sidered to be very successful. Under such circumstances one cannot blame the Russians for avoiding the risks of partnership.

M. Gardner Clark
Cornell University

SOVIET SOCIOLOGY OF SCIENCE. By *Linda L. Lubrano.* Columbus, Ohio: American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, 1976. vi, 102 pp. Paper.

This slim volume, appearing under the auspices of the AAASS, fills a gap with its survey of Soviet writings on *naukovedenie* (the science of science) and in somewhat more detail on Soviet sociology of science. The latter is defined as part of the study although occasionally the science of science and sociology of science seem to be synonymous.

Linda Lubrano has read very widely in the field and provides a clear account. This is essentially a work of reportage rather than of criticism. Lubrano rather cautiously interposes her own opinions—which always express good sense—from time to time.

Although the author claims that "the Marxian paradigm provides a philosophical perspective for a wide variety of subjects and opinions" (p. 7), the majority of writers cited apparently hold views that are fairly near to each other, despite distinctions of approach and emphasis. Dissenters such as Sakharov are out on a limb. The skewed distribution allows one to suppose that published material does not reflect accurately the spectrum of views actually held: works which receive the imprimatur have followed the official line. Presumably for this reason, a few rather incontrovertible propositions are offered: for example, that "greater efficiency in the organization of science will raise its productivity" (p. 69). This kind of obviousness helps to explain why the research carried out by Soviet scholars within their politically predetermined frame of reference helps to organize, rather than stimulate, thinking about the subject.

The selected bibliography includes Mikulinskii both under his last name and under Chlen-Korrespondent Akademii Nauk SSSR; and such titles as Rostov State University and Ural State University are Americanizations of the Russian originals.

Altogether, this volume provides a good description of a burgeoning activity, the results of which will help to shape Soviet scientific efforts.

Raymond Hutchings
Croydon, England

HEALTH CARE IN THE SOVIET UNION AND EASTERN EUROPE. By *Michael Kaser.* Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1976. vi, 278 pp. $30.00.

Health care has emerged, in the post-World War II period, as a major political, ideological, and financial issue the world over. The promise and the guarantee of universal access to health care at no direct cost at the time of use is part of the platform and program of every nation of the Comecon as a "civic right," as Michael Kaser puts it in this pioneering, important, and fact-filled study.

It is a pendant to an earlier study by Alan Maynard, *Health Care in the European Community* (1975). It provides basic and indispensable information on the health services available to 9 percent of the world population, roughly 360 million people. It details the experience of sixty years of Soviet "socialized medicine," and the thirty years of experience for Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania. Albania and China, which were dropped from Comecon, and Cuba and Mongolia, which joined it, do not figure in the study, the latter because they are outside Europe.

https://doi.org/10.2307/2494933 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The book begins with a comprehensive chapter on the "revolution in health care," and then quickly reviews first in the aggregate for all seven nations, and then for each one individually, data on the following six categories: legislation and policy, demographic patterns, health conditions, health service administration, health care facilities, and the financing of health care.

Several important points are made, only a few of which I can mention in a brief review: The promise of universal health care coverage is easier to enunciate than to implement. It was only by 1975 or thereabout that the seven nations examined here could boast that they had achieved that coverage. There are two main schemes whereby that coverage can be secured: the more traditional one through insurance, which usually is available to specific groups (primarily gainfully employed individuals) and often ignores the needs of important segments of the population, particularly rural populations and the self-employed; and a (national) health service scheme, sometimes called socialized medicine, whereby the polity arranges to provide health and related services, rather than arranging, mandating, or regulating the collection and the disbursement of monies to pay for services. In the second scheme, health services are usually financed from general revenues rather than specific individual or group contributions; health personnel are directly remunerated by the state through salaries, and all health facilities are nationalized and placed on a state-provided budget.

Most nations begin with the insurance model, and then gradually phase in the health service model. I think that the second model (in force in the Soviet Union since the mid-thirties for all except the peasantry) permits better planning and a tighter control on expenditures. It is interesting to note that the German Democratic Republic uses a system primarily of insurance and reimbursement, which sets it apart from all the other East European systems considered.

Although the health systems of these countries increasingly show similarities (facilitated by their common political structures), there are still important variations and differences which are tied primarily to historical factors, that is, to schemes that had developed prior to World War II. Germany, with its long history of social and health insurance is probably the strongest example (health insurance also predominates in the Federal Republic of Germany). Kaser has calculated health expenditures as a percentage of the GNP for the Comecon nations. The figure for the USSR is amazingly low when compared to the other Comecon nations (with the exception of Bulgaria and Rumania) and with other industrial nations. Thus the Soviet Union spent only 2.8 percent of GNP on health in 1968, whereas most industrial nations spent at least 5 percent and more (the present U.S. figure is 8.6 percent). As noted earlier, the move toward a health service scheme away from insurance is normally dictated by a need to control or reduce expenses for health (the GDR, which still operates mainly on the insurance scheme, spent 5.7 percent of GNP on health in 1968, the highest figure for Comecon nations). In most of these nations, patients still make private payments, sometimes sub rosa, to physicians and hospital personnel either to ensure better attention or because it is the custom (salaries for health care personnel are usually very low in these countries). It is difficult to determine how much these payments raise the total bill that the population pays for health services. One can infer that medical care is of such importance to recipients that they feel compelled to make additional payments, thus "buying" personal attention. Such payments are likely to persist, socialized medicine or not, legal or not. All these nations provide health services on a stratified basis: the elites, whether political or intellectual, get better care and better amenities than the average citizen. And the elites, which are better paid, can also better afford to make the payments mentioned above. Thus the promise of universal coverage is not matched by a guarantee of equity within the system.

https://doi.org/10.2307/2494933 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The book is valuable not only because it is the only one of its kind available, but also because the accumulation of statistical data permits the comparative focus to be carried out within the Comecon nations, and between the Comecon and other nations. It will round out any scholarly collection dealing with social conditions in the Comecon countries.

Mark G. Field
Boston University

ŬZBEK SOVET ENTSIKLOPEDIIASI, vols. 1–7: Ä–NIKELIN. Chief editor, *I. M. Mŭminov*. Tashkent: Ŭzbekiston SSR Fänlär akademiiasi, 1970–75. Illus. Maps.

The *Uzbek Soviet Encyclopedia* is one of several multivolume encyclopedias currently being prepared in their own languages by the scientific academies of individual union republics. While those acquainted with Soviet reference works in Russian will find much familiar material in the Uzbek encyclopedia, there is also much that is distinctive. For example, the entry for the Islamic philosopher, mathematician, and naturalist, Abu Räyhan Berunii (al-Biruni), who was born in A.D. 973 in the Khorezm region, is accorded considerably more prominence (five and one-half pages plus a full-page color portrait) than that of General Secretary Brezhnev (one and one-half pages with a two-column black-and-white photograph).

Whether spontaneously or by design, the Uzbek encyclopedia celebrates as its leitmotif those elements of the national heritage (many of them shared with other peoples of the area as part of a common Turanian culture and Islamic tradition) which contrast with European ways. This effect is heightened by a profusion of color plates devoted largely to pre-Russian and pre-Soviet origins: medreses, minarets, and mausoleums; reproductions of miniatures and illustrations from medieval manuscripts of the region; portraits of major figures of the Islamic period; contemporary painting emphasizing the Asian quality of life; Uzbek native theater and dance; textile patterns in vivid colors, jewelry, ceramics, and other traditional handicrafts; Uzbek traditional native costumes, including two full pages in color of richly embroidered *dŭppilär* (Muslim skullcaps better known to Westerners by the Russo-Tatar word *tiubeteika*) illustrating regional and tribal differences; and local flora and fauna.

The contents of the first seven volumes correspond to organization of the editorial board into separate sections for various branches of the natural and social sciences. The latter include archaeology, ethnography, and anthropology; economics and pedagogical science; art and architecture; history; language, literature, and folklore; philosophy and law; and lexicography. Reflected throughout is nostalgia for the period from approximately the ninth to the seventeenth century when (with time out for invasions) Islamic cities of Central Asia such as Khorezm and Samarkand were in the forefront of much of civilized progress, and when local scholars such as al-Khorezmi (whose ninth-century treatise on quadratic equations is said to have given us the word "algebra," from the Arabic *"al-jabr"*), al-Biruni, ibn Sina (Avicenna), and Ulugh Bek were leaving their mark on the history of human thought. Even articles on the natural sciences go out of their way to stress the contributions of this early Islamic period.

On current topics, where ideological controls are more rigid and systematic—for example, on relations with foreign countries or with other Soviet nationalities—the Uzbek viewpoint is expressed more cautiously: Afghanistan (which has large Uzbek, Tadzhik, and Turkmen minorities) is given more space than Austria, and the entry for Ashkhabad, capital of neighboring Turkmenistan, is twice as long as that for European Vilnius, despite the latter's greater population. The content of

https://doi.org/10.2307/2494933 Published online by Cambridge University Press