

career opportunities of social utility for unmarried women.

The Educated Woman is a valuable and thoroughly researched study that illuminates the interaction of numerous different strands – the scientific, the medical, the religious, the political – within specific national contexts and particular historical moments on this important topic.

Lesley A. Hall,
Wellcome Library, London

Kenneth M. Pinnow, *Lost to the Collective: Suicide and the Promise of Soviet Socialism, 1921–1929* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2010), pp. xi + 276, \$49.95, hardback, ISBN: 978-0-8014-4766-2.

With *Lost to the Collective*, Kenneth M. Pinnow details the rise of the ‘social science state’ in the Soviet Union. In the investigations of suicides by state, party, and military organs, Pinnow underscores the desire of authorities to see citizens through forms, statistics, and forensic examinations, but highlights a uniquely Bolshevik goal of diagnosing and preventing ideological deviance alongside a distinctive conception of the role of the state in the lives of Soviet individuals. Pinnow argues that because the Bolsheviks believed the survival of their collective was closely tied to individual behaviour, ‘the making of suicide into public property achieved its ultimate expression in the hands of the Soviets’ (p. 65).

The number of suicides pales in comparison to the vast losses from war, disease, and famine in the aftermath of revolution, yet suicide emerged as a focal point for broad investigation in 1920, under the purview of the Soviet Commissariat of Health, even in the face of limited resources and personnel. Pinnow argues that Soviet doctors, psychiatrists, and forensic specialists elevated the importance of suicide as a way to assess both the individual’s progress and that of

society as a whole. The evaluation of suicide fluctuated depending upon viewer and victim. Many authorities considered it a mark of degeneracy in males, it was especially disquieting when found among the advanced cadres of Komsomol youth, the Red Army, or party workers, yet they considered suicide a sign of progress in women who, as a consequence of the opportunities of revolution, were more engaged in economic and social affairs. Numbers, especially those collected by the Department of Moral Statistics of the Central Statistical Administration, became a major part of expert analysis, but even so, Pinnow deftly shows how not all were won over to the side of data, as debate raged over the value of aggregates over the investigation of the particular. As they examined holdovers of the past, moral statisticians measured their profession’s progress against the dearth of statistical studies from Tsarist authorities. In the creation of this statistical structure, Pinnow argues that the Soviet state presided over ‘the formation and radical expansion of the social as a site of governmental action during the 1920s’ (p. 13).

Firmly embedded in works on the history of medicine, psychology, and sociology in Russia and Europe, Pinnow’s study is less tied to cultural works – particularly those on gender. Although Pinnow brings excellent insights to the perceived wave of female suicides, anxiety over masculine potency and feminine danger resonate through the expert commentaries on male suicides as well, and could have been more fully explored. Including Elizabeth Wood’s work on the interconnection of gender and political standing, as well as further incorporating the ruminations of Fran Bernstein, Dan Healey, Sharon Kowalsky and Eric Naiman on the angst-filled, gender-troubled NEP era, would have expanded on the underlying disquiet regarding nervousness and problems of the will among male suicides, as well as giving further depth to the analysis of suicides among women.

Clearly written and provocatively argued, the work is extremely, and impressively, well

situated within the Russian language materials – both contemporary and modern – and contributes to a growing literature on the ways in which Soviet policies compare to those of Europe and to pre-revolutionary Russia (many of these works also authored by graduates of Columbia's prolific and influential programme). Specialists in the history of suicide, psychology, sociology, or forensic medicine will find much of comparative interest in the history of these fields in the exotic, contested, and politically charged terrain of revolutionary and Stalinist Russia.

Tricia Starks,
University of Arkansas

Marcel H. Bickel (ed.), *Henry E. Sigerist: Correspondences with Welch, Cushing, Garrison, and Ackerknecht* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2010) pp. 488, £57.40, paperback, ISBN: 978-3-0343-0320-0.

In 1932, Henry Sigerist (1891–1957) took up the position of chair and head of the brand new Institute for the History of Medicine at Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore. The University's medical school glittered with past and present clinicians – William Osler, Harvey Cushing – and Sigerist and his circle were to bring to Maryland equal lustre to their chosen subject. To this day in the United States Sigerist's name illuminates the study of the history of medicine and, to a lesser degree, this is true of Britain, other English-speaking countries, then Germany, and finally anywhere where the discipline has practitioners. This may seem an unnecessary prologue to a review in a specialist journal but, conceivably, new readers and students on the margins may not have encountered his presence. The concerns of Sigerist and his cohort still reverberate: ambivalence towards doctors; within which faculty should history of medicine be sited in a university?; is the subject humanities or social science?; what is its relationship to the history of science?

Sigerist was a prolific letter-writer and recipient of mail from all over the world. The present volume reveals but one part of that postbag. His correspondence contains not only quotidian concerns, but also shows the deep structures being put in place as a discipline was shaped. The letters to the pathologist William Welch, the neurosurgeon Harvey Cushing, and the military officer and librarian Fielding H. Garrison are, for the most part, centred on organisational matters – Sigerist taking up the Hopkins chair, conference arranging – and rarely revealing much of contemporary events, although in 1932 Cushing presciently observed, the 'whole Orient seems to have gone mad, and the Hawaiian Islands are near enough to feel the general uneasiness' (p. 53). There is barely anything by way of tittle-tattle, indeed the formality of tone is striking – no first names, 'Dear Sigerist', Cushing writes after Sigerist had stayed at the surgeon's home 'I sincerely hope that both Mrs Cushing and I will have an opportunity to meet [Mrs Sigerist]' (p. 53).

On the other hand, the letters to and from Erwin Ackerknecht are eventually (especially on the latter's side) personal and richly revelatory of the medical historical culture of the 1940s and 50s. Ackerknecht was born in Szczecin – then in Germany, now in Poland – in 1906, and was a student of Sigerist's in Leipzig where he wrote a thesis (1932). A medical doctor he studied anthropology in France and left for the United States in 1941. Forthright in opinion, a polymath, polyglot and voracious reader, Ackerknecht finally gained a position at Wisconsin, but in the 1950s took up a permanent post in Zurich. His anthropological training left an intriguing hint of the cultural relativism of the 1920s in his medical historical writing. Many of his letters to Sigerist are laments about his cultural isolation and his love of Europe.

The self-exiled and then communist Ackerknecht's first few letters (in German) are from Paris before the war. By 1939, he was increasingly desperate to escape France. After internment and various adventures, he reached