

manifestations; explains its nature and potential long-term effects; and highlights its limits and pitfalls. *The Inclusionary Turn* opens many avenues of inquiry, such as research into the long-term effects of this episode of political inclusion, how the deinstitutionalization of many Latin American party systems shaped particular forms of inclusion, and the role direct action played in politicizing the demands of the popular sectors.

Managing Transition: The First Post-Uprising Phase in Tunisia and Libya. By Sabina Henneberg. Cambridge University Press, 2020. 266p. \$99.99 cloth.

doi:10.1017/S1537592721003522

— Kirstie Lynn Dobbs , Merrimack College
dobbsk@merrimack.edu

Managing Transition: The First Post-Uprising Phase in Tunisia and Libya by Sabina Henneberg offers a comparative analysis of the role of interim governments after the fall of the authoritarian regimes in Tunisia and Libya following the 2011 Arab Spring protests. Henneberg wishes to “restore the importance of local agents’ choices in critical moments during the transitions” (p. 14). Focusing on the role of these actors themselves is just as important as the debates surrounding the religious–secular divide and questions on national identity that have “consumed so many analysts” (p. 14) investigating Libya and Tunisia. Henneberg fills a significant gap left open in the post-revolution literature, especially regarding the Arab Spring: she reveals that both the agency of the interim governments and the structural environments in which they made decisions were of critical importance for each country’s transition. Tunisia made the transition to a successful, albeit precarious, representative democracy, whereas Libya’s transition resulted in violence and conflict among groups competing for political power. Overall, the book presents a theory for analyzing interim governments in post-revolution or democratizing contexts based on three key elements or challenges that they face: bridging the old and the new institutions, securing internal and external legitimacy without being elected, and creating agreed-on power-sharing rules.

This study uses qualitative data based on interviews conducted with political elites and other actors involved with the interim governments in Tunisia and Libya. It also uses primary and secondary sources, such as official texts, laws, reports published by international organizations, and news articles from credible outlets. Although the author traveled to Tunisia to conduct interviews, she did not conduct interviews “on the ground” in Libya—possibly explaining the lack of voice given to grassroots civil society activists in Libya, especially compared to the Tunisian case. Overall, however, the analysis is incredibly rich in detail and useful for quantitative methodologists seeking to build a dataset on interim governments.

Managing Transitions sheds light on the delicate balance between continuity and stability and revolution and change. The book carefully connects each country’s historical past with the decisions made by the interim governments. For example, the *Destour Sagheer* (the constitution passed immediately in the interim phase in Tunisia) reflected the country’s 1861 constitution that pushed for reform and modernization; this showcased how the country’s long-standing trends in institution building influenced decision-making in 2011. Establishing new governing institutions in Libya proved more challenging. Since independence, Libya has never possessed a strong unifying national identity and has consistently lacked a strong central governing entity in which security, economic, political, and judicial institutions carried out daily functions of government. The lack of governing norms in Libya’s past carried over into the transition phase and significantly affected the decision-making of the interim government. Furthermore, Qaddafi’s susceptibility to foreign influences during his last decade in power put international pressure on the interim government that also affected its decision making when building institutions, ultimately to the detriment of the transition.

Henneberg carefully notes the costs and benefits that individual actors face when negotiating the trade-offs in bridging political and social divides at times when countries face a national identity crisis brought about by a major transition and an influx of new spaces for political contestation. A much-appreciated aspect of the book is that it takes a psychological approach in describing the individual personalities of the elite actors and why their dispositions for compromise or past associations as a moderate or technocrat had a considerable impact on the decision outcomes of interim bodies and the transitions. For example, it mattered that Ben Achour, one of the leading figures in Tunisia’s interim government, possessed a disposition well suited for compromise and consensus; it had a great impact on the work of the transition government—ultimately culminating in the *esprit de consensus* that characterized the interim government.

Political mistrust created by the former regime also carried over into the post-revolution era. Tensions between members of interim governments proved consequential in the decision-making processes; overcoming barriers of mistrust left over from the previous regime was a major challenge for interim governments in both Tunisia and Libya. In Libya, Mustafa Abd al-Jalil was nominated as chairman of the interim government because he was seen as apolitical and had a public image as a unifying figure. Yet, tensions arose between Jalil and Mahmoud Jibril, who became the prime minister based on his connections with the Qaddafi regime. Mistrust between members of the interim government in Tunisia also persisted, especially when those connected to the former regime were connected on their ability to be independent and nonpartisan. During

these critical periods of internal conflict, the individual personalities of the decision makers played a significant role in the government's ability to bridge political divides.

Overall, *Managing Transitions* inserts itself into the wider scholarly debate famously framed by Philippe Schmitter and Terry Lynn Karl (1991) in the *Journal of Democracy* in their article titled "What Democracy Is... and Is Not." Democratic transitions do not necessarily appear more orderly, consensual, or stable than the former regimes. In both Tunisia and Libya, the process of building new institutions, securing legitimacy, and creating new power-sharing rules was fraught with conflict, although Libya faced greater threats of military intervention than did Tunisia. This process did not necessarily lead to economic efficiency (as seen in Tunisia), but a successful democratic outcome does rely on the core principles of successful implementation of free and fair elections and a transfer of power, which the interim government in Tunisia achieved.

Henneberg argues that citizens in Tunisia viewed the interim government, despite its not having electoral legitimacy as more connected to civil society and more effective than the subsequent elected legislative bodies; this perception challenges the tenet that elections serve as the foundational element for a liberal society to thrive. The public's trust in the interim government, as opposed to the elected officials, suggests that the starting point for measuring democratic success needs to begin with interim governments giving a holistic trajectory of unfolding events during a country's transition. Understanding how the scholarship measures or predicts democratic success is especially pertinent in Tunisia, where President Kais Saied recently suspended the constitution—seriously threatening the country's democratic progress. Henneberg's book represents a solid contribution to that debate.

Another question left open for future exploration includes the generalizability of Henneberg's theory of interim governments for other cases across the world. Although many scholars have shied away from connecting structures and agents in theories of democratization, Henneberg's rich analysis provides an opportunity for political scientists to measure variables that capture structural conditions and the impact of agents' individual decisions in predicting successful democratization transition outcomes. Identifying these variables allows researchers to test the generalizability of these findings. These variables include but are not limited to the inclusion of old regime elites; the structure of old versus new interim governments; the ability to secure internal and external legitimacy; decision-making processes; and decisions regarding elections, the constitution, economic reform, and the interim government's involvement in future elections.

In sum, *Managing Transitions* is a foundational text for scholars seeking to understand post-revolutionary environments in the MENA region and throughout the world. Scholars of democracy, in general, will find

Managing Transitions an engaging read on questions regarding inclusion in democratic processes and reparations for past grievances and injustices—issues that even scholars of American politics might find particularly interesting in the current political climate.

Mobilizing in Uncertainty: Collective Identities and War in Abkhazia. By Anastasia Shesterinina. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2021. 258p. \$49.95 cloth.
doi:10.1017/S1537592721003613

— Kristin M. Bakke, *University College London*
kmbakke@ucl.ac.uk

Anastasia Shesterinina's *Mobilizing in Uncertainty: Collective Identities and War in Abkhazia* masterfully achieves three objectives. First, it enhances scholarly understanding of mobilization in civil war, highlighting how the "collective threat framing" that happens through individuals' social networks can shape their wartime mobilization. Second, it represents a model for fieldwork-based research in our discipline, giving voice to ordinary people who had to make hard choices at times of intense uncertainty. Third, it presents an in-depth analysis of an important yet understudied case, introducing the reader to the 1992–93 Georgian-Abkhaz war, which to this day has local, regional, and international implications.

The puzzle motivating the book is how ordinary people navigate the uncertainty they face at the onset of a civil war to make decisions about mobilizing. Departing from the oft-held assumption that people make cost-benefit calculations based on a known sense of risk, Shesterinina shows how the situation faced by the Abkhaz was instead characterized by intense uncertainty: "*Was this a war... Who was threatened by whom, and to what extent?... How to act in response?... for whom to mobilize?*" (pp. 11–12; emphasis in original). This puzzle emerged from the many conversations that Shesterinina had during her fieldwork, demonstrating her genuine engagement with research participants from the very first stage of formulating the research question. The book draws on participant observation and 150 in-depth, semistructured interviews conducted in Abkhazia in 2011. This unique and rich ethnographic material also challenged the theoretical expectations that Shesterinina had when entering the field—namely, that prior activism would be a key predictor for mobilization—and steered her toward developing a novel argument emphasizing collective conflict identities and collective threat framing.

The book reveals that, although political elites articulated the imminent threat that the Georgian advance in August 1992 represented for Abkhazia, key to mobilization was how this message was adapted to fit local needs through the networks of friends and family members that people turned to at such a time of uncertainty. "The discussions that unfolded in this trust-based context