

difficult to find detailed and reliable information even on Otpor's relatively well-known campaigns, let alone the much more obscure and abortive activities of Yokh, be it in western or local languages. Thus, Nikolayenko's meticulous synthesis makes the book a valuable first-stop reference even for those who do not share her interests in movement tactics and cross-border contacts.

Those interests are what propels the author's narrative, which draws heavily on her interviews. Strictly speaking, the book's central sources are retrospective assessments of movements by prominent members of those movements. While Nikolayenko is at pains to explain that government officials are much harder to approach for interviews, I do not see that as a serious shortcoming of the book. Much as it would be fascinating to be privy to internal discussions on how to deal with challenger organizations, such information is hard to glean even from interviews, and the author does a good job of reconstructing it based on decrees, public pronouncements, and observable actions, in addition to first-hand material, such as an interview with an activist for the loyalist Ireli movement in Azerbaijan. What I missed much more was the perspective of the silent majority of movement participants, those further removed from key organizing positions, as well as that of sympathetic or indifferent bystanders. This might have helped gain a richer view of internal conflict, assess the extent to which leaders' pronouncements are *ex post* rationalizations, and also weigh the importance of cultural conventions and dimensions of mobilization beyond the strategic. Coverage of such topics varies between chapters: conflicts inside movements are covered in greater detail for Ukraine; socio-cultural factors are discussed more explicitly for Azerbaijan. Nikolayenko argues that strategic and tactical decisions can matter regardless of cultural context. This is plausible to a degree, but it is precisely to make that kind of argument that one needs historical depth rather than abstraction. The structural constraints she does mention are intriguing and open up further questions: why, for example, are university rectors in Azerbaijan expected to do ideological work, unlike their colleagues in Leonid Kuchma's Ukraine? What factors, other than wages, account for police loyalty to incumbent regimes? Why did the Georgian state abolish subsidized student housing (ruling out eviction as a retaliatory measure)? What shapes expectations of gender roles within protest movements, and how does involvement in protest alter such expectations? Such questions are difficult to address using the thin descriptions favored by political science, but exploring them would make the comparison even richer, and advance our understanding of the relationship between political movements and long-term social change, not just short-term political outcomes. But that is a task for another book.

MISCHA GABOWITSCH  
Einstein Forum, Potsdam, Germany

***Social Imaginaries of the State and Central Authority in Polish Highland Villages, 1999–2005.*** By Anna Malewska-Szałygin. Trans. Aniela Korzeniowska and Stefan Sikora. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017. x, 299 pp. Appendix. Bibliography. £61.99, hard bound.  
doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.335

Students of Polish politics and society have become increasingly disturbed by the prevalence of sentiments and opinions incompatible with modern liberal democracy. Since the Polish economy has performed consistently well in the last two decades, the rise of populism, exemplified by the Law and Justice Party (PiS), the ruling party since 2015, cannot readily be attributed to declining material conditions. Anna

Malewska-Szałygin's book, first published in Polish in 2008, provides both graphic illustrations and intriguing answers to this puzzle. According to the traditional world view of villagers in the Podhale region (immediately north of the "real" highlanders of the Tatra Mountains), it is the task of the state to provide for its citizens according to the same basic principles that hold the head of a family is responsible for all its members. The *gospodarz* should carry out this function not so much through strong forms of *care* (though these are apparently important in other regions of Poland) but above all through ensuring the availability of paid work, always scarce in these poor upland villages. Since the disintegration of the socialist economy and the downsizing of local factories, these basic duties have been neglected.

Of course, these fiercely independent, strongly Catholic villagers would never self-identify as socialists. Malewska-Szałygin argues against stereotypes such as "homo sovieticus" and also the "postsocialist" approaches of western anthropologists. Rather, we need to understand persisting rural "social imaginaries" (a concept borrowed from Charles Taylor) since the late nineteenth century. Drawing on the classical study of the Polish peasantry by William Thomas and Florian Znaniecki (1918–20), she asserts that the state first made itself felt in villagers' consciousness as a mysterious "superhuman" order in the wake of feudalism. In the course of the twentieth century it was "tamed." In comparison, however, with respected leaders of the socialist era (Edward Gierek and also Wojciech Jaruzelski, who acted in the nation's best interests), the new political elites lack credibility. In the present "post-traditional" (Anthony Giddens) or "post-peasant" society, politicians are perceived as feudal "lords," who accumulate wealth without honest work. Worse, liberals are readily identified with Jews and excluded altogether from the national community. The pages detailing populist antisemitism are prescient in light of Polish politics today. Translating her informants' obscenities into the language of academia, the author notes drily that these representations are indicative of "a deep crisis of the government's legitimacy" (140).

The central imaginaries are explored empirically in five substantive chapters devoted respectively to the state, the authorities, the nation, democracy, and participation in public life. Vivid transcriptions are littered with exclamation marks, hilarious humor mingling with fascist bigotry. These chapters make depressing reading for those who value parliamentary democracy, tolerance of others, and the rule of law, but in her lengthy introduction Malewska-Szałygin explains why it is important to understand these voices, no matter how repugnant they may seem. She offers a sophisticated discussion of relevant theory and methodology, including a *who's who* of Anglophone political anthropology and a subtle engagement with narrative theory and the awkward "common sense" of those whose views are seldom registered by opinion pollsters or social scientists. Her methods rely primarily on teamwork with students. When interviews in villagers' homes in 1999 proved unsatisfactory, later expeditions focused on the marketplace of the county town, where conversations flowed more freely. The next task was to impose order on the resulting 450 unruly transcripts (including twenty-two mysteriously lost, according to the list provided in an Appendix). This feat was accomplished by means of the source metaphor "as on the farm, so in the state" (74). The resulting analysis flows very well. It is leavened with plentiful references not only to celebrated American anthropologists such as Arjun Appadurai, Clifford Geertz, and Marshall Sahlins, but also to Polish intellectuals such as Leszek Kołakowski on myth, Józef Tischner on ethics and work, Zdzisław Krasnodębski on the difference between liberal and republican, participatory variants of democracy, and Jadwiga Staniszkis on Poland's historic inability to accomplish the "mental revolution of nominalism" (117) that permitted modern forms of polity to emerge elsewhere in Europe.

Even if the market crowd is unrepresentative and the colorful exaggerations of loudmouth highlander extroverts (mostly male) interacting with liberal Warsaw undergraduates (mostly female) are not necessarily a reliable guide to their voting behavior, let alone their deeper values, I find the interpretations offered in this book largely convincing. It is a welcome addition to the English-language literature on contemporary east European politics (an index would also have been welcome). It might be suggested that, since these data were collected when the chaos of 1990s “shock therapy” was still a vivid memory, they provide little guidance to the significantly different cleavages observable in Poland today. Yet the Podhale villagers who voted enthusiastically for PiS in 2005 seem to have blazed a trail for the rest of the country. Following EU access, many Poles have again found work abroad, especially in Britain. But deep-seated dissatisfaction with those managing the Polish state has evidently not gone away. Anna Malewska-Szałygin notes that those who experience more cosmopolitan forms of life elsewhere through migration do not change their values and opinions concerning problems at home; these tend to remain anchored in the traditional world view.

CHRIS HANN

*Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology*

***Moskva i tatarskii mir: Sotrudnichestvo i protivostoianie v epokhu peremen,***

**XV–XVI vv.** By Bulat Raimovich Rakhimzianov. St. Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Evraziia, 2016. 396 pp. Appendixes. Notes. Bibliography. Chronology. Glossary. 659, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.336

A new book by Bulat R. Rakhimzianov continues on a larger scale his earlier research on Muscovite-Tatar relations and Tatar enclaves within the Muscovite realm, started with his 2009 monograph on the Kasimov Khanate (*Kasimovskoe khanstvo [1445–1552 gg.]: Ocherkii istorii*). In the Introduction, the author states his purpose, to reveal the involvement of Muscovy into the complex system of mutual relations between the “later Golden Horde states” (*pozднезолотоордынские государства*) in the fifteenth through sixteenth centuries (8–9). Drawing on abundant primary sources, mainly Moscow foreign office records (*posol'skie knigi*), both archival and published, Rakhimzianov carefully explores various forms of Muscovite-Tatar cooperation in the period that followed after the disintegration of the Golden Horde.

The book under review consists of two chapters, a conclusion, select bibliography, and three appendices including a chronology of the main events in central Eurasia in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, a glossary, and biographical notes on the persons mentioned in the text. In the first chapter, the author examines the phenomenon of Tatar emigration to Muscovy, which took different forms, from a short stay (euphemistically called *opochiv*, literally “a rest”) to a permanent residence that led to the formation of specific Tatar enclaves, semi-autonomous principalities known as *iurty*. The Kasimov khanate, established in 1445, was the largest among them, but similar Tatar settlements, on the basis of the grand-princely grants, existed also in Romanov (on the Volga), Kashira, Zvenigorod, Serpukhov, and some other Russian towns.

The second chapter focuses upon the administrative status of the Tatar enclaves in the Muscovite realm and their role in maintaining contacts between Moscow, the Crimea, and the Noghay Horde. This section (and the whole book) ends up with enumerating the indicators of Muscovy's deep involvement in the steppe politics and of its long-lasting subordinate status vis-à-vis the Tatar world.