

European Russia. Despite Ascher's conclusion that a coalition of liberals, workers, peasants and national minorities might have toppled the autocracy, the work indicates that divergent goals made such a coalition unlikely. The work is a needed corrective to Soviet accounts stressing Lenin and the Bolsheviks in 1905, but more attention is needed on the Bolsheviks prior to November 1905. The growth of anarchism as a movement during 1905 is not adequately treated by Ascher.

A veritable flood of new works concerning the 1905 Revolution in Russia have appeared in the last three years which were absent in Ascher's bibliography. They include works by Ian Nish and J.N. Westwood on the Russo-Japanese War. *Specific Studies on 1905* include: Theodor Shanin, *Russia 1905-1907: Revolution as a Moment of Truth*, MacMillan, 1986; Henry Reichman, *Railwaymen and Revolution: Russia 1905*, California 1987; Joseph Sanders, *The Moscow Uprising of December 1905*, Garland, 1987; and Robert Edelman, *Proletarian Peasants: the Revolution of 1905 in Russia's Southwest*, Cornell, 1987. Missing is the fine Italian study by Valdi Zilli, *La Rivoluzione del 1905*, 1963.

Gary Hanson
University of Saskatchewan

* * *

Virginia Berridge and Griffith Edwards — *Opium and the People: Opiate Use in Nineteenth-Century England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987. Pp. xxx, 370.

According to one well-known prescription, the quickest way out of nineteenth-century Manchester and the desolations of its industrial regime was by bottle — yet, according to this welcome paperback reissue (first published in 1981), the bottle was just as likely to have contained opium as alcohol. In various forms of pills, tinctures and powders, the "black drop" was widely and cheaply available for over-the-counter sales at corner shops, street markets and indeed pubs, where it was available not as a competitor to strong drink but as a reputed cure for hangovers.

Then, paregorics were taken for a wide range of purposes besides their euphoriant relief of social pain. Opiates were recommended for treating innumerable ailments, great and small, by internal or external application, from cholera to flatulence, earache to piles. They were, of course, regularly administered to infants in such legendary concoctions as Godfrey's Cordial, a soothing syrup based on laudanum (opium mixed with water and alcohol) that solved problems of child minding in the working-class home. While taken to relieve aches and fatigue after work, opiates were also taken to fortify men and women before work.

It is this very diversity of usage, together with the problems of evidence (extensive, but patchy), that makes the reconstruction of distinct patterns of opium eating particularly difficult. To meet this problem, the book offers amid its general account a detailed picture of opium use in the Fen country. Here, consumption was as high if not higher than in Manchester, due to the unhealthy marshy terrain, negligible medical assistance and a traditional resort to the indigenous poppy. Instructive here and offered as the probable pattern of popular use elsewhere is the common practice of self-medication and the control of consumption by informal social mechanisms with only minimal medical and legislative intervention.

The book also sets well-known instances of opium taking in literary and middle-class society — its use as a creative stimulant by De Quincey and Coleridge — in a wider context of self-medication and tolerance. Gladstone spiked his coffee with laudanum before addressing the Commons, though his sister Helen was a laudanum addict. A new biography of the Queen's physician indicates problems of addiction in the court, but this account again suggests the efficacy of normative or cultural controls on consumption. The balance of the book is concerned with the decisive changes

of official attitudes from the mid-century which stigmatized opium taking and sanctioned restrictive legislative controls.

Berridge and Edwards attribute the growth of formal controls to an alliance between the State and the newly professionalized bodies of doctors and pharmacists. The doctors who had widely and unhesitatingly prescribed opiates in the first half of the century now professed alarm at their toxic effect on public health and advocated a more narrowly "scientific" treatment use, particularly with the development of hypodermic injection of morphine, an opium derivative. Pharmacists were also concerned with adulteration, and the 1868 *Pharmacy Act* restricted the sale and availability of opiates. The increasing currency of the disease model in medical theory reconceived addiction in terms of deviancy, such, that it became both disease and vice — a failure of will. From this cautionary specialist perspective, it was the lower classes who were most fallible to the degeneracies of "infant doping" and the "luxurious" use of opiates. Thus was professional self-interest reinforced by class discrimination and opium eating, newly labelled a "problem" demanding penal as well as medical control. A lay anti-opium movement in the late-century added another discriminatory judgment in scapegoating the East End Chinese and their sinister opium dens, though the evidence suggests they were harmless enough resorts. A nice example of the deteriorating image of drugtaking, from normal through exotic to dangerous, comes from the increasingly disapproving response of Dr. Watson to Sherlock Holmes' cocaine habit.

The greater part of the book was written by Virginia Berridge, a social historian; Griffith Edwards, a psychiatrist, concludes with a lengthy chapter relating nineteenth-century experience to the present. Here, it is made plain how the nineteenth-century problem framework and reliance on formal controls are still the dominant responses to drug use. The book's argument from its historical reconstruction is that society would be better served by allowing cultural ecology to assert its own self-balancing controls, though this is to simplify a case that is made with a shrewd regard for the complexities of the issue and eschews any facile resort to history as a repository of ideal alternatives. The tone throughout is judicious not partisan, and the emphasis on specifics and social context makes the use of history properly instructive rather than polemical.

This is an impressive piece of work, both in exposition and interpretation, though there are some problems with the theoretical frames of the larger argument. The model of a natural equilibrium of controls suggests a misplaced optimism in the face of evidence from other fields that equilibria seem more generally to have been contested in the nineteenth and probably every other century. Foucault's argument for the institutionalization of discipline and surveillance seems to fit well enough, but there is no acknowledgment of his emphasis, however ambiguous, on resistance to power and dominance. But then, in passing, the book suggests that the decline in popular drug use in the nineteenth century was also a consequence of voluntary disuse. Why was this so?

Peter Bailey
University of Manitoba

* * *

Jeremy Black — *The English Press in the Eighteenth Century*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987. Pp. xv, 321.

Dr. Jeremy Black's book is a study of the chief features of the eighteenth-century newspaper press in England. He has made an exhaustive search of the secondary material and has thoroughly digested the output of the press. He picks up the story with the "upsurge in press activity during the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis" (5) and the "spate of new titles" (12) that followed the lapse of the *Licensing Act* in 1695. He provides informative summaries of economic news, advertisements, crime and sport coverage; sources and distribution, circulation and costs; and the problems of