

in addiction treatment. Chapter 5 examines the practice of an Alcoholics Anonymous 12-step program in post-Soviet Russia at a private rehabilitation center, introducing the concept of “illness sodality,” or sociality around an illness identity.

Raikhel’s central and most compelling claim is that the bureaucratic authority of narcology began to erode with political and economic changes during the 1990s. In the area of alcohol treatment, these changes included the end of involuntary treatment, decreased funding, and new competition. Under these conditions, the performance of charismatic authority in the clinical encounter became even more important. Therapeutic legitimacy hinges on associations with specific institutional and broader historical, political, and economic contexts. Individual patient life histories are also at play. Legitimacy is not solely or even primarily about training and technology, rather it is performed, drawing on a diverse array of informal social discourses that extend far beyond the clinical encounter. Thus, practitioners of suggestion-based therapies draw on tropes about Russian forms of authority or on symbols of Russian Orthodoxy. An AA network bolsters legitimacy through its association with the St. Petersburg visual art and rock scene. Closely attending to therapeutic legitimacy raises new questions on classic themes in medical anthropology: authority, placebo, belief, and efficacy among these.

Another claim intersects with anthropological work on the transformation of selves in post-Soviet Russia. The literature on post-Soviet subjectivities has focused on the rise of neoliberalism and self-governance. Here Raikhel intervenes to show how suggestion-based treatment differs from Foucauldian “technologies of the self,” instead functioning as “prostheses for the will.” The self is not transformed—behavior is. Twelve-step therapies such as AA in the post-Soviet context may have more of an affinity with neoliberalism, but Raikhel considers AA as a form of sociality around the illness identity, an illness sodality. Raikhel tasks anthropologists with linking subjectivities to institutions and relationships rather than specific therapies or neoliberalism. Illness sodality is meant to offer a different lens for anthropological studies of subjectivity. His insight that selves are transformed through their integration in new forms of sociality is powerful, but I would have liked it more fully grounded in ethnographic evidence of patient experiences.

Raikhel’s book is an important contribution to the medical anthropology of therapeutic institutions and practices, offering new insights on the cultural specificity of biomedical and lay therapies of addiction. In Raikhel’s careful account, authority, knowledge, and subjectivity are mutually transformed in the post-Soviet context. The book should be of broad use to those interested in the areas of post-Soviet healthcare, global health, and substance abuse treatment. It is also a vital contribution to the anthropology of medicine, psychiatry, addiction, institutions, and expertise.

MICHELLE PARSONS

Northern Arizona University

The Instrumentalisation of Mass Media in Electoral Authoritarian Regimes: Evidence from Russia’s Presidential Election Campaigns of 2000 and 2008.

By Nozima Akhrarkhodjaeva. Stuttgart: Ibidem-Verlag, 2017. viii, 283 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Figures. Tables. \$45.00, paper.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.73

For many western analysts, Vladimir Putin’s regime is associated with the state’s takeover of NTV in 2000–2003, the assassination of the columnist Anna Politkovskaia

in 2006, and the frequent use of anti-terrorist legislation to curb freedom of the internet. We are mesmerized by Freedom House graphs showing post-Soviet Russia steadily sliding down the press freedom scale. The book under review represents a noble attempt to reconstruct this history in a nuanced and multidimensional way. The author, Nozima Akhrarkhodjaeva, is a new doctor of political science (2016). In her book, she zooms in on the state's manipulation strategies and misuse of the media during the presidential election campaigns of 2000 and 2008. The chosen analytical frame is the subtle distinction between competitive and hegemonic authoritarianisms. She argues that Russia's devolution from the former to the latter affected the way that mass media are being manipulated and how their content becomes biased. The author meticulously classifies various practices and strategies of manipulation and documents their changes by taking two cases, the years 2000 and 2008. To give just one example, the book demonstrates how framing the incumbent changed from representing him as "able" in 2000 to "the one who is capable of maintaining stability" in 2008, whereas framing the oppositional programs changed from critical assessment to ridicule and belittling (257).

One of the most interesting discussions in the book is how journalists themselves reflect on their relations with the state. Surprisingly, many of them emphatically deny overt pressure, manipulation, or even self-censorship. At the same time, Akhrarkhodjaeva aptly diagnoses the atmosphere of uncertainty in which Putin-era media are forced to operate. The toughening rules of the game on the one hand, and the bare necessity of the media market to keep on playing this game, produces this uncertainty. For example, the state has expanded the legislative and precedential basis for prosecuting journalists for libel, hurting religious feelings, or violating the private lives of bureaucrats, but when consistently implemented, this legislation would effectively outlaw almost any journalism. The policy of cherry picking the next whipping boy makes journalists apprehensive of the fine line, separating punishable from non-punishable actions (173–78).

In spite of the many important issues addressed in this book, the author avoids the discussion that I deem to be central to the topic: the causal link between media manipulation practices and regime change. The author's research optic, honed to examine niceties of the political regime's configurations, made her inattentive to the problem of socio-political dynamics. She argues that "media manipulations . . . differ depending on the regime type" (258), and this traps the argument of the study into seeing the mass media on the receiving end only, deprived of agency. It is legitimate to ask; is it the change of the Russian regime that preconditioned the change in the type of media ownership (as it is shown, for example, on 251), or the other way around—the change of media ownership had critical impact upon regime change? The author's conspicuous lack of interest in continuities and developments leaves readers tantalized by the unanswered question: what is happening now, after the Ukrainian crisis?

The structure of the book raises doubts as well. It bears the indelible imprint of a PhD thesis—an excellent PhD thesis probably, but still a thesis, with its overextended analytic apparatus and literature survey. In fact, readers cannot reach the original research until well into the middle of the book, only after they beat their thorny path through the first three chapters, the first being dedicated to the theoretical accounts on hybrid regimes; the second, to electoral manipulations and the third, to instrumentalization of the media. On page 130 you are finally treated to the "Research Design," and what is left after that is the discussion of the strategies of media manipulation in Russia, grounded on eleven interviews with journalists in Chapter 4 and the content analysis of media coverage of the presidential elections in Chapter 5. The author's passion for tables (there are fifty-eight tables in the book!) is especially exasperating.

In many cases, where a simple focused narrative would do, they distract attention by the treadmill of repetitious classifications and taxonomies.

MIKHAIL SUSLOV
University of Copenhagen

The Force of Custom: Law and the Ordering of Everyday Life in Kyrgyzstan. By Judith Beyer. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2016. xxvi, 244 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Glossary. Index. Photographs. Maps. \$28.95, Paper. doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.74

The Force of Custom: Law and the Ordering of Everyday Life in Kyrgyzstan by Judith Beyer is a convincing ethnographic monograph on the persistence of social practices that contribute to a resilient community. Beyer situates her narrative in a remote part of the Central Asian steppes known as Talas province in northwestern Kyrgyzstan. She argues determinedly that the road map for navigating successful legal pluralism in this country is a daily understanding and interpretation of the Kyrgyz' everyday practice known as *salt*. What might be considered as something similar to a Zen *Koan*, Beyer writes that *salt* can only "maintain its relevance as it remains flexible. To capture and codify its rules and principles at a given moment in time would destroy the possibility of negotiation in future situations" (10). So how does such a process really work?

When it comes to deciphering codes of the everyday variety, anthropologists employ a magnifying glass that illustratively captures distinct cues and offers a nuanced explanation of how such codes are linked together. In this light, Beyer exemplifies the best of anthropology by painstakingly demonstrating *salt* through a series of detailed ethnographic engagements with leaders from the two villages of Aral and Engels, places that Beyer suggests have escaped post-socialism dilemmas, perhaps because of their daily adherence to *salt*. Following her ethnographic instincts, Beyer sets out to define the concentric circles of *salt* in these Kyrgyz villages. First, she insists that *salt* is a daily practice—a coded belief system—that brings people together and aligns them. In the process of invoking *salt*, they recognize its code that bring order and meaning to the other sometimes contradicting legal systems that shape their daily lives, including *shariat* and national laws. Second, Beyer conveys that *salt* is not another name for customary law; "*salt* was too deeply embedded in practice to be codified, and too strongly embodied in people to be institutionalized" (35). Nevertheless, Beyer is somewhat entangled by "customary law" in trying to describe *salt*. She diligently refocuses her readers' attention to demonstrating a diverse set of everyday social engagements in these two small villages, and how in each instance, *salt* operates—from sorting through a divorce to changing funerary practices—and how different actors such as politicians, religious leaders, and businessmen utilize *salt*.

While Beyer carefully illustrates the multiple examples of how leaders from two small villages demonstrate *salt*, I continually contemplated her efforts from the applied policy worlds that I work in everyday, that of development and peacebuilding, and our favored term of "resilience." In so doing, how would a moniker such as "resilience" enable Beyer to redefine *salt* by studying its impact instead of its interactive process? In other words, in moving away from the definition of *salt* under the rubric of customary law, which denotes rules and orders, and instead shifting it to that of an attitudinal or psychological state of being—flexibility, adaptability and persistence—would Beyer gain additional analytical tools to more completely make the invisible