and trade union rights of association (C. R. Swain)—to enlightening discussions of some of tsardom’s great threats to civil rights like the secret police apparatus (D. C. B. Lieven) and the exile system (Alan Wood). Several other articles explore the nature and variety of contemporary Russian opinion on special problems of civil rights. Richard Wortman and Olga Crisp, albeit from different perspectives, examine the complex relationship of private property and individual rights with particular attention respectively to populist thought and peasant landholding. William Wagner focuses on the role of women’s rights in the general debate on the equalization of rights, while S. A. Smith undertakes a sophisticated investigation of the workers’ understanding of civil rights. Three more broadly defined papers round out the collection. W. E. Butler begins the volume with a theoretical and historical look at the concept of civil rights; Linda Edmondson asks whether Russia actually had a civil rights movement; and H. J. White concludes the volume with a timely (in the light of recent events under Gorbachev) survey of the fate of civil rights under the Provisional Government.

Given the disparate nature of these essays, general conclusions are difficult to draw. However, it quickly becomes clear that the chances for civil rights in late imperial Russia were slim. On the one hand, the government did not recognize the inalienability of its citizens’ rights but saw these more as privileges which it had granted and could easily withdraw. On the other hand, society often had too narrow or too superficial a notion of individual rights with the result that the latter were readily sacrificed for either particularist or “higher” goals. Caught between these two forces, Russian proponents of traditional liberties could hardly prevail.

Unfortunately, Civil Rights in Imperial Russia is not free from the problems that plague collections of conference papers. In some contributions the issue of civil rights appears at times to be the secondary rather than the primary focus. Furthermore, this reviewer would have liked to see more interchange among the participants, especially since the editors do not provide any linkages between chapters. Finally, the volume cries out for a concluding section that would attempt to tie together the more significant themes raised in the separate articles. Still, this is a much needed addition to the scanty literature in English on a vital topic in Russian history.

Allen Sinel

University of British Columbia


Who should receive medical care? Who should bear the costs? Who should determine policies and agendas for research and development, and who should administer publicly-funded health care — the state, local gov-
ernment or the medical profession? These critical questions, at the center of today's debates about public health in North America, dominated similar controversies in a very different time and place — Russia in the first three decades of this century.

The two books under review reveal some intriguing continuities not only in Russia across the great divide of 1917, but with the dilemmas contemporary politicians and medical professionals face in trying to deliver good medical care to the entire population. As the Russian case reveals, the advent of new scientific discoveries, an ideology committed to improving public health, and a revolutionary government ostensibly dedicated to the popular welfare did not make finding satisfactory answers to these questions any easier.

The appalling state of public health in Russia, even before the years of war, revolution and civil war took a further toll, is well-known. By the late nineteenth century, the autocracy, local governments and the medical profession were united in their desire for the ozdorovlenie Rossii, making Russia healthy. John F. Hutchinson's *Politics and Public Health in Revolutionary Russia* expertly delineates the conflicts that arose among the competing institutions and groups pursuing this common aim. He shows how the tsarist government continued to adhere to a "medical police" approach, viewing physicians as state servants, while the champions of *zemstvo* medicine and local government, still dominant in the Pirogov Society, viewed virtually any state initiative with the deepest hostility. Equally critical of both sides, Hutchinson offers a welcome revision of the "good guy — bad guy" approach that used to color histories of tsarism, local government and the intelligentsia. Like Ben Eklof and other historians of the *zemstvo*, he offers a more critical and balanced assessment of the motives, objectives and accomplishments of the state and local self-government in efforts to improve popular well-being.

From the turn of the century, and especially after the 1905 Revolution, new trends and new actors emerged that did not fit into the decades-old opposition of tsarism and the liberal *zemstvo* physicians. *Zemstvo* medicine, with its strong populist ethos, went into crisis as its ideology, aims and assumptions were questioned after the failed revolution. Hutchinson's account of how *zemstvo* medicine was becoming outmoded in the post-1905 period, while a strong nostalgia for the idealism and "moral purity" of the community physician lingered, is most interesting, but leaves some questions unanswered. Drawing almost exclusively from polemical articles in the medical journals, he provides little information on what was really happening in *zemstvo* medicine and the medical profession between 1905 and 1914. Was private practice growing? Was unemployment increasing among physicians? Were the more conservative *zemstvos* increasingly curtailing the autonomy of the doctors in their employ?

In place of the biases of *zemstvo* medicine, Hutchinson argues, new specialties, like bacteriology and sanitary engineering, and East European trends toward centralized health administration advanced new answers to Russia's public health problems. Recurring cholera epidemics after 1905 added strength to arguments for a new approach. Against unrelenting opposition from both defenders of traditional *zemstvo* medicine and a jealous