

of do-it-yourself scale-model kits and magazines, in which hobbyists, amateur engineers, and teenage enthusiasts lovingly built miniature models of Soviet bomber planes, ships, battle tanks, and the sundry hardware of Russian military might. The manufacturers traded on pre-Soviet histories of Russian material power, as this DIY scale-model hobby culture—despite official ideology to the contrary—openly peddled nation over class, even rebranding foreign models (such as RAF fighter planes) as part of the “plastic historicity” of popular patriotism. Golubev also notes the importance of historical preservation as a social practice, addressing the campaign from the 1960s onward to restore traditional wooden architecture in Karelia and Kizhi Pogost in northern Russia, including churches and regional fishing boats. This was all part of Khrushchev Era reforms (driven by Aleksandr Opolovnikov) to preserve material heritage as cultural patrimony to help connect past and present in the Soviet historical imagination—yet it did open up a different cultural consciousness based on an alternative people’s history of the region.

That said, there are points that might have been explored in more depth. At various points Golubev touches on how western objects and practices exerted a key if awkward influence, be it in body-building, punk, and Jane Fonda-inspired aerobics workouts, but it would have been useful to hear more on this theme. The conclusion touches on the need to put this Soviet material history in a wider “landscape of modernity,” though this comparative aspect is never developed. This is a pity, not least because many of the examples he describes found expression in communist societies across eastern Europe and Asia. In any case, Golubev has written a fresh and suggestive account of overlooked aspects of Russian “late socialism” that will be of substantial value to historians of Modern Europe and late twentieth century material culture more generally.

PAUL BETTS
University of Oxford

Pharmapolitics in Russia: Making Drugs and Rebuilding the Nation. By Olga Zvonareva. SUNY Series in National Identities. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2021. xi, 204 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. Figures. Tables. \$95.00 hard bound; \$31.95 paper.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.276

Physicians diagnose and excise neoplasms but to perform operations, cure diseases and manage medical problems they depend upon pharmacologists, biochemists, the pharmaceutical industry, and pharmacists. To Olga Zvonareva the Soviet period was a golden age for pharmaceuticals production. In Chapters 1 and 2, she emphasizes that despite shortages, social justice ideals guided the Soviet pharmaceutical industry. Soviet pharma eschewed the profit motive, avoided the duplication and waste of market economies, and innovated methods of production if not many products. The breakup of the Soviet Union and rejection of communist ideals in 1991 tragically affected pharmaceutical production. Trade links were severed between Russia, which produced pharmaceutical substances, and the Baltic states, Belarus, and Ukraine, which produced finished medicines. Neoliberal ideas led to the privatization of state-owned pharmaceutical companies. Their new owners lacked business expertise and investment. The number and kinds of drugs produced domestically shrank. Foreign drugs flooded the Russian market. In 2009/2010, the Russian Federation Ministry of Trade and Industry lamented that 80 percent of medicines were foreign, with provenance largely from India and China. The ministry’s 2020 Project aimed for parity

between domestic and foreign drugs by that date, through luring back biochemist and virologist emigres and financial aid to the domestic industry. In Chapters 3 through 6, Zvonareva surveys the results of the 2020 project, particularly in comparison with western pharma, though curiously not vis-a-vis Indian or Chinese pharma. One of the benefits of rebuilding post-Soviet pharma has been the introduction of clinical trials. In contrast to the west, however, where new drugs and placebo controls are tested on healthy individuals, in Russia ethical concerns require that promising new therapies be given to the sick. Project 2020 pushed collaboration between academics and pharmaceutical companies. Envisioned synergies did not fully emerge because academics were not familiar with business methods and businesses considered academics naïve. Nevertheless, innovation has occurred—mainly from private investment. By 2016, amongst twenty top companies—British, American, German, Japanese—accounting for 47 percent of the Russian market, one Russian company, *OTC*, placed fifth and *Farmstandart*, though placing nineteenth, outpaced Roche, which derived a quarter of its income from Russia before 1917 (166–67).

Zvonareva's analysis of Russian pharma from 1991 to the present is enlightening. However, her account of Russian pharma's Soviet and pre-Soviet antecedents do not mesh with my findings in archival materials, publications of the period, and for the late Soviet period, my on-site experiences and interviews with Soviet citizens. Soviet pharma was never self-sufficient. In the 1920s and 1930s, Soviet pharmaceutical factories imported large quantities of pharmaceutical substances from the west and pharmaceutical/medical apparatus from Germany. American lend lease aided in World War II; Hungary was a major supplier of medicines after the war. Central planning and social justice visions of Soviet pharmaceutical executives—like Onisim Magidson—did not result in adequate supply, distribution, and quality. A profit motive reared when factories on *khovraschet* produced and unloaded cheap products on local purchasing entities. Red *Streptotsid* was used as hair dye. In 1963, antibiotics were scarce, as were soap, disinfectants, detergents, and anesthesia through 1991. Feminine hygiene products were non-existent. Public toilets were filthy. Citizens begged me for aspirin, asthma medication, and insulin. If these negatives did not cause large-scale mortality, they did make life difficult. Soviet colleagues were compensated with medicinal botanicals they cultivated and acquired, thus preserving time-honored phytotherapy.

Zvonareva misstates my depiction of late imperial pharma. It was not primitive. Approximately 300 chemical factories, including 100 pharmaceutical factories, some large, operated throughout the empire (*Khimicheskoe delo v Rossii*, Odessa, 1913) supplying urbanites with soap, disinfectants, cough syrups, Vaseline, salicylic acid, and therapies of the time. Some zemstvos sourced predominantly or entirely domestically. Institutes produced vaccines against diphtheria, smallpox, scarlet fever, and rabies. The 1918 American Dispensary recommended A. V. Pel's Spermine; Russian licorice was important to American pharma; Santonin was vital to the American hog industry. Zvonareva noted that Russian factories did not synthesize aspirin, Novocaine, phenacetin, or Salvarsan, but she ignored the reasons: Swiss and German firms held patents, low customs duties made it economical to import, the Medical Council of the MVD was slow to approve new medicines, and medicinal botanicals abounded. For context, the Swiss army derived vitamin C from rose hips until Roche synthesized the vitamin in the 1930s. During World War I, Russia produced synthetics and sourced iodine and opiates domestically, despite active ingredients too low for the Pharmacopoeia. Ferrein, Keler, and other imperial firms continued as major Soviet factories.

Ironically, these flaws validate the book's thesis: political systems influence pharma. Imperial pharma might have been more competitive had the government

been less paternalistic. Had Bolshevik nationalization and sequestration not ruined imperial pharma, Civil War mortality would have been lower. With brilliant scientists throughout Russian history, had the Soviet experiment not intervened, Russian pharma might be world-class today.

MARY SCHAEFFER CONROY
University of Colorado, Denver

The Palgrave Handbook of Russian Thought. Ed. Marina F. Bykova, Michael N. Forster, and Lina Steiner. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021. xxviii, 814 pp. Notes. Index. \$155.99, hard bound.
 doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.277

There have been countless attempts to organize and summarize the history of Russian thought. Metaphilosophy has become an entire subgenre of Russian thought in itself, whereby philosophers have attempted to highlight the distinguishing features of their national tradition, be it religiosity, the anthropological impulse, or dialogue with literary and artistic traditions. Vasilii Zen'kovskii has identified this as Russia's historiosophical preoccupation, since Russian thought "is constantly addressing the question of the meaning of history" (*Istoriia russkoi filosofii*, 1991, 22). At present, this practice takes the form of a near fixation with the idea of "originality," whereby the adjective "original" sits among the highest terms of praise for describing a thinker or idea. Perhaps there is something about Russian thought, as Mikhail Epstein has argued, that keeps it returning to the site of its own origin story, rebuilding itself from the ashes of its past. At the same time, when considering metaphilosophy in the context of Russian thought, we must also be wary of this originality reflex, which risks the automatic "othering" of its subject and often ignores the ways thinkers from Russia have freely and productively participated in the philosophical process more broadly.

The present handbook, edited by an international trio of eminent specialists in the field of Russian thought, does not position itself as a history of Russian philosophy; nor does it claim to offer a complete picture, or any single overarching narrative, about Russian thought. A history is monologic (at least, where histories of Russian philosophy are concerned); this project is dialogic. Specifically, in the sense that it highlights the multiplicity of genres of philosophical thinking in Russia. Already in the introduction, we find references to the various understandings of philosophy that readers may encounter on the pages ahead: these include "pure philosophy" and "academic philosophy," but also "philosophically minded," "philosophical writers," "religious philosophy," "philosophical life," "philosophical culture," and "the love of wisdom." In their selection of topics, the editors foreground the complexity and multiplicity of the philosophical experience in Russia, without fixating on questions of "Russianness" or "originality."

The characteristics of complexity and multiplicity are also signaled in the volume's hefty form: 36 chapters and over 800 pages, with about half of chapters authored by scholars who were educated and/or employed in Russia. The volume is organized in two main parts: Part I, "Russian Philosophical Thought" (Ch. 2–20), comprises articles on political thought, religious philosophy, the reception of western thinkers in Russia, Vladimir Lenin and philosophy, profiles of leading thinkers (Nikolai Berdiaev, Lev Shestov, Gustav Shpet), and four chapters on the late-Soviet and contemporary period. Part II, "Philosophy in Dialogue with Literature and Art" (Ch. 21–35), includes investigations of the Russian novel, aesthetics and philosophy of art, and individual