

work by British historians on these topics in recent decades. While Joyce seeks mainly to deploy theoretical concepts and the works he cites to paint a sophisticated picture of the British state and the ways in which it changed from the Napoleonic era to the eve of World War II, his findings and methods of analysis can be used by sociologists to test theories and to pose comparative questions.

The final chapter is a significant intervention into debates over neoliberalism. Joyce enumerates the ways in which neoliberalism is a continuation of the British form of strong state that was developed in the 19th century. He argues that neoliberalism has deepened the economic inequality and reaffirmed the political inequality that characterized Britain even during the heyday of labor in the 1960s. However, he identifies ways in which the neoliberal state is new. He finds that the ethos of public service, which was integral to the upper-class cohesiveness and discipline fostered by the elite public schools and Oxbridge, has been fatally undermined in the neoliberal present. As a result, mass consent to liberal rule has been lost, ushering in a new era of “instability and incoherence” (p. 336). Joyce does not speculate on what will replace two centuries of elite duty and mass discipline, but he adds much, theoretically and empirically, to our understanding of how the habitus of liberal government and citizenship were created and now are being lost.

Integrating Varieties of Capitalism and Welfare State Research: A Unified Typology of Capitalisms. By Martin Schröder. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. Pp. x+223. \$90.00.

Kaj Thomsson
Maastricht University

In *Integrating Varieties of Capitalism and Welfare State Research*, Martin Schröder sets out to unify what he refers to as the two most important typologies of capitalist diversity: the varieties of capitalism (VOC) approach and Gøsta Esping-Andersen's classification of welfare states. While they may, at first sight, seem closely related, these two typologies categorize different dimensions of countries' economic and political systems. The varieties of capitalism literature characterizes the *production* of resources and the way firms coordinate (on not) their *economic* activities, while Esping-Andersen's typology is centered around the *distribution* of resources and the way the state and the *political* system is organized. Schroeder combines these two literatures and shows—convincingly—that they are closely connected and that a typology incorporating both can generate insights beyond what each of them can explain independently.

The book starts with an extensive survey of each of the two typologies and carefully discusses the most well-known alternative approaches. Schröder does an excellent job bringing out the core ideas of each typology; indeed, the first part of the book could serve as an introduction to the study of capitalist

diversity. The following two chapters (3 and 4) deliver the core argument of the book. The author presents his unified typology, in which countries are divided into liberal, social democratically coordinated, and conservatively coordinated countries. The first category contains the liberal countries in Esping-Andersen's typology and the uncoordinated countries in the varieties of capitalism literature. The latter two categories are both uncoordinated according to the varieties of capitalism literature, but Schröder makes use of Esping-Andersen's typology to split them according to different types of coordination: social democratic or conservative. He argues cogently that both social-democratic and conservative welfare regimes are complementary to coordinated production systems, in different ways, while liberal welfare regimes are not.

After having described the new typology, Schröder goes on to analyze all of the 17 countries in his sample in detail while looking for the origins of the capitalist diversity captured by his classification. Although the previous chapters contain the core idea, this part, with all the individual countries described in greater detail, is in many ways the heart of the book. It is certainly the most illuminating part for anyone not already familiar with the majority of the 17 countries.

Schröder does an excellent job showing that there is significant variation at the national level—each country has its own story—but that there are strong common themes within each of the three groups. The key concept of “policy style” is introduced. This concept is explained as a combination of culture and material circumstances. Schröder shows that within each of the three categories, countries have similar policy styles. He argues that religion is a particularly important component: there is a strong link between Calvinism and liberalism, between Catholicism and conservative coordination, and between Lutheranism and social-democratic coordination. While the ideas behind these links are not new—they are based largely on the work of scholars such as Sigrun Kahl, Kees van Kersbergen, and Philip Manow—Schröder aptly places them in the context of his typology.

The book ends by illustrating what a combined typology can explain. Readers are likely to come away from this book thinking that the unified typology does have significant explanatory power beyond that of the two underlying ones, for instance, when it comes to explaining different trajectories of liberalization in mature welfare states. The author could, however, have been more ambitious in his discussion of the implications of his unified typology. Schröder for the most part avoids normative statements, value judgments, and policy recommendations, and while this choice is likely to serve the author well in limiting criticism of the book, a bolder approach would make the book more interesting for readers who are not themselves actively engaged in the study of capitalist diversity. Schröder does appear to find some capitalist models better suited for current economic circumstances; for instance, he seems to find social-democratically coordinated countries better positioned to adapt to current economic conditions than conservatively coordinated countries. However, such assessments are not made explicit and cannot be properly evaluated by the reader.

In addition to avoiding explicit normative statements and policy recommendations, Schröder avoids strong statements about “deep” explanations for the origins of the trajectories the countries took. He even explicitly states that such depth is beyond the scope of the book. While hedging in this way might, again, help the author deflect criticism, it does so by lowering the level of ambition beyond what appears necessary. Much of the discussion about diversity and the features of individual countries (in chap. 5) does leave the reader with the impression that Schröder is in fact looking for, and perhaps believes he has found, the root causes of the capitalist diversity given by the new typology. Religion is certainly described in such a way; readers will likely leave the book with the impression that the author considers it a deep explanation despite claiming otherwise. The main problem with the book is therefore not what it actually does but the discrepancy between what it does and what it claims to do (or what it could have done).

The book suffers from some minor stylistic problems and occasional carelessness in editing. Core arguments, for instance about the complementarities between production (economics) and distribution (politics), or about the link from religious histories to country trajectories, are unnecessarily repeated in the introductions and conclusions to each chapter, leaving the book longer and more difficult to read than it needs to be. This fact, and the tendency of the author to understate his assertions, does not, however, detract from the fact that Schröder has succeeded both in providing an excellent overview of the most important existing work on capitalist diversity and in combining this work into a unified typology that is more than the sum of its components. I recommend that anyone who is interested in how advanced capitalist democracies developed, or where they might be heading, read this book.

Constructing Capitalisms: Transforming Business Systems in Central and Eastern Europe. By Roderick Martin. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013. Pp. xviii+342. \$110.00.

Richard Whitley
University of Manchester

The transformation of the state-socialist societies of Central and Eastern Europe (henceforth CEE) into democratic-capitalist ones represented both a major opportunity for comparative social scientists, especially those concerned with the role of institutions in structuring economic activities and outcomes, and a considerable challenge to current theories and frameworks. On the one hand, it provided a large-scale natural laboratory for the comparative analysis of how radical institutional change could affect the nature of market structures and behavior in a number of different political economies. On the other hand, it highlighted the difficulties of systematically studying the interconnections between rapid discontinuities in both domi-