

went to the private sector. They relied upon bribing state authorities, like inspectors, to look the other way. The sophistication of such frauds increased, despite strengthened penalties, resulting in losses estimated in the billions of rubles.

Chapter 4 is a case study of one such illegal enterprise: the “Khain affair.” Khanan Aronovich Khain ran a textile factory in Kyiv. He was accused of diverting surplus fabrics to market and bribing local authorities, and of running a “counter-revolutionary” band of thieves. The Khain affair, Cadiot notes, must also be connected to postwar antisemitism in Ukraine: all of the accused were Jewish, and the trial trucked in antisemitic stereotypes. Khain and his associates were convicted in 1952 and executed in 1953, a rare example of the death penalty for economic crime in those years. The case was later reexamined after Stalin’s death; the conviction for “counter-revolutionary” activity was reversed, but not the conviction for thievery.

The last chapter listens to “the voices of thieves,” looking at how they explained and interpreted their actions, especially in their appeals for mercy. Most emphasized miserable social and economic conditions and portrayed their acts of theft as an aberration in life trajectories that otherwise emphasized their integration with Soviet society (254). “To explain themselves. . . [thieves had to justify] their place in this society, even when they did not follow, know, or grasp its rules, especially those for the protection of socialist property,” Cadiot observes. “They sometimes even stumbled over the concept, the contours, the value, the exact content of this concept” (261).

In the conclusion, Cadiot reflects on post-Stalinist developments and the fact that theft of socialist property remained endemic in Soviet society for the remainder of its existence. After the collapse of communism, post-Soviet capitalism expanded opportunities for theft and corruption as oligarchs managed to acquire state property through illegal and corrupt means. The concept of “socialist property” Cadiot argues, helps explain “why the accusation of theft is so important in the Russian imaginary,” for example, in jailed opposition leader Aleksei Naval’nyi’s critiques of current President Vladimir Putin’s kleptocratic reign (301–2).

Cadiot’s book is exhaustively researched, making use of an impressive number of archival sources, including newly declassified files from the political police archives in Ukraine. If it has one drawback, it is simply that the abundance of small case studies is overwhelming, making it easy to lose the thread of a chapter’s argument. That said, the incredible amount of detail offered reinforces Cadiot’s point about the massive “universe of theft” the Soviet system both created and tried to eliminate. This book is required reading for those interested in the history of Soviet crime and punishment and of the second economy, but also for those interested in the porous border between those who committed crime and those who policed it.

KRISTY IRONSIDE  
McGill University

***Une histoire de la psychiatrie soviétique.*** By Grégory Dufaud. Paris: Éditions de l’Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, 2021. 314 pp. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Glossary. Index. Photographs. Tables. Maps. €23.00, paper.  
doi: 10.1017/slr.2023.219

One of the challenges facing historians of east European psychiatry, like in any underdeveloped subject, is that there are few survey-style overviews that capture historical change over a long period. Instead, scholars in this area—and indeed we are growing in number—confront something of a staccato historiography: a number of fascinating articles and book chapters, but little that ties it all together. Grégory Dufaud’s recent

monograph should thus be warmly received, even more so for the fact that Dufaud draws broadly from the work of historians writing in English, French, and Russian, many of whom do not necessarily read each other's work. And while the author has done well to integrate these historiographical strands, the book is not a mere synthesis; Dufaud consults a wide array of primary sources, ranging from psychiatric textbooks and medical journals to hospital records and ministerial files pulled from both federal and regional archives. The result is a genuinely insightful monograph that simultaneously presents new ideas and arguments while also acting as something of a report on the state of the field.

On the whole, historians of eastern Europe have been slow to turn their gaze to psychiatry, even when other aspects of social life have received significant attention. Such a situation is not merely a pity; it is a problem. As Dufaud underscores, psychiatrists are responsible for setting the boundaries between normal and abnormal thoughts, feelings, and behaviors. In this regard, they are intimately involved in the shaping of social norms, which are themselves important to the everyday exercise of power. In addition, they are caregivers charged with mitigating citizens' suffering; by studying mental healthcare, historians also learn something of how political leaders attended to—or not—the distress experienced by the population over which they rule. For these reasons, as Dufaud illustrates throughout the monograph, the study of psychiatry is thus useful for non-medical historians, in that it offers up new perspectives on political and social life within the Soviet context.

The book's chronology runs from the late Tsarist period up to death of Brezhnev, with chapters dedicated to specific episodes familiar to historians of east European mental healthcare, including revolutionary enthusiasm for using the human sciences to transform society, challenges to psychiatry that came from physiologists, the so-called Pavlovian controversy, and the political misuse of psychiatry against those protesting against aspects of Soviet life. At the same time, the book also breaks new ground, with fascinating subsections that draw upon new archival material. For instance, readers learn of the letters that patients and their families sent to complain about the conditions within psychiatric hospitals ("a single toilet for 63 patients") and of the production difficulties related to Aminazine, the Soviet equivalent of the blockbuster drug chlorpromazine.

Dufaud expends significant effort pushing back against Cold War era distortions that framed psychiatry as little more than a tool to manipulate Soviet citizens and enforce ideological purity. This work further demonstrates that psychiatry was not a monolith simply in service to the state; practitioners often enjoyed a fair degree of autonomy, engaged with ideas from abroad, debated vigorously within the discipline, and made decisions with their own professional interests in mind. Aside from the period immediately after the revolution, psychiatrists rarely concerned themselves with radical attempts to alter society. Even if authorities might sometimes pay lip service to psychiatry's potential role in social transformation, the work of psychiatrists was fairly modest and primarily consisted of caring for those with psychiatric illness. While they might make the most of opportunities offered by the revolution, such as pushing for more outpatient care at the expense of hospital-based treatment, they were usually guided by professional goals (ensuring that psychiatry remained firmly affixed to medicine), rather than ideological ones.

None of this is to suggest that the changing political winds were immaterial; one of the strengths of the book is its exploration of how psychiatrists navigated the challenging political and scientific circumstances associated with revolution, Stalinist rule, and the Khrushchev and Brezhnev eras. But Dufaud's work demonstrates that the challenges faced by clinicians were as likely to be material as ideological. In this regard, the book does an outstanding job of giving historians much greater insight

into the day to day practices of Soviet psychiatry—and consequently an understudied portion of the Soviet population, the mentally ill—both within and outside of the historiography’s major discussion points.

MAT SAVELLI  
McMaster University

***Substate Dictatorship: Networks, Loyalty and Institutional Change in the Soviet Union.*** By Yoram Gorlizki and Oleg Khlevniuk. Yale-Hoover Series on Authoritarian Regimes. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2020. ix, 464 pp. Appendixes. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Photographs. \$72.00, hard bound.  
doi: 10.1017/slr.2023.220

In *Substate Dictatorship*, Yoram Gorlizki and Oleg Khlevniuk draw on the expansive social science literature on comparative dictatorship to examine the functioning of the Soviet political system on the regional level. The authors begin from the assumption that Soviet substate functionaries faced the two key problems of authoritarian rulers: namely, those pressures and threats emanating from their own ruling circle and from the broader social constituency over which they exercised their power. Soviet regional leaders also had to contend with a third source of potential trouble, namely the Central Committee. Drawing on a large volume of archival material, the book composes a detailed picture of the tactics they used to build and sustain political networks that would enable them to succeed in this challenging environment. These included over-promotion (to create dependents), blackmail through compromising material and various forms of political exclusion. Depending on their particular combination of these tools, and their success in repelling threats from competitors, the authors class regional leaders as “substate dictators,” “contested autocrats,” and “party governors” (22). The first two categories emerged during the late-Stalin era, while the third became the norm during the Brezhnev period. In many ways, the core narrative thread of the book is the gradual maturation of Soviet regional governance from substate dictatorship as essentially unchecked, military-style rule constrainable only by the center or actors with access to its resources (powerful industrial directors), to party governorship, a more sophisticated and stable system of power relations still operated by a principal actor (the regional secretary) but held together by a complex web of norms of seniority and personal respect.

There is little doubt that this book is a valuable contribution of exemplary scholarship. The primary material deployed is voluminous, rigorously selected and, significantly, largely untapped. As the world of post-WWII Soviet politics remains understudied, *Substate Dictatorship* is a pioneering work empirically as well as conceptually. It is therefore difficult to measure the book’s findings against other contributions, though the authors make excellent use of the available secondary literature (especially when considering less examined cases, such as the Baltic republics). The theoretical toolkit of the social sciences is also skillfully used. For example, the concept of institutional conversion (114) is particularly illuminative with regard to the process by which regional officials used their position to redirect organizational innovations initiated by Moscow in a way that served their own interests.

Nevertheless, though ably deployed, the analytical framework of comparative dictatorship is also a constraint on the book’s explanatory power. Historians will be naturally suspicious of attempts to draw parallels between political systems as diverse as absolute monarchies, military dictatorships and single party states. Gorlizki and Khlevniuk recognize the limitations of working on the basis of a residual concept of