

placed in the new “magic bullet” called DOTS (directly observed therapy short course) in the 1990s and the problems that ensued because of it. He describes “the combined neglect of both the HIV/TB pandemic and multi-drug-resistant TB” as “one of the greatest public health tragedies of the last generation” (209, 223).

Parts II and III, covering the period 1935 to the present, could have been subtitled “Faith, hope, and despair,” as McMillen demonstrates how, despite a massive amount of scientific research, campaigns to prevent and treat TB relied primarily on notions of faith and hope. These sections also tell a harrowing story of failure; as McMillen notes in his conclusion: “the history of TB control is arguably an example of regression” (226).

In his conclusion, McMillen is at pains to point out that he is not blaming anyone for the failures. While he claims there are no “culprits,” there are clearly heroes and villains in his story, with Wallace Fox, head of the MRC TB unit, approaching hero status, and S. Lyle Cummins villain status: Cummins appears in part I (“Discovery, 1900–1945”), and we learn that he “did more than perhaps anyone to promote the notion of race-based resistance [to TB]” (19). McMillen mentions on pages 7 and 22 that we will “hear much more” of Cummins, and on page 25 he acknowledges that his “influence is hard to underestimate.” Yet, frustratingly, we are not told who Cummins was—his official position, his institutional affiliation, why he was so influential. He was apparently more significant than B. A. Dormer, “South Africa’s top TB expert and soon to be chief tuberculosis officer” (43)—but why?

This is an important study of TB research and its impact, but I would not describe it as “global.” The first section (1900–1945), concentrating on North American Indians and with references to developing countries, almost implies that TB was not a problem in the Western world, which it clearly was at that time. McMillen mentions that currently China has the world’s largest number of TB cases, estimated at 11 percent of the global total (206), and yet China hardly features in the narrative apart from a few scattered references. The focus of the book is on indigenous peoples and developing countries and even then it is selective. Nevertheless, the study holds many important lessons for current public health policy and efforts to control TB; as McMillen writes, the story has not ended.

LINDA BRYDER
The University of Auckland

ASIA

SVETLANA GORSHENINA. *L'invention de l'Asie centrale: Histoire du concept de la Tartarie à l'Eurasie*. (Rayon histoire de la librairie Droz, no. 4.) Geneva: Droz, 2014. Pp. 702. \$73.20.

Debates over the origins, meanings, and interpretations of designations of geographical, geopolitical, and ideological spaces should be familiar to most scholars. But

“Central Asia” (*l'Asie centrale* in French, *Sredniaia Aziia* in Russian, *Mittelasien* in German, and a host of additional terms in these and other languages) is a relatively recent addition to our vocabulary and therefore has not provoked as much deliberation as have, for example, “Europe” or “Africa.” In fact, “Central Asia” came into usage (in Russian, primarily) only in the mid-nineteenth century, but not many agree on what exactly the term means. In this hefty volume, the author’s “Central Asia” corresponds to the territory of the former “Central Asian” Soviet republics (Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, and Kyrgyzstan), northeastern Turkey, the northern parts of Iran, Pakistan, Afghanistan, and India, as well as Xinjiang, Mongolia, and the southern reaches of Siberia (22). One could argue that such an expansive definition could lead to predictably complex conclusions.

Svetlana Gorshenina traces the history of this vast region’s portrayal by outsiders—almost exclusively by Europeans (including Russians)—and what their descriptions of “Tartary,” “Turkestan,” the “Land of Gog and Magog,” and “Transoxiana,” to name but a few designations, supposedly meant. Arranged chronologically, the book transports the reader as far back as Achaemenian times (sixth century B.C.E.) and resurfaces in the twenty-first century. The first half (roughly three hundred pages) of the book deals with the premodern era (that is, pre-nineteenth century) and relies mainly on the author’s extensive and impressive research of contemporaneous maps and cartography. Gorshenina demonstrates convincingly the resilience of old traditions in Europeans’ tangible representation of the world. She portrays the European reliance on and departure from Ptolemy’s map of the world and the Arab-Muslim geographical explorations that followed, to associations of the vast lands to the east with eschatological occurrences and prophetic predictions (e.g., about Gog and Magog). In the aftermath of the thirteenth-century Mongol Empire and the dispersal of “Tatar” peoples (Turks and Mongols, mostly), the region acquired a more widespread and a remarkably enduring identification with Tartary. “Tartary” dominated travel narratives well into the nineteenth century, although the term was not static and carried “ethnic” connotations for some, political associations for others, and a mix of wonder and suspicion for all. By the eighteenth century, most scholars and explorers would distinguish between a Russian Tartary, a Chinese Tartary, and an independent one.

Only with the (separate) voyages of the Russian general Egor Meyendorff and the Prussian naturalist Alexander von Humboldt in the first decades of the nineteenth century did a new term—Central Asia—come about, influenced by the perception of political and “ethnic” characteristics of the region (by Meyendorff) and by the scientific observations of the region’s allegedly distinct geography (by Humboldt). The term and its supposed equivalents (Middle Asia, the Center of Asia, the Heart of Asia, High Asia, Inner Asia, etc.) found new denotations—often with much variation—with the publication of contemporary lexicons, geographical dictionaries,

and encyclopedias (materials that complement the cartographic sources). Increased travel and continued exploration, as well as the growing popularity of Oriental Studies, an emphasis on the study of origins, and the increasing weight of a more “scientific” lingo also influenced the understanding of the nomenclature.

However, essential differences still prevailed: for some, “Central Asia” included Mongolia and Manchuria; others extended the region’s boundaries into Tibet and beyond the Himalayas; yet others included Persia and Baluchistan. But whereas in previous generations these variations could coexist with little dispute, the nineteenth century was an era for debates and controversies, with Russia, given its proximity to—and eventual inclusion (conquest) of—the region, as the scene for the liveliest discussions. Some advanced the idea that “Central Asia” should remain limited to the territory that Russia had just subjugated, but others argued that the centrality of “Central Asia” was really a Eurasian centrality and fit with Russia’s imperial—and “civilizing”—mission and its place in the world. Not surprisingly, the advent of acknowledged political boundaries (of Iran, Afghanistan, the limits of the Qing and the Russian empires, etc.) also had an effect on terminology. Russia’s imperial position also dictated the usage or rejection of such terms as Turan and Turkestan, both implying a degree of association with Turks and Turkic peoples, who Russia typically viewed with mistrust.

The demise of the empire and the rise of the Soviet Union brought about the region’s national delimitation and the creation of new Soviet republics (1924–1936), but also hastened the emergence of new ideologies such as Eurasianism (which sought to distance Russia from Europe), nationalism and nation-building, etc. Thus, in the early Soviet era, “Central Asia” referred to the Soviet republics of Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Kyrgyzstan, and the southern parts of Kazakhstan. Other understandings followed, but seem to remain, to this day, dependent on political, national, and nationalist agendas in addition to—albeit to a lesser extent—the role of area studies, professional associations, and science. But here, too, the definitions of what constitutes “Central Asia” vary greatly. Gorshenina asks what clear criteria we should seek when we aim to define a region. Skeptical of environmental and geographical determinism and acknowledging that linguistic and cultural criteria only serve to showcase an “ethnic mosaic” and multiple centers of prominence, the author recognizes that we are at a theoretical impasse. The “terminological chaos” that the author has demonstrated so well in this book seems to confirm this impasse but perhaps also leads to more freedom of research and interpretation.

As mentioned earlier, the choice of what constitutes “Central Asia” ties also to the terminological chaos. If one were to choose differently, one could emerge perhaps with a different conclusion. An engagement with indigenous (“Central Asian”) sources and an assessment of the degree to which European visions of the region were influenced by encounters with the locals and with their written and oral perceptions and testimonies is missing from an otherwise well-researched, nuanced, and very

accessible volume. But this may be a subject for a future endeavor.

RON SELA

Indiana University, Bloomington

BRETT SHEEHAN, *Industrial Eden: A Chinese Capitalist Vision*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2015. Pp. 327. \$45.00.

With China’s economic rise and increasing tensions between government and private enterprise, interest in the history of Chinese family businesses and capitalist entrepreneurs has resurfaced. Brett Sheehan’s *Industrial Eden: A Chinese Capitalist Vision* traces the Song family and their industrial corporation that grew out of a small hairnet business, which survived five different authoritarian regimes from the late Qing empire to the post-Mao era. Sheehan weaves the different strands of source material, ranging from family archives and personal interviews to local and national history, into a masterful tapestry of a case study exploring the volatile relationship between Chinese capitalists and authoritarianism in twentieth-century China.

With all the previous scholarly attention to family businesses in Shanghai and Hong Kong, it is refreshing to read a story anchored in north China. Shandong province, the initial home base of the company, represented a difficult business environment. Semicolonial conditions and warlord regimes thwarted the province’s development until the rise of the Guomindang party-state in 1927. The business founder Song Chuandian was influenced by his Western mission-school education and pursued a career in teaching before starting a small lace and hairnet production. With good entrepreneurial instincts, Song recognized the new business opportunities in Shandong province conditioned by modern rail transportation, its connections to commercial hubs, and the availability of cheap labor. In the fragmented political climate of the early republic, he also chose to enter a political career as president of Shandong’s provincial assembly, resulting in considerable advantages for his business. However, Song’s political career was short-lived once Chiang Kai-shek established his own political order in the north. Because he had Song’s assets and the company confiscated, the family moved into the protected space of the foreign concession in Tianjin.

Although the story concentrates on the Song family during five successive regimes, the structure of the book consciously moves the narrative away from the biographical approach to each generation and the concurring life cycle of the family business. As the book’s title indicates, Sheehan focuses on the family’s business leaders not only as pragmatic respondents to various political and economic crises but also as visionaries who wanted to contribute to the transformation of society and nation. Song Feiqing, leading the family’s Dongya wool business in the second generation, managed the company’s transformation from a hodgepodge import-export business in Tianjin into the largest manufacturer of wool knitting yarn in China with considerable commercial success. Combining