but rather part of a local tradition that had been yielding results since the first decades of the 20th century. The tentative starting date can be set as around 1919, when the Instituto de Fisiología was established under the leadership of Dr. Bernardo Houssay. The institute's founding was also a milestone because Lanari initiated political and budgetary discussions to establish a full time career in clinical medicine. This field was unknown in Argentina and was seen as part of an effort to achieve scientific modernization, and as a stimulus for youth interested in medicine to choose this specialty.

This book provides a well-organized set of theoretical concepts that dialogue with a large number of primary sources, such as files, professional journals, and minutes of board meetings, in addition to 30 interviews. Taking advantage of all this and after comparing primary sources with secondary ones, the author weaves a fluid and very interesting history of

what she considers the “Linari tradition.” This is understood as the articulation of the lines of work that preceded it. In terms of Linari’s style of work, Romero emphasizes laboratory research and healthcare characterized by contact between the doctor and the patient. The combination of research with teaching and practicing medicine led to a series of modifications in the degree program of medicine and in the profile of those who graduated from the Faculty of Medicine. New professional options were created, in addition to the existing professional profile that was shaped by health care and the demands of private patients. These options allowed healthcare to be combined with scientific research in laboratories, leading to technological changes that, in turn, changed how medical care was given to patients.

The intersection between healthcare and scientific research led to an interest in kidney transplants and dialysis. Romero develops one of her strongest hypotheses in Chapter 3. According to her, the growth of a specialty or a line of research within a specific institution is not the result of a mere process of spontaneous generation, nor is it due to purely cognitive logic. Instead, this growth is the result of human actions and decisions made by people in positions of leadership who had the capacity to influence the design and the model of the institutional apparatus (p. 136). It is in this sense that Linari becomes the protagonist of this narrative, given his role as organizer, his hiring of human resources, and his systematization of areas of interest and priority.

The voices of the patients are retrieved from scientific reports and the viewpoints of the researchers. In future research, I think that it would be interesting to investigate some of the other aspects of these practices on the bodies of those who were ill, in order to bring into play or suggest the ways that individual suffering and the horrors perpetrated by the techniques used were present in the link between these and science. This is something which is absent from historiography. Without taking an extreme or critical position on modern science, we should ask ourselves about the role of suffering, pain, emotion, and death in our historical studies.

Scientific investigation in Argentina during the 20th century was a space of male primacy, and the terrain of clinical investigation was no exception. Nevertheless, Romero describes how what she calls the “second generation” and the “third generation” included women: Elvira Arrizueta, Felisa Molina, and the biologist Elizalde de Bracco. This visibilization of female scientists in a masculinized domain is a line of research that can be pursued in future studies that take into account the contributions of gender theory to the field.

I would also like to draw attention to the use of 27 personnel files from the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Buenos Aires. There were at

least two problems with this material. First, the bureaucratic difficulties of accessing them; and second, the complications of analyzing them, since they contain a large and dense amount of personal data. Romero was able to ask interesting questions regarding the material in these sources, and the answers that she found are at the heart of this book. The networks of sociability, profiles, links, and conflicts are its protagonists, and allow the author to distance herself from the celebratory histories of what she sees as the inevitable and ever-increasing progress of the medical sciences and of its main players.

I welcome the publication of this book, since it never loses sight of its object, the issue it deals with, and its various chapters achieve the appropriate equilibrium between the selection of data and its organization. Without doubt, *Entre pipetas, bisturíes y pacientes...* will be required reading for those who are interested in the social history of health and illness, the history of science, and studies about higher education. At the same time, its intelligent and accessible style of writing will draw readers from a broader audience than that usually interested in this subject.

Karina Inés Ramacciotti

*Instituto Interdisciplinario de Estudios de Género; Facultad de Filosofía y Letras,
Universidad de Buenos Aires; Conicet; Universidad Nacional de Quilmes; Buenos
Aires*

karinaramacciotti@gmail.com