

faculties are indicated, for example, by confusion over the dates and locations of his military service and over his statement that he spent time in a psychiatric institution in 1944–45, which is undocumented and uncorroborated by others. In terms of the environment in which Okudzhava lived, one of the most charming episodes involves his discussion of his name. He reports that his parents' circle enjoyed a certain cultural flair, their revolutionary commitment notwithstanding, and they liked to name their children after striking characters in books and plays. Thus, Okudzhava was initially named Dorian Gray. (Can you imagine Okudzhava's legacy as "the guitar poet Dorian Gray"?). However, it turned out that the baby's father could not pronounce the English name and reverted to asking "Kogda my budem *etogo* kupat'?" ("When are we going to give *that one* a bath?"), or "Ty *etogo* uzhe kormila?" ("Have you already fed *that one*?"). "It was with a great sense of relief that they changed my name to Bulat. But," Okudzhava adds, "they only called me Bulat after I grew up. . . . When I was a kid they called me Kukushonok, or Ku-ku" (26). Other anecdotes include gentle digs at the authorities. For example, Okudzhava asserts that his professor's comments on his thesis on Vladimir Maiakovskii—"Excellent, but there are problems with punctuation"—indicate that it was never actually read (176). He reports on a negative review of his performance in the journal *Smena* with a similar sense of gentle irony: "A dubious-looking man came out on stage," wrote the reviewer. "He sang some vulgar songs and accompanied himself on a guitar. But the girls won't chase after him—they chase after the likes of Tvardovskii and Isakovskii." "So," responds Okudzhava, "that's the way to judge the quality of literature—whom the girls chase after" (295).

The book is arranged chronologically. The opening chapter introduces Okudzhava's real family members along with their avatars in *Uprazdnennyi teatr*. Much of the rest of the book traces the parallels in the fates of these two sets of figures. Some chapters are followed by segments subtitled "Dokumenty, pis'ma, interv'iu" ("Documents, Letters, Interviews"), containing excerpts of relevant materials. The book also offers a number of photographs, including an especially touching one of the young Okudzhava with his parents and other relatives from the 1930s. An appendix of more comprehensive interviews with Russian writers as well as some of Okudzhava's Polish friends and colleagues rounds out the volume. Among those interviewed by Rozenblium are Evgenii Evtushenko, Naum Korzhavin, and Inna Lisnianskaia, and Archpriest Aleksandr Borisov.

The book's notes, appendixes, and index of names attest to the seriousness of the endeavor. An index of songs and poems would make the book still more useful. In sum, readers needing an introduction to Okudzhava should turn to works by Dmitrii Bykov, Gerald Smith, and Vladimir Shlapentokh. Those equipped to cope with the idiosyncrasies of Rozenblium's volume, however, will be richly rewarded.

SARAH PRATT
University of Southern California

Politika apolitichnykh: Grazhdanskie dvizheniia v Rossii 2011–2013 godov. Ed. S. V. Erpyleva and A. V. Magun. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie," 2015. 479 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Tables. RU 351.00, paper.

This is an edited volume produced by a team of Russian sociologists affiliated with the Laboratory of Public Sociology at the European University at St. Petersburg and the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Sciences at St. Petersburg State University. The book's main goal is to analyze the motivations and self-identification of participants in the social movement *Za chestnye vybory* (For Fair Elections), formed on the eve of the

2011 parliamentary elections in Russia. The main finding is that “the politicization of citizens previously indifferent to or even alienated from politics” explains a relatively high level of citizen engagement in protest events in 2011–13 (8). *Politika apolitichnykh* sheds light on this contentious episode in Russian society and contributes to social movement literature by unpacking determinants of mass mobilization in a repressive political regime.

The contributors provide multiple reasons why *Za chestnye vybory* differs from prior episodes of contention in post-Soviet Russia and merits academic attention. First, the movement engendered the first large-scale demonstrations since mass protests against welfare reforms in 2005. According to some estimates, as many as one hundred thousand people participated in public rallies in Moscow alone in the winter of 2012. Additional protest events were held across Russia, from Kaliningrad in the west to Vladivostok in the Far East. Second, *Za chestnye vybory* staged the first public rallies with explicitly political slogans since the political standoff between the incumbent president and the national parliament in 1993. As pointed out by Margarita Zavadskaya and Natal'ia Savel'eva, mass perceptions of stolen votes as a personal matter triggered citizens' engagement in post-election protests. What is also noteworthy about the social movement is that it partially overcame widespread repugnance toward united action in the public sphere and legitimized contentious collective action as something “normal” and even appealing in a postcommunist society.

Multiple approaches to the conceptualization of politics inform this empirical work. Some scholars consider conflict at the core of politics, while others emphasize public action as a defining feature of politics. Svetlana Erpyleva and Maksim Kulaev, for example, suggest that depoliticization manifested itself in the protesters' reluctance to acknowledge differences within the movement and to identify an external enemy. In contrast, Oleg Zhuravlev views depoliticization in the Russian context as the rejection and stigmatization of the public sphere. Furthermore, Artemii Magun underscores the importance of collective identity and solidarity, while Anna Zhelnina regards individual action aimed at achieving public good as political. Despite these differences, all the contributors agree on the salience of depoliticization in Russian society.

The book is divided into four parts. Part 1 analyzes the phenomenon of depoliticization in post-Soviet Russia in the years preceding the 2011 parliamentary elections. Karin Kleman, for example, observes that the emergence of grassroots social movements was an ad hoc response to urgent social problems faced by ordinary citizens. Part 2 discusses the movement's antecedents and its distinct attributes. Maksim Aliukov, for example, investigates how social media influenced the development of collective identity, which subsequently affected the level of citizen engagement in protest events. Part 3 elaborates on the self-identification of movement participants. The concluding section examines cases of contentious collective action in the provinces in 2012–13 and reflects on the decline of the social movement. Zhuravlev, Savel'eva, and Erpyleva argue that the post-2011 growth of local civic initiatives was driven by the participants' desire to prolong the experience of collective action acquired during their engagement in protest events and their service as election observers.

The volume's forte is its nuanced analysis of rich empirical data derived from in-depth interviews with former movement participants. The team of sociologists conducted interviews with more than one hundred participants in public rallies in Moscow and St. Petersburg between 2011 and 2012. Additional survey research reported in the volume extends this study both temporally (before and after the 2011 elections) and geographically (outside the two largest Russian cities). Furthermore, a few chapter authors analyze the content of political slogans retrieved from the database of protest events, photos, and slogans compiled by Mischa Gabowitsch. The use

of qualitative research methods enables the scholars to uncover different dimensions of citizens' motivations for engagement in political action. What remains somewhat unclear in the volume is whether Russian scholars encountered any difficulty in securing interviews and asking politically sensitive questions in a repressive political regime.

One of the main findings to be gleaned from this study is that Russian citizens are torn between their longing for social solidarity and their yearning for individual autonomy. This tension is seen as a product of the Soviet experience, wherein citizens rejected the ideology-laden public sphere as a false reality and withdrew into the private sphere. It must also be noted that the book challenges a popular assumption that *Za chestnye vybory* has since its inception called for dismantling the political regime installed by Vladimir Putin. Erpyleva and Kulaev find that the majority of protesters did not see themselves as anti-Putinists. That personification of the regime was found to be uncommon among participants in the protests against electoral malpractice during the 2011 parliamentary elections and began to emerge only in the aftermath of Putin's re-election for a third term in office, in March 2012.

Analysis of citizens' motivations for participating in pro-government rallies might be an area for future research. The organization of regime-friendly public rallies is a common state countermove in Putin's Russia. The oft-cited reason for citizens' involvement in such rallies is fear of loss of employment or expulsion from university. Further research needs to be done to unravel the logic of compliant activism.

In sum, *Politika apolitichnykh* presents a masterful analysis of citizens' motivations for engaging in contentious collective action in Russia. Given the multidisciplinary nature of this research, the book will appeal to a wide audience, including political scientists and sociologists.

OLENA NIKOLAYENKO
Fordham University

Dying Unneeded: The Cultural Context of the Russian Mortality Crisis. By Michelle A. Parsons. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2014. xii, 209 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Figures. Tables. \$59.95, hard bound. \$27.95, paper.

The epidemiological literature analyzing the profound drop in life expectancy in the Russian Federation after 1991 can benefit from thick cultural contextualization. Life conditions, everyday practices, shared perceptions, and socioeconomic dynamics all contributed to the "mortality crisis" of the 1990s, when male life expectancy dropped more than six years (to 58) and female life expectancy dropped more than three (to 71). Sociocultural anthropologist Michelle A. Parsons dedicated eleven months of fieldwork in Moscow in 2006 and 2007 to probing local interpretations of excess mortality, aiming for a ground-level understanding of "why Russians died" in the years just after the end of the Soviet Union (5).

Parsons and two local colleagues conducted forty in-depth interviews and life histories with older Muscovites. These conversations, alongside deep engagement with the ethnographic literature, led Parsons to turn her question around, positing, instead, a theory of how people *survive* social transformation. Understanding "what things make life worth living for Russians" (176) will, she hopes, account for the capacity of many to endure the multiple shocks of the post-Soviet period and, reciprocally, the fatal incapacity of others to survive.

In clear, readable prose, Parsons describes the life trajectories of the generation born around the time of World War II, who bore the brunt of the mortality crisis of the