and premature death for the many. Some of McCulloch's targets, most notably, apartheid and the racial segregation that preceded it, are undoubtedly well chosen. However, his book's scattergun approach and tendency towards sweeping and unsupported generalization undermine its authority. "Universities", apparently regardless of time or place, "were sympathetic to management as they depended upon industry for funding, consultancies and jobs for their graduates" (p. 71); the task of "physicians in factories or mines", again, universally and without exception, "was primarily to control the costs of production rather than to protect employees" (p. 71). As for British, Australian and South African factory inspectorates, they were simply "captive to the very forces they were supposed to control" (p. 90). If these and numerous other such statements are to be viewed as anything other than wild conjecture they require substantiation rather than mere assertion. McCulloch's medical history is also questionable. For example, it is widely accepted that in 1955 Richard Doll confirmed earlier suspicions, mainly dating from the 1940s, that lung cancer was causally associated with asbestosis. McCulloch, however, dates the link somewhat earlier: "There is anecdotal evidence from antiquity of the high incidence of what would now be called lung cancer among slaves employed weaving asbestos fabric". No evidence is provided to support this version of an old chestnut.

An intriguing reflection to arise from this book concerns environmental conditions in the South African asbestos fields, especially in the north-west Cape around the town of Kuruman where mesothelioma clusters were first noted. Some recent testimony recalling conditions in the 1940s and 1950s refers to clouds of blue dust and fruit that could be eaten only when the asbestos fibre had been removed. However, in 1964 Gerrit Schepers, a scientist who has since testified in court repeatedly against asbestos companies, was incredulous that a fatal disease could have any connection with the idyllic area in which he spent part of his childhood: "When I hear that one may acquire a malignant mesothelioma through living near Kuruman, I am filled with misgivings.... As a boy I lived not far from Kuruman for a number of years. One could not imagine a more healthy territory". He went on to suggest that a certain type of grass was responsible for the lung abnormalities reported and "offer[ed] this as the Klitsgras theory of Kuruman mesotheliomatosis in order to clear the hurdle created by the discovery of this rare disease in such abundance in persons with such little meaningful exposure to asbestos" (*Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1965–6, **132**: 599).

McCulloch writes with passion. He has produced a readable and stimulating volume but also an idiosyncratic, somewhat under-referenced and often infuriating one.

Peter Bartrip,
University College Northampton

Andreas-Holger Maehle and **Johanna Geyer-Kordesch** (eds), *Historical and philosophical perspectives on biomedical ethics: from paternalism to autonomy?*, Ashgate Studies in Applied Ethics, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2002, pp. xi, 159, £40.00 (hardback 0-7546-1529-4).

This somewhat disjointed collection of eight conference papers may be unique in commencing with a cliché that is not only factually wrong and methodologically suspect, but largely irrelevant to the pages that follow. "New technologies create new ethical dilemmas," the editors assert, adding, "This is true not only of today, but of the past." Really? Does evidence lie with dialysis, hip replacement, insulin therapy, antibiotics, MRI, CAT and other such one-time-celebrated new technologies? And even if we were tempted to say, for example, that test-tube technology for baby manufacture in the 1970s raised debate over the sanctity of life, would we wish to dismiss so lightly an extensive literature refuting this kind of shallow deterministic thinking in history? In any case, technologies are not what this book is about. The closest it gets to them is in the chapter by the medical practitioner, Bryan Jennett, on the ethical intrusiveness of modern medicine's machines for sustaining life, and that by the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025727300057161 Published online by Cambridge University Press

philosopher, David Cooper, on the "Frankensteinian" nature of biotechnology. Other "technologies" are apparent here—financial, managerial, professional, and legal, among them—but these are not implied in the opening statement, nor do they come within the analytical scope of the volume. Rather, as the subtitle has it, the theme is 'From paternalism to autonomy?'—the question mark signifying an effort to transform into a "useful heuristic" (p. 8) an otherwise commonplace historical structuring for medical ethics in the twentieth century.

Yet, notwithstanding the philosopher Susan Lowe's well-penned castigation of the concept of autonomy as "fundamentally misconceived" and a "show of rhetoric" (p. 129) in relation to physician-assisted suicide, none of the contributors seeks historically to unpack the idea of patient autonomy, nor explain socially and culturally what may have been displaced by its rise to prominence. All too readily they fall back upon describing the displacement of the medical profession's paternalistic authority and privilege—a possibly historically misinformed notion, which in places here is presented even with a whiff of nostalgia.

This is not to suggest that the contributors have nothing new, interesting or insightful to say on ethics in medicine. Not least through German comparisons, they contribute significantly to this still too little known and under-researched area. Andrew Morrice explores the rise (*c*. 1900) and the demise (post-1945) of the British Medical Association's Central Ethical Committee, exposing how class-based codes of gentility in Britain counted for more than ethics as such in the profession's patrol of its boundaries. Andreas-Holger Maehle, on the emergence of doctors' ethics in Germany in the late nineteenth century, stakes a greater (if still limited) claim for some "real ethics" among the profession by referring to controversies over issues of "confidentiality" and "informed consent". The latter is more fully articulated in the German context through the contrasting evidence presented by Cay-Rüdiger Prüll and Marianne Sinn in relation to consent to surgical procedures, on the one hand, and consent to autopsies, on the other—different stories born of different professional relations. However, as Lutz Sauerteig makes clear in his useful chronicle of compulsory sickness insurance in Germany, at the root of most medical morality and doctor-patient relations is money. Sauerteig has nothing directly to say on medical ethics. His object, rather, is to trace how, within the German sickness insurance system, a discourse on social progress and a practice of greater equality of access to health care gave way in the 1970s to a rhetoric of market economics and a reality for the German working population of paying "an unnecessarily large proportion of its income for a financially inadequate health care system" (p. 68). Ulrich Tröhler's chapter on the national and international codes governing human experimentation since 1947 also hints at important recent shifts in discourse. Most intriguing is the move away from "rights" to the more flexible (and corruptible) concept of "human dignity". Tröhler makes too little of the political economics behind this trend, but his chapter, like Sauerteig's, serves at least to remind us that medical ethics, like technology, is more fruitfully pursued intellectually when treated as socially constitutive, rather than causal. Its real motor always lies elsewhere, in places where this volume, alas, largely fails to reach.

Roger Cooter,
The Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at UCL

Dan Healey, *Homosexual desire in revolutionary Russia: the regulation of sexual and gender dissent*, Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press, 2001, pp. xvi, 392, illus., $40.00 (hardback 0-226-32233-5).

Studies of same-sex Eros are still relatively few in the historiography of Russia and the Soviet Union. The limited accessibility of Russian archives under Soviet rule has been one major reason for this gap. The collapse of communism and the opening up of the archives made it possible for researchers to address this important subject. Dan Healey's book is a welcome contribution to this relatively under-investigated

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025727300057161 Published online by Cambridge University Press