new migrants. The problems of language, color, and low income can be to some degree overcome by a strong sense of Somerville as first and foremost a town of migrants. She is not, however, unduly optimistic or naive about the role of these shared experiences in creating community, and in chapter 5 she fully recognizes how American politics has been deeply divided over the status of migrants, especially illegal migrants or so-called illegal aliens, in relation to formal or juridical citizenship. Ostrander goes on to challenge the legacy of the mainstream sociology of migration that has concentrated on social mobility and assimilation to the neglect of civic and political engagement, presenting a useful comparison of the United States and Canada. For Ostrander, the main problem with what are often referred to as "paperless citizens" is not their association with crime and disorder; it is that passive, disengaged, and marginalized denizens cannot contribute to democracy because they have little effective means of engagement.

Although of modest dimensions, this volume offers an important contribution to the study of citizenship and governance. There are, however, two interesting lacunae. The sociology of voluntary associations and civil society has traditionally paid significant attention to the role of churches and religious institutions, especially in support of migrants. The place of the Roman Catholic Church in the history of Irish and Italian migration into the United States is well documented, but I cannot find a single reference to religious groups in this otherwise comprehensive study of the civil sphere. Somerville must be unusually agnostic. Second, much of the recent literature on civil engagement (from Occupy Wall Street to the Arab Spring) has examined the important role played by Facebook and Twitter in mobilizing the public, but these means of mobilization and shared governance are absent in her account.

The State of Freedom: A Social History of the British State since 1800. By Patrick Joyce. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. xii+376. $32.99.

Richard Lachmann
State University of New York, Albany

The State of Freedom offers a new interpretation of the British state from 1800 to the 1920s. Patrick Joyce sees the state as "liberal" in the sense that it "systematically deploys political freedom as the [principal] means of governance" (p. 3). In other words, the governors of Britain developed ways to instill certain behaviors in the mass of subjects/citizens that led Britons to consent to and turn into habitus the rules of capitalist markets and to acquiesce in the state's growing ambitions to order Britons' daily lives. Joyce therefore is concerned with how the state shaped and ordered civil society. He also seeks to trace the development of a modern governing elite in Britain by examining how the nation's rulers learned to govern themselves and to control the growing population and territories of the empire.

Joyce asks "how the heterogeneous institutions of the state are held together" (p. 146). His answer is numbers (i.e., money) and words (i.e., bureaucratic documents and systems of communication). Others have written extensively on British taxation and state budgets, and Joyce adds little to that research. However, *The State of Freedom* is a major theoretical and empirical contribution to understanding how Britain and the empire were linked together by the post office and by the India Office, the governmental replacement of the British East India Company.

The post office, which began in the 17th century, achieved national reach in the 19th century. Joyce focuses on how the daily presence of postal stations and postmen became the face of an efficient national government that served to facilitate communication and commerce among free citizens. Postmen also modeled behaviors that the state sought to instill in all citizens as political subjects and as workers. At the same time, Britons were active social agents who made demands on the state.

Joyce sees the rising volume of mail as both a sign and source of literacy and of Britons' sense of themselves as citizens with rights, such as the privacy of their mail, that the state was obliged to respect. The post office, to enhance its efficiency, mandated the naming of streets and numbering of buildings and created municipal districts. Joyce presents these as positive developments, helpful to citizens as well as officials, quite different from the sinister impositions of "legibility" depicted by James Scott in *Seeing like a State* (Yale University Press, 1999).

Joyce notes that other countries, which lacked Britain's liberal government, also developed efficient and ubiquitous postal systems, but he does not draw out the implications those similar outcomes pose for his view of the liberal state. However, Joyce's attention to the post office and its effects on individuals outside the state provides a basis for future comparative historical study. Similarly, Britain's post was linked into an international network of postal systems and then later into a worldwide network of telegraph systems. Joyce is clear on how rapid communication facilitated commerce and the operation of the stock market within Britain and then on a continental and worldwide scale but has little to say about if and how the growing reach of communication affected Britons' view of their social and political, as opposed to economic, position in the world.

The India Office, the most important and efficient agent of empire, produced a great deal of paper. Joyce traces the shift from what he calls the symbolic-performative creation of documents to the systematic compiling and filing of records of all the India Office's actions and decisions, although Joyce is careful to note that even into the late 19th century, many preliminary documents were destroyed and not incorporated into the permanent records, and that officials often took documents home and considered them private property, although Joyce doesn't explain why they did so or specify what effect that had on colonial administration.

Joyce has read deeply in both the historical and sociological literature on states, bureaucracies, empires, and political culture. *The State of Freedom* is worth reading for the footnotes alone, which highlight much of the best

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