

convergence of parties imposed by European accession in turn encourages disgruntled citizens to opt for radical right-wing alternatives. This is conditioned by other factors, of course, such as the legacy of the type of previous communist regime, which explains the national variation in the level of support for radical right parties.

Chapter 8, by Radoslaw Markowski and Enyedi, focuses on whether parties have developed deep societal roots by investigating the accuracy of representation (matching parties with their electorate). Using a voluminous amount of survey data they conclude that, contrary to the expectation that Europeanization would promote the deepening of the parties' social roots, the accuracy of representation has deteriorated over time—that is, segments of the population have become more politically disengaged and greater alienation and cynicism have emerged.

Robert Ladrech in chapter 9 argues that EU expansion has in fact had a negative impact on party systems institutionalization in the region because as party elites collaborated to meet the demand of European accession, this eliminated the socioeconomic cleavages that had divided them. What replaced this was competition along political cultural issues, which did not reflect the interests of most voters. This allowed parties on the far left or far right to exploit the situation, thus weakening party system institutionalization.

Although this is one of the better volumes to deal with Europeanization's effect on party politics, there are a few notable weaknesses. First and foremost, it is not always clear what definition of "Europeanization" the authors in this book collectively employ. Although the definition Lewis uses in chapter 1 refers to Europeanization as "the domestic impact of the EU" and presumably the process of European accession, at least one of the chapters opts for the definition of Europeanization as "back to Europe," which involves a more cultural and attitudinal transformation. Without a common definition of Europeanization used by all authors, one wonders if the differential findings in the contributions are due to some degree to a lack of conceptual clarity or consistency. Second, there is a certain unevenness to the chapters. Although most attempt to address the basic themes of the book outlined in chapter 1, at least one of the chapters has little or nothing to do with political parties, let alone party systems institutionalization. Finally, the volume answers the question the title poses in a very conditional way. Does Europeanization affect party politics in the countries of central and eastern Europe? The answer provided is much like the proverbial elephant—it depends on what you are looking at. In this way, this volume will not satisfy readers who are looking for a more definitive answer to the question posed by the book's title. Nonetheless this book is an important contribution to the literature on Europeanization and political parties in the postcommunist political environment.

JOHN ISHIYAMA  
University of North Texas

*The Politics of Privatization: Wealth and Power in Postcommunist Europe.* By John A. Gould. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2011. viii, 247 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Tables. \$55.00, hard bound. \$22.50, paper.

For most of the 1990s, the debate surrounding postcommunist privatization largely revolved around the question of speed: should there be an immediate "shock therapy" approach to privatization, or should the process be organized more gradually? While a variety of different authors have tackled the question of what ought to replace the shock therapy versus gradualism debate, perhaps nowhere is it more clearly laid out than in this new book by John A. Gould.

Gould also presents a bifurcated debate, but one in which the political context of the transfer of property figures more prominently. First, there is the neoliberal "Coasian logic" (41–43), which suggests that the key to economic efficiency is simply to get property into the hands of private actors. No matter how the property is acquired, these new actors will be interested in maximizing profit and therefore will ultimately demand a restrained (liberal) state, which will unleash economic efficiency. On the other end of the spectrum is what Gould calls the "political competition theory" (35), which suggests that unless the

state is constrained by robust political competition leading to the regular replacement of governments through elections, economic transformation is bound to get caught up in what Joel Hellman described as a partial-reform equilibrium (Joel Hellman, "Winners Take All: The Politics of Partial Reform in Postcommunist Transitions," *World Politics* 50, no. 2 [1998]: 203–34). Here, self-interested economic actors collude with the state to protect their own ability to extract rents from partial reform (including privatization), and economic efficiency for society as a whole is greatly compromised.

Gould provides a series of nuanced critiques of both theories, noting for example that there are many instances in which economic agents with control of private property have no interest in pushing reformist policies—in opposition to the Coasian story—but also that political competition theory really cannot explain the fact that many nondemocratic postcommunist regimes have been economically successful for prolonged periods of time. Gould's theoretical contribution to this debate is not so much to provide an alternative to these two approaches as to highlight what he feels are underappreciated aspects of the relationship between postcommunist political developments and privatization. First, he draws our attention to the fact that the extent of democratization in the initial period of the transition is crucial for establishing whether *insiders* (e.g., former communist apparatchiks) or *outsiders* control the privatization process. Second, he focuses attention on the extent to which privatization occurs within a general context of a *rule of law*. Third, and perhaps most innovatively, Gould stresses the extent to which privatization and democratization are often linked in an *endogenous* relationship: rule of law may constrain the ability of former communist insiders to control the initial privatization process, but at the same time a desire to control the privatization process may lead state actors to subvert democracy (e.g., Vladimír Mečiar in Slovakia).

Gould's very valuable reconceptualization of the theoretical literature on postcommunist privatization is followed by five chapters of case studies that illustrate these themes: three on the Czech Republic and Slovakia, one on Ukraine, and one on Azerbaijan, Serbia, and Georgia. The Czech and Slovak case studies in particular offer an invaluable view into the real nitty-gritty of postcommunist privatization and again ought to be required reading for anyone with an interest in postcommunist political economy.

My primary critique of the book is that I wish Gould had devoted a little more effort to putting forward his own theoretical account of privatization with an explicitly falsifiable empirical framework. Instead, his theoretical account—with its emphasis on insiders and outsiders and the endogeneity of liberalization and privatizations—reads more as a guide to understanding how and why privatization and liberalization unfolded in his case studies, but less as a test of an alternative theoretical approach. I came away from the book strongly convinced that I had a better idea of how to understand the postcommunist privatization process, but not as much that I had seen a new theoretical argument about the determinants of privatization either falsified or empirically vindicated; one can only hope that Gould's future work will take him in this direction. That being said, what the book is not should not detract from what it is: an excellent and insightful overview of our best current understanding of the most important factors driving postcommunist privatization; a sophisticated argument about the interrelatedness of democratization/liberalization and privatization; and a potentially unparalleled comparative illustration of how privatization actually unfolded in multiple postcommunist countries.

JOSHUA A. TUCKER  
*New York University*

***Residential Change and Demographic Challenge: The Inner City of East Central Europe in the 21st Century.*** Ed. Annegret Haase, Annett Steinführer, Sigrun Kabisch, Katrin Grossman, and Ray Hall. Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate Publishing, 2011. xx, 355 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Photographs. Figures. Tables. Maps. \$124.95, hard bound.

Detailed studies of inner-city transformation in postcommunist east central Europe tend to focus on the region's capital cities. As the writers of this book rightly point out, however,