

ailleurs. Elle est simplement devenue éclatée et fragmentée, ce qui a conduit les malades vers des parcours transinstitutionnels complexes et désarticulés.

En fin de compte, si le portrait de la désinstitutionnalisation psychiatrique en Saskatchewan dressé par Erika Dyck et son équipe sur la base de l'étude du Weyburn Mental Hospital n'est pas des plus réjouissants, il est certainement des plus exacts et des plus pertinents. En abordant, par le biais de cette institution, la question de l'évolution des soins de santé mentale sous l'angle tant scientifique que social et politique, les auteurs de *Managing Madness* nous offrent en effet un portrait réaliste et des plus nuancés de ce que fut la transformation des modalités de prise en charge de la maladie mentale dans cette province des Prairies canadiennes au cours du XX<sup>e</sup> siècle. Ils contribuent ainsi avec finesse et à-propos à l'enrichissement de l'histoire de la psychiatrie canadienne contemporaine, dont beaucoup de pans restent encore à étudier. Ils participent de plus au renouvellement global de l'historiographie de la santé, qui ne peut plus désormais échapper à la mutualisation des points de vue et au dépassement d'une histoire de la médecine centrée sur les seuls médecins et leurs institutions. En ce sens, l'ouvrage de Dyck et Deighton s'impose comme une référence majeure, en raison de sa grande qualité, pour appréhender l'histoire de la santé mentale dans le Canada contemporain et pour comprendre plus précisément, et avec les nuances requises, les modalités complexes du déploiement de la désinstitutionnalisation psychiatrique sur le territoire de la Saskatchewan.

Alexandre Klein  
Université Laval

ENGELSTEIN, Laura – *Russia in Flames: War, Revolution, Civil War 1914-1921*.  
New York: Oxford University Press, 2018. Pp. 823.

After a bit of a lull in the study of the Russian revolution since the first years following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the centenary of the revolutions of 1917 has, not surprisingly, led to a flurry of new books on the subject. In her panoramic new account of the revolutionary period, Laura Engelstein focuses on politics and the problem of power: it was one thing for the Bolsheviks to seize power in October 1917, but they then had to reconstitute authority in the territories of the former Russian Empire—to reconstruct power in order to win the ensuing civil war. This the Bolsheviks did by mobilizing violence not just as a destructive force but as an instrument for building state institutions.

Engelstein's lively narrative draws on a vast array of primary sources, the rich historiography produced from the late 1960s through the late 1980s, as well as a deep reading of newer post-Soviet studies, especially Russian ones, in order to anchor those revolutions firmly within the broader context of seven years of war, state collapse, and imperial disintegration. Her periodization and conceptualization reflect transformations of the field in the past quarter century.

The first of these changes is the blossoming of the study of the First World War, a period that was neglected until recently by historians, who tended to treat it as a mere denouement of the imperial period or prelude to the 1917 revolutions. Engelstein draws on this new work's emphasis on the activation of civil society, on the transformation of the relationship between state and society, on patterns of violence and the suspension of moral restraint, and especially on state-directed stigmatization of designated social and especially ethnic groups during the war in order to advance an understanding of the revolution and civil war as the product of volatile forces released by the Great War, and as an effort to tame and redirect them. The second major change that Engelstein embraces is the "provincial turn" in Russian history: in the Soviet period, it was very hard for historians to get visas to work in "the provinces" outside Moscow and Leningrad, but ever since, scholars have flocked to these regions of Russia and to the various post-Soviet states that were once the Soviet provinces too. Their research has transformed an historiography that was traditionally told very much from the two capitals. It has brought pre-revolutionary and Soviet Russia's previously understudied and undertheorized multinational and imperial nature into high relief and has altered our understanding of how the power of the centre actually worked across this far-flung territory. Engelstein's revolution takes place across the whole space of the Russian Empire, pulling the central, regional, and imperial struggles into one story, drawing out common patterns and explaining diverging outcomes.

In Engelstein's reading, the revolution of February 1917 was both the product and the generator of mobilization, at all levels of society and across the Empire, around the idea of democratic political participation. This civic movement, as well as traditional forms of social cohesion, would remain remarkably resilient from 1917 to 1921, giving the Bolsheviks a run for their money. The Bolsheviks were ultimately more successful than their competitors in first rallying that movement and then conquering it—in region after region, Engelstein shows their "signature tactic": "penetrate, mobilize, dominate, liquidate" (p. 227). Most importantly, though, they focused on state building—the forging of the Red Army as a model of the future society united in its political mission, the nationalization of the economy and the destruction of private trade replaced with a top-down system of grain requisitioning and the militarization of labour, and the elimination of political alternatives. The regime was not shy about using violence, including the violence of starvation, to impose its vision of the future communist society. In so doing, the Bolsheviks betrayed the spirit of the 1917 revolution, substituting forced mobilization for the aspiration to popular political participation that had animated it. In this argument, Engelstein is influenced by the work of Peter Holquist, who has shown how modern state power is not merely repressive but also an active, organizing force and has explored violence as a technology of power in revolutionary Russia.

Along the way, Engelstein weighs in on many of the classic questions of interpretation of the revolutionary period. As someone who cut her teeth as an historian with a book on the 1905 revolution in Moscow, she provides a thoughtful analysis of the influence of that uprising on those in 1917. Although she claims in

the introduction that the imperial Russian regime might have been able to evolve into a democratic, capitalist society had it not been for the war, the thrust of her argument is the contrary: that authority had already been badly compromised even before hostilities broke out in 1914, due to the tensions generated by the internally inconsistent governing system established by the October Manifesto of 1905. She explores the relative impact of individual leaders—in particular, Vladimir Lenin and Leon Trotsky, but also Nicholas II, Alexander Kerensky, General Carl Mannerheim in Finland, Józef Piłsudski in Poland, or Alexander Kolchak in Siberia—on the revolutionary process, demonstrating their crucial role but also showing that personalities alone cannot explain the evolution of events. And she addresses the question of the impact of the civil war on the character of Bolshevism, rejecting the argument that Bolshevism was transformed and made more authoritarian by the exigencies of civil war. Rather, she insists, the Bolsheviks expected and promoted fratricidal conflict from the start, using it as a means to clarify the political landscape and to test out new institutions of rule. No purer form of Bolshevism was betrayed in the process.

Although it seems churlish to ask for more of such a comprehensive, careful, and vividly told narrative, Engelstein might have devoted a bit more attention to the story of civic mobilization in 1917; oddly, she does not really engage the important recent work of scholars such as Sarah Badcock and Aaron Retish, who have shown how actively peasants engaged in the political process and sought to assert their citizenship during that year. Similarly, we could hear more about the soft side of Bolshevik power, which Engelstein refers to but does not analyze in depth as she does the violent aspect. Indeed, she pays little attention to culture. There is considerable evidence, for instance, of religion providing both a setting for civic mobilization and an idiom for contesting the Bolshevik vision, yet religion is completely absent from this account, aside from one inexact sentence that the Orthodox Church lost its place as the state religion in 1917 (in fact, although freedom of religion was decreed, the church remained state-funded and its status was deferred to the Constituent Assembly). Finally, it is perplexing that Engelstein refers to Ukraine as “the” Ukraine, a strange grammatical practice long ago abandoned in scholarly writing and for good reason.

This book represents a monumental undertaking and a marvellous accomplishment, and it will be a standard work in the field for years to come.

Heather J. Coleman  
*University of Alberta*