

the poor is the role of private charities, not the state; that providing for the poor makes them lazy and dependent; that public relief programs retard the development of social insurance programs and employer-based supports for workers; and that the poor cannot be trusted to use cash aid wisely and should be closely supervised.

Ward, in Chapter 4, undertakes a regression analysis of government statistics from the 1930s to correlate regional differences, state racial and age demographics, state wealth, and urbanization with the timing and designs of mothers' pension programs in the states. Her results are not surprising, but are likely to be widely cited for their empirical value. In a subsequent chapter, Ward maps the problems of localized discretion and rampant racial discrimination, and describes Congress's failure to remedy these problems when designing the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program.

The author highlights issues of federalism, explaining how Congress and state politicians, particularly in the South when the Social Security Act was drafted, fought against the imposition of federal standards and strong federal oversight. Once the act was passed, many states and localities maneuvered to circumvent the limited federal mandates that were created. For example, vaguely defined "suitable home" requirements imposed on recipients of ADC were selectively employed to exclude nonwhites. The success of politicians and ground-level officials in resisting federal power had momentous effects on race and poverty in the United States.

Notably, Ward argues that the exclusions of African Americans from welfare rolls in the 1930s and 1940s laid the groundwork for later resistance to welfare programs generally. She argues that the shift in power during the 1960s, when the federal government began enforcing minimal standards upon states and when participation of African Americans in welfare programs suddenly increased, led to an enduring white backlash against welfare programs. All in all, Ward writes, federal welfare programs "reproduced and deepened these existing social inequalities" (p. 107).

In Chapters 6 and 7, the author weaves together multiple threads about racial disparities into an intricate

history of the ways local, state, and even the federal governments deepened the racial fault lines in the United States during the twentieth century. Ward does an impressive job documenting how racial disparities and discriminatory practices within the states were well known to federal program administrators from the passage of the Social Security Act onward. Ward's recurrent theme, that racism has shaped state and federal welfare programs, has two leitmotifs. First, notions of "race"—and particularly who is a racial minority—have been ever shifting rather than fixed, with early discrimination focused not only on African Americans and Native Americans, but also European immigrants and religious minorities. (This suggests that new targets may emerge in the future, though Ward does not elaborate.) Second, efforts to exclude or control the racial "other" consistently played a prominent role in private and public aid policies during the early twentieth century—and continue to play such a role.

Though Ward uses race as her sole lens of analysis, she touches on other axes of social differentiation, namely marital status and immigrant status. She might have explored these issues more deeply. Not only was exclusion of racial minorities built into welfare policies, but so also was exclusion of unmarried mothers. Ward points out that while most states had mothers' pensions by 1934, only three states and two territories authorized aid to unmarried mothers. Ward concludes with a discussion of the federal welfare reform legislation of 1996. Her study would have been improved had she brought her historical analysis, particularly her discussion of race and unfit motherhood, to bear on more recent debates over government programs. Historical disregard of unmarried mothers, most particularly among those who are racial minorities, echoes in twenty-first century policies and proposals. Whether current government targeting of nonmarital childbearing is simply a matter of race by proxy or whether it is a new form of differentiation is an important issue of social policy, and it would have been interesting if Ward had weighed in on this problem.

COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Owning Russia: The Struggle over Factories, Farms and Power. By Andrew Barnes. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006. 288p. \$35.00 cloth.
DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707070454

— William Tompson, *Birkbeck College (University of London) and the OECD*

Andrew Barnes has produced an admirably complex book. While providing a lucid, readable, and persuasive analysis of the evolution of property relations in Russia during the 20 years from 1985, he avoids imposing artificially tidy theoretical schemes on the very messy processes he

describes. Instead, he explores the full range of actors, institutions, strategies, and exogenous events that have shaped the struggle for property in Russia since the advent of Mikhail Gorbachev. This is above all a work of history—a theoretically informed history, but history nonetheless—and it is therefore a work in which contingency is sometimes important, and one in which the question of which actors shaped which outcome, and why, is always an empirical one—never something determined by an *ex ante* assumption. In place of a spare, highly theoretical explanation of this or that aspect of Russian privatization, Barnes offers a complex but nevertheless comprehensible account of how contests for

control of real assets have evolved hitherto and where they may be headed in the future.

The first virtue of the book is simply its impressive combination of broad scope with remarkable concision. *Owning Russia* provides what is probably the most comprehensive account of the evolution of property relations in Russia available in English, and it does so in well under three hundred pages. That alone is likely to make it essential reading for students of Russia's economic transformation for a long time to come, particularly as it is written in a lucid and engaging style. Of particular value in this regard is Chapter 3, which tells the story of the property reforms of the Gorbachev era, beginning with the first timid steps in the mid-1980s and culminating in the onset of large-scale "spontaneous privatization" as the Soviet era drew to a close. This story is both fascinating and important for an understanding of what follows, and it has received too little attention since 1992, having been overshadowed by the turmoil of the post-Soviet period.

However, the book offers more than just a "history of Russian privatization". While he avoids forcing his history into a rigid theoretical framework, Barnes knows the literature on the political economy of transition well and draws deeply on it. His principal theoretical concern is to break with the habit of reading Russia's postcommunist history through the prisms of "democratization" and/or "transition," which imply that the end point of the transformation under way since 1985 is clear and well known, and which exhibit a tendency to interpret the conflicts of the present in terms of some anticipated future. In analyses of property relations, this leads to accounts that pit "reformers" against "conservatives" and that treat privatization as ipso facto evidence of progress. Such accounts often impute to the property-settlement process an order that was not necessarily there, and they tend either to ignore postprivatization control contests or to view them simply as the pathological aftereffects of flawed privatization processes. In rejecting this approach, Barnes focuses not on the future but on the present and past—on the stakes being contested and on the agents who are contesting them, their motives, and the resources at their disposal. As Barnes puts it, "today's conflicts produce tomorrow's resolutions, not the other way round" (p. 227).

A second major strength of the book is the inclusion of agriculture in the analysis. The study of post-Soviet Russia's agrarian transformation has largely been isolated from the study of the industrial and financial sectors. The study of the rural transition has also been heavily focused on a narrow range of issues, such as the emergence (or not) of private farming on a substantial scale. Yet as Barnes shows, the contrast between the privatization of factories and farms is instructive: The implications of privatization policies for control over real assets were different in the two sectors and prompted farm directors to resist precisely the forms of privatization their industrial colleagues pur-

sued. Moreover, the author shows that the struggle for assets in the agrarian sector makes sense only when it looks not only at the farm sector but also at the entire agricultural production chain, including the sectors that produce the farms' inputs, as well as the "downstream" food-processing industry.

The book's treatment of other sectors, while solid and well informed, lacks the depth of understanding of sectoral issues that it displays with respect to agriculture. For the most part, it would be hard to quibble with the conclusions reached in the analysis of industrial property contests, but more attention to the sectoral peculiarities would have enriched the analysis of sectors like aluminum (pp. 136 ff.), where Barnes traces but does not fully explain the success of outsiders in establishing strong positions in some enterprises. A part of the explanation, at least, lies in the structure of the industry: Russia's major aluminum smelters were privatized as just that—individual smelters. Lacking stable sources of raw materials or marketing arms of their own, they soon fell under the influence of trading companies able to provide them with both under "tolling schemes." The traders then sought to secure control over the smelters themselves.

Owning Russia ends with an analysis of developments since 2003 and a look at the future. The former is persuasive and offers a clear, nuanced account of President Vladimir Putin's understanding of the relationship between politics and property—an account that avoids both underplaying the significance of recent policy shifts and painting them in apocalyptic "back to the future" terms. However, the look ahead is less convincing. It is not difficult at the end of a work such as this to adduce many reasons why Russia remains a long way from a stable property settlement—why "the Russian struggle for property moves from phase to phase rather than to a stable system of regularized capitalist competition" (p. 230). Yet this assessment may underestimate the progress Russia has already made—at an uneven pace, and with many zigs and zags, to be sure—in precisely that direction.

The State and the Global Ecological Crisis. Edited by John Barry and Robyn Eckersley. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005. 307p. \$67.00 cloth, \$27.00 paper. DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707070466

— Kenneth Richards, *Indiana University*

The 12 essays offered in this book are a bit like an invitation to a New York cocktail party; the experience is impossible to fully anticipate from a first glance. And like a good cocktail party, this book is interesting not only for the content of the conversations but equally for what it reveals about the participants' relations, values, and assumptions, and even for what the guests might learn about themselves.