

Welfare States: Construction, Deconstruction,
Reconstruction
Volume I

Wherever possible, the articles in these volumes have been reproduced as originally published using facsimile reproduction, inclusive of footnotes and pagination to facilitate ease of reference.

For a list of all Edward Elgar published titles visit our site on the World Wide Web at
www.e-elgar.com

Welfare States: Construction, Deconstruction, Reconstruction Volume I

Analytical Approaches

Edited by

Stephan Leibfried

*Professor of Public and Social Policy and
Director of the Collaborative Research Centre 'Transformations of the State'
University of Bremen, Germany*

and

Steffen Mau

*Professor of Political Sociology and Dean of the Bremen International
Graduate School of Social Sciences (BIGSSS)
University of Bremen, Germany*

An Elgar Reference Collection

Cheltenham, UK • Northampton, MA, USA

© Stephan Leibfried and Steffen Mau 2008. For copyright of individual articles, please refer to the Acknowledgements.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

Published by
Edward Elgar Publishing Limited
Glensanda House
Montpellier Parade
Cheltenham
Glos GL50 1UA
UK

Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.
William Pratt House
9 Dewey Court
Northampton
Massachusetts 01060
USA

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 978 1 84720 080 8 (3 volume set)

Printed and bound in Great Britain by MPG Books Ltd, Bodmin, Cornwall

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	ix
<i>Introduction Welfare States: Construction, Deconstruction, Reconstruction</i> Stephan Leibfried and Steffen Mau	xi
PART I WELFARE STATE DEVELOPMENT: THE GRAND PERSPECTIVE	
1. Ira Katznelson (1986), 'Rethinking the Silences of Social and Economic Policy', <i>Political Science Quarterly</i> , 101 (2), 307–25	3
2. Edwin Amenta (2003), 'What We Know about the Development of Social Policy. Comparative and Historical Research in Comparative and Historical Perspective', in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer (eds), <i>Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences</i> , Chapter 3, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 91–130	22
3. John Myles and Jill Quadagno (2002), 'Political Theories of the Welfare State', <i>Social Service Review</i> , 76 , March, 34–57	62
PART II MODERNIZATION AND THE EXPANSION OF CITIZENSHIP	
4. T.H. Marshall (1992 [1949]), 'Citizenship and Social Class', in T.H. Marshall and Tom Bottomore, <i>Citizenship and Social Class</i> , Part I, London and Concord, MA: Pluto Press, 3–51	89
5. Richard M. Titmuss (1974), 'What is Social Policy?', in Brian Abel-Smith and Kay Titmuss (eds), <i>Social Policy: An Introduction</i> , Chapter 2, New York, NY: Pantheon Books, A Division of Random House, 23–32	138
6. Robert Henry Cox (1998), 'The Consequences of Welfare Reform: How Conceptions of Social Rights Are Changing', <i>Journal of Social Policy</i> , 27 (1), January, 1–16	148
PART III FUNCTIONALISM AND THE INDUSTRIALIZATION THESIS	
7. Peter Flora and Jens Alber (1981), 'Modernization, Democratization, and the Development of Welfare States in Western Europe', in Peter Flora and Arnold J. Heidenheimer (eds), <i>The Development of Welfare States in Europe and America</i> , Chapter 2, New Brunswick, NJ and London: Transaction Books, 37–80	167

8. Harold L. Wilensky (1975), 'The Welfare State as a Research Problem' and 'Economic Level, Ideology, and Social Structure', in *The Welfare State and Equality: Structural and Ideological Roots of Public Expenditures*, Chapters 1 and 2, Berkeley, CA, Los Angeles, CA and London: University of California Press, 1–49, references 211
- PART IV NEO-MARXIST THEORIES**
9. Claus Offe (1984), 'Social Policy and the Theory of the State', in John Keane (ed.), *Contradictions of the Welfare State*, Chapter 3, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 88–118 267
10. Bob Jessop (2002), 'Capitalism and the Capitalist Type of State', in *The Future of the Capitalist State*, Chapter 1, Cambridge, UK: Polity, 11–54, references 298
- PART V THE POWER RESOURCES APPROACH**
11. Walter Korpi (1983), 'The Democratic Class Struggle' and 'Social Policy', in *The Democratic Class Struggle*, Chapters 2 and 9, London, Boston, MA, Melbourne and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 7–25, 184–207, notes, references 347
12. Walter Korpi and Joakim Palme (2003), 'New Politics and Class Politics in the Context of Austerity and Globalization: Welfare State Regress in 18 Countries, 1975–95', *American Political Science Review*, **97** (3), August, 425–46 399
- PART VI MANAGING AND SHARING RISK**
13. Peter Baldwin (1990), 'Introduction: Welfare, Redistribution and Solidarity', in *The Politics of Social Solidarity: Class Bases of the European Welfare State 1875–1975*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–54 423
14. Nicholas Barr (2001), 'The Market and Information', in *The Welfare State as Piggy Bank: Information, Risk, Uncertainty, and the Role of the State*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 11–29, references 477
15. Giuliano Bonoli (2005), 'The Politics of the New Social Policies: Providing Coverage Against New Social Risks in Mature Welfare States', *Policy and Politics*, **33** (3), July, 431–49 497
- PART VII POLITY-CENTERED APPROACHES AND INSTITUTIONALISMS**
16. Ann Shola Orloff and Theda Skocpol (1984), 'Why Not Equal Protection? Explaining the Politics of Public Social Spending in Britain, 1900–1911, and the United States, 1880s–1920', *American Sociological Review*, **49** (6), December, 726–50 519

17.	Evelyne Huber, Charles Ragin and John D. Stephens (1993), 'Social Democracy, Christian Democracy, Constitutional Structure, and the Welfare State', <i>American Journal of Sociology</i> , 99 (3), November, 711–49	544
18.	Ellen M. Immergut (1990), 'Institutions, Veto Points, and Policy Results: A Comparative Analysis of Health Care', <i>Journal of Public Policy</i> , 10 (4), October–December, 391–416	583
19.	Jacob S. Hacker (2002), 'The Politics of Public and Private Social Benefits', in <i>The Divided Welfare State: The Battle over Public and Private Social Benefits in the United States</i> , Chapter 1, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 28–66, notes	609
20.	Bo Rothstein (1998), 'The Political and Moral Logic of the Universal Welfare State', in <i>Just Institutions Matter: The Moral and Political Logic of the Universal Welfare State</i> , Chapter 6, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 144–70, references	660
	<i>Name Index</i>	689

Acknowledgements

The editors and publishers wish to thank the authors and the following publishers who have kindly given permission for the use of copyright material.

Academy of Political Science for article: Ira Katznelson (1986), 'Rethinking the Silences of Social and Economic Policy', *Political Science Quarterly*, **101** (2), 307–25.

American Sociological Association for article: Ann Shola Orloff and Theda Skocpol (1984), 'Why Not Equal Protection? Explaining the Politics of Public Social Spending in Britain, 1900–1911, and the United States, 1880s–1920', *American Sociological Review*, **49** (6), December, 726–50.

Ann Oakley for article: Richard M. Titmuss (1974), 'What is Social Policy?', in Brian Abel-Smith and Kay Titmuss (eds), *Social Policy: An Introduction*, Chapter 2, 23–32.

Cambridge University Press for excerpts and articles: Peter Baldwin (1990), 'Introduction: Welfare, Redistribution and Solidarity', in *The Politics of Social Solidarity: Class Bases of the European Welfare State 1875–1975*, 1–54; Ellen M. Immergut (1990), 'Institutions, Veto Points, and Policy Results: A Comparative Analysis of Health Care', *Journal of Public Policy*, **10** (4), October–December, 391–416; Robert Henry Cox (1998), 'The Consequences of Welfare Reform: How Conceptions of Social Rights Are Changing', *Journal of Social Policy*, **27** (1), January, 1–16; Bo Rothstein (1998), 'The Political and Moral Logic of the Universal Welfare State', in *Just Institutions Matter: The Moral and Political Logic of the Universal Welfare State*, Chapter 6, 144–70, references; Jacob S. Hacker (2002), 'The Politics of Public and Private Social Benefits', in *The Divided Welfare State: The Battle over Public and Private Social Benefits in the United States*, Chapter 1, 28–66, notes; Edwin Amenta (2003), 'What We Know about the Development of Social Policy. Comparative and Historical Research in Comparative and Historical Perspective', in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer (eds), *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*, Chapter 3, 91–130; Walter Korpi and Joakim Palme (2003), 'New Politics and Class Politics in the Context of Austerity and Globalization: Welfare State Regress in 18 Countries, 1975–95', *American Political Science Review*, **97** (3), August, 425–46.

Oxford University Press for excerpt: Nicholas Barr (2001), 'The Market and Information', in *The Welfare State as Piggy Bank: Information, Risk, Uncertainty, and the Role of the State*, 11–29, references.

Pluto Press for excerpt: T.H. Marshall (1992 [1949]), 'Citizenship and Social Class', in T.H. Marshall and Tom Bottomore, *Citizenship and Social Class*, Part I, 3–51.

The Policy Press for article: Giuliano Bonoli (2005), 'The Politics of the New Social Policies: Providing Coverage Against New Social Risks in Mature Welfare States', *Policy and Politics*, **33** (3), July, 431–49.

Polity Press for excerpt: Bob Jessop (2002), 'Capitalism and the Capitalist Type of State', in *The Future of the Capitalist State*, Chapter 1, 11–54, references.

Taylor and Francis Books UK and MIT Press Journals for excerpt: Claus Offe (1984), 'Social Policy and the Theory of the State', in John Keane (ed.), *Contradictions of the Welfare State*, Chapter 3, 88–118.

Taylor and Francis Books UK for excerpt: Walter Korpi (1983), 'The Democratic Class Struggle' and 'Social Policy', in *The Democratic Class Struggle*, Chapters 2 and 9, 7–25, 184–207, notes, references.

Transaction Publishers for excerpt: Peter Flora and Jens Alber (1981), 'Modernization, Democratization, and the Development of Welfare States in Western Europe', in Peter Flora and Arnold J. Heidenheimer (eds), *The Development of Welfare States in Europe and America*, Chapter 2, 37–80.

University of Chicago Press for articles: Evelyne Huber, Charles Ragin and John D. Stephens (1993), 'Social Democracy, Christian Democracy, Constitutional Structure, and the Welfare State', *American Journal of Sociology*, **99** (3), November, 711–49; John Myles and Jill Quadagno (2002), 'Political Theories of the Welfare State', *Social Service Review*, **76**, March, 34–57.

Harold L. Wilensky for his own excerpt via the Copyright Clearance Center: Harold L. Wilensky (1975), 'The Welfare State as a Research Problem' and 'Economic Level, Ideology, and Social Structure', in *The Welfare State and Equality: Structural and Ideological Roots of Public Expenditures*, Chapters 1 and 2, 1–49, references.

Every effort has been made to trace all the copyright holders but if any have been inadvertently overlooked the publishers will be pleased to make the necessary arrangement at the first opportunity.

In addition the publishers wish to thank the Library at the University of Warwick, UK, and the Library of Indiana University at Bloomington, USA, for their assistance in obtaining these articles.

Introduction

Welfare States: Construction, Deconstruction, Reconstruction

*Stephan Leibfried and Steffen Mau*¹

Want is only one of the five giants on the road of reconstruction ...

The others are Disease, Ignorance, Squalor and Idleness.

William Henry Beveridge (1879–1963), British economist and civil servant
Social Insurance and Applied Services [= The Beveridge Report] (1942: pt. 7)

... for it is clear that, in the twentieth century, citizenship and the capitalist class system have been at war.
Thomas H. Marshall (1893–1981), British Sociologist, *Citizenship and Social Class*, A. Marshall Lecture,
Cambridge 1949 (1998: 18 = 1964: 84)

I think we've been through a period where too many people have been given to understand that
if they have a problem, it's the government's job to cope with it. 'I have a problem, I'll get a grant.'

'I'm homeless, the government must house me.' They're casting their problem on society.

And you know, there is no such thing as society. There are individual men and women,
and there are families. And no government can do anything except through people,

and people must look to themselves first. It's our duty to look after ourselves and then, also,
to look after our neighbour. People have got the entitlements too much in mind, without the obligations.

There's no such thing as entitlement, unless someone has first met an obligation.

Margaret Thatcher (1925–), U.K. prime minister 1979–1990,
talking to *Woman's Own* magazine, 31 October 1987

European post-1945 history had crystallized into a system of security that provided safety
against all collisions, any unexpected turns ... Europeans need to realize this epoch has ended.

For a variety of reasons broad popular participation in education and prosperity
is not a political priority anymore. What comes instead is unclear,
what can be preserved is uncertain—but we have left an epochal safe haven.

Tony Judt (1948–), professor of contemporary history (see Judt 2005) at New York University
in an interview titled 'We are now leaving the security zone' ('Wir verlassen jetzt den Sicherheitssektor')

Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, December 1, 2006, no. 280, p. 46

Historically the welfare state is a rather recent but nonetheless extremely influential social invention. It has fundamentally transformed relations between the state and its citizens – both as individuals and members of social groups, that is, classes, generations and sexes. Furthermore, the welfare state has successfully mitigated social inequalities and minimized social risks. Its rapid introduction since the 1880s – first in Germany, then through nationally distinct routes elsewhere (Alber 1982) – and the quick evolution of numerous core institutions during the ensuing decades culminated in an extraordinary boom period after the Second World War,

which lasted until the onset of the oil crises in the mid-1970s. Since then, however, the welfare state has been grappling with deep-rooted challenges. A series of major economic, social and political shifts – such as globalization, demographic pressures, individualization, persistent high unemployment, greater social diversity and fiscal scarcity – have raised the question: How sustainable is the welfare state in the long run? Public and academic debates have – as our bibliography reveals at length – vigorously engaged the seemingly never-ending project of restructuring the welfare state and rewriting the ‘social contract’ on which it rests.²

We focus primarily on the welfare state in Western Europe and North America – there especially on the US, the major ‘laggard’ or ‘restrained’³ (Obinger/Wagschal 2000) welfare state, if one at all. These two world regions were the historical turf of the welfare state’s origin and blossoming and, later, of the extant discourse on it, and after the Second World War until the 1960s both regions saw eye-to-eye on this issue: welfare state development was still perceived only as a matter of ‘time’, of sooner or later. But these are also the two world regions between which a primary, transatlantic Oedipal, if not hegemonic, relationship unfolded after the Second World War, a relationship in which, since the 1970s, differences in visions of welfare have also unfurled and turned into an unremitting bone of contention. In the course of this development, a difference solely in time transmuted into a significant distinction in substance, a laggard remade its self-image into a unique welfare universe (Glazer 1998) – from ‘backwardness’ to *Sonderweg*, as a German would note.

In this overview, however, we also sketch the broader welfare state *literatures* that transcend this Euro-centrism turned transatlantic. First, we do so in the ‘old OECD’ itself, by referring to the literatures on all ‘laggard welfare states’ (Obinger/Wagschal 2000), that is, that on the US as well as those on Canada, Australia and New Zealand. In different ways, all of these post-colonial states have turned out to be no simple laggards but welfare states in their own right. And further, we refer to some extent to the ‘contained’ welfare states of the more recent East Asian members of the OECD plus Taiwan and Singapore, which some have come to label ‘Confucian’ (Rieger/Leibfried 2003: ch. 5; Jones 1993). Finally, we point to the literature on East European welfare states, with their often still unresolved transformation, their transitional trajectories.⁴ ‘Unrestrained’, comprehensive or even universal welfare states remain, however, a West European phenomenon of the ‘Golden Age’ of the 1950s and 60s. Hence Eurocentrism – including the US as offspring, as well as contrasting foil and moving target – comes naturally, and most of the debates documented in these volumes have been in and on this welfare state core. Nevertheless, if we were to look at this transatlantic region through an East Asian rear-view mirror, we are again likely to see something else: How all these different Western welfare states – or, for that matter, even ‘non-welfare states’ like the US – are located in one common religious-cultural-institutional tradition without which a welfare state cannot even be conceived (Rieger/Leibfried 2003). Difference in substance, once again, fades.

The volumes which we introduce here contain key research contributions to the issues of welfare state change on a conceptual, empirical and normative level. We are building on the framework of our established course on welfare state theory, taught in the Doctoral Program of the Graduate School of Social Sciences (BIGSSS) at the University of Bremen. There we survey different schools and theoretical camps ranging from functionalism to institutionalism, analyze welfare state typologies and welfare state transformation, and identify the normative premises of the welfare state as well as the economic, social, political and cultural challenges it faces today.

In 2000, Robert E. Goodin and Deborah Mitchell published their three volume collection *Foundations of the Welfare State* with Edward Elgar. Our three volumes follow up on this work.⁵ While *Foundations* is more retrospectively orientated, *Welfare States* is designed prospectively and focuses on more recent debates. *Welfare States* is also broader, in that it embraces normative, motivational and cultural dimensions. *Welfare States* offers more of a *systematic* introduction to the current debates in the social sciences – looking at schools of thought, paradigms, and perspectives – hoping to interest every student of the welfare state. *Welfare States* is organized like a syllabus, and can serve ‘as is’ as a graduate teaching text in its own right.⁶

In our collection we concentrate on a political and social-scientific understanding of the post Second World War welfare state, but any comprehensive understanding will fail without knowledge of relevant economic theory and contemporary economic development in this area. Here, the three volume collection on *Economic Theory and the Welfare State* edited by Nicholas Barr (2001b = *Economic Theory*) should be consulted, especially Volume I which is the most pertinent companion to our *Welfare States*. Under the heading ‘The role of the state in the mixed economy’, a topic that encompasses ‘Market Success’ (*Economic Theory* 1: Part III. A), ‘Market Failure’ (III. B) and ‘Government Failure’ (III. C), an update of *Economic Theory* by Barr would include George A. Akerlof (2002), Michael Spence (2002) and Joseph E. Stiglitz (2002) – all Nobel Prize winners for their work on the economics of information – and under ‘Poverty, Inequality and Social Inclusion’ (Part IV) Timothy Smeeding (2006a, b) plus Tanja Burchardt, Julian Le Grand, and David Piachaud (2002). The big controversies over ‘whither public pensions?’, that is, over the flagship of most Western welfare states, also require attention (Barr 2006; Diamond 2004).⁷ For the opposite ends of the pension debate see Nicholas Barr and Peter A. Diamond (2006) and Martin Feldstein (2005).⁸

With this state-of-the-art collection we provide a rich and balanced source book that will be useful to students at various levels of university education and to researchers around the world. An extensive, up-to-date and internationally ambitious bibliography at the end of this introduction completes the overview.

The *first* volume starts with a comprehensive history of welfare state theories. It enables the reader to gain a clear understanding of the issues at stake and the intellectual progress in this field. We have selected and organized the texts to document social-scientific development in this area, and to show how interpretations of welfare state evolution were inherent to the most comprehensive social-science theories: The welfare state was rarely understood in isolation but seen, above all, through the prisms of various theories of the state or state development, such as modernization, neo-Marxist theory or the British Labour Party tradition.⁹ To stay *à jour*, we have, whenever possible, included the most recent characteristic writings from these theoretical camps.

The *second* volume begins with the extensive debate on welfare state regime typologies and ‘varieties-of-capitalism’, a debate which originated from and focused on Western OECD states and sheds light on the distinctive modes of social regulation in different ‘welfare systems’. These writings have often challenged the widely held assumption that welfare states would, in the end, converge in their institutional characteristics and levels of social spending. After the ‘Golden Age’ of the 1960s and 70s, the welfare state entered an era of austerity that forced it off the path of ever-increasing social spending and ever-expanding state responsibilities.¹⁰ How policy-makers (are able to)¹¹ enact policies of retrenchment has received much scholarly attention, and will continue to do so in this volume. The discussions on globalization and

post-industrialism have also been central to the ongoing debates on the (various) future(s) of the welfare state, and are thus covered by key texts. In the last two sections we take up the issue of ‘welfare policies beyond the nation state’, first looking at *supranational* integration as it takes place in Europeanization, and, second, focusing on ‘*global social policy*’, a concept which addresses the role of international organizations and transnational civil society in promoting social policy and regulation.

The *third* volume starts with major philosophical debates about justice, equality and the role of state intervention. Here we attempt to build a bridge between more abstract philosophical and normative debates and the controversies in welfare state politics and policies. In the following sections we included two contributions on the outcomes of welfare state intervention, which highlight not only the achievements of comprehensive and redistributive welfare states, but also their limitations – features which are also discussed, more radically, in the subsequent section on the trade-offs and dysfunctions of the welfare state. The sections on human motivation and welfare state attitudes address the emerging ‘cultural turn’ in welfare state research, a concentration on the particular relationship between individuals and the welfare state, for example, how do individuals view the welfare state? What are their reasons for welfare state support? How can people exercise choice and behave responsibly when they are confronted with life contingencies? How do they see their role as users and clients? The next section is devoted to the challenges to the solidarity principle now institutionalized in the welfare state, challenges brought about by greater social heterogeneity. In the section on gender we present a discussion that arose as an upshot of Gøsta Esping-Andersen’s welfare-regime typology published in 1990. Critiquing the typology’s gender-blindness, authors have repeatedly drawn attention to the role of the family and the unequal division of labor on which welfare state functioning rests. The welfare state not only affects gender relations, but also establishes and institutionalizes the relationships between generations. Hence, in the last section we examine the challenges to public pension schemes and the ‘generational contract’.

As already mentioned, the introduction finishes with a lengthy and comprehensive bibliography extending beyond the literature actually used. We provide this bibliography as a source for students of the welfare state interested in a more detailed, profound and comprehensive picture than the one we can provide in a short introduction.

We will now give a brief and synoptic overview of the recurring debates on the welfare state. This introduction to all three volumes of the reference collection aims to provide a context for the myriad contributions and to show how the chapters relate to one other. In contrast to other fields of social-science enquiry, welfare state research forms one fairly comprehensive and coherent body of literature. Though characterized by very different theoretical and methodological points of departure, the field is distinguished by a high level of cross-fertilization and cross-referencing amongst its various interpretive approaches. This sustains – and also is sustained by – a broad conceptual agreement on the nature of the welfare state and issues considered scientifically important, a close interaction between theory and empirical work and, finally, a relatively open-minded, pragmatic outlook on theory and methods with a combination of macro- and micro-level accounts (Katznelson 1986;¹² Amenta 2003; Myles/Quadagno 2002). The perspectives we present utilize a wide variety of methods ranging from single case studies to large-scale comparisons, from historical qualitative studies to data-driven quantitative approaches – the latter having benefited tremendously from the availability of international datasets provided by the International Labor Organization (ILO), the Luxemburg Income Study

(LIS) and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).¹³ Welfare state scholars also have invested heavily in refining their methods, especially their quantitative methods, so today's students of the welfare state can employ a wide variety of well-established methods and techniques of data analysis.

State Building and Welfare State Formation

The state is the dominant political organization exerting authority over and controlling a defined territory and its inhabitants. It does so by monopolizing the right to create and enforce law, by exercising power, by imposing taxes and other duties and by gaining the acquiescence and loyalty of its citizens. The growth of state bureaucracy and the invention of new techniques of political rule enabled the state to take over the provision of public infrastructure and 'social security' (Kaufmann 2001a, 2003a; DeSwaan 1988). For most of the modern period, the relationship between the state and its citizens was characterized by a dominating state and a subordinate citizenry. Only as political rights were won by the ordinary citizen did the state become democratized and 'civilized' in the sense that citizens could increasingly influence and shape state politics (T.H. Marshall 1992/1964 [1949]). Political mobilization and participation evolved from various unstructured forms, such as public protest and violence, to more structured forms of democratic participation, for example, unions, interest groups, political parties and parliaments. As a state apparatus and administrative capacity developed, and the ordinary citizen became involved in public and political affairs – for example, through elections – the state was transformed into a welfare state, that is, a political organization that fulfils collective tasks and responds to the interests and needs of its citizens (Rokkan 1974).

But in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries several roads lead to Rome (Rimlinger 1971). While democracy and the welfare state seem to have an 'elective affinity' for each other, we do find other distinct welfare state routes: in Bismarck's time the autocratic German state, in which the social-insurance state was created to gain the loyalty of the new working class (see Alber 1982); the racist and war-flanking welfare state under Fascism (Cherubini/Piva 1998; CNEL 1963; Hertner 2003; De Grazia 1992; Quine 2002) and Nazism (Mason 1993, 1995; Recker 1985; Aly 2006⁴);¹⁴ the more encompassing welfare aims pursued by the state under Communist regimes, for example in Eastern Europe (e.g., Burawoy 1985; Estrin 1994; Haraszti 1977; Tennstedt 1976); or the developmental authoritarianism of the East-Asian kind, that prevailed for many decades in Taiwan, South Korea, and still does in Singapore (Rieger/Leibfried 2003: ch. 5).

The welfare state today is typically defined as a range of state programs that provide for life contingencies and redress market-produced inequalities (Kaufmann 2001b), just as the classic 'five giants' epigraph taken from William Beveridge indicates. In general, the welfare state comprises those statutory or public *de facto* arrangements that absorb life risks such as illness, unemployment, old age and poverty, together with public programs providing or facilitating the provision of housing, education, personal social services and social care to citizens. While many writings on the welfare state rest on a dichotomy between the state and the market, with the welfare state intervening in and redressing the market, there were always organizations operating between the market and the state, labeled non-profit, voluntary or third sector organizations, including the churches and guilds and later unions, with myriad contributions to public

welfare (Salamon et al. 1999; Harris/Rochester 2000; Fix/Fix 2005, 2002; Kuhnle/Selle 1992). Country differences, therefore, exist not only on the level of state activity, but also with regard to the third sector reflecting contrasts in historical policy legacies, legal traditions, and prevailing ideologies.

The term 'welfare state' became popular after the Second World War, and refers to the responsibility of the state for the well-being of its citizens and the promotion of the 'common good'. Following Thomas H. Marshall's (1992/1964 [1949]) scheme of the evolution of civic, political and social rights, scholars have concurred that the welfare state has become the key institutional mechanism for providing social rights to the citizenry. In contrast to philanthropic or discretionary forms ('largesse') of social provision (Reich 1964), the welfare state establishes legal entitlements vis-à-vis the state and does so with different emphases and through various detours.¹⁵ The overarching claim in Marshall's 1949 (1992: 19 = 1964: 85) account is that the battles to establish citizenship rights have transformed patterns of social inequality fundamentally, from education via health to income security.¹⁶ According to Marshall, class inequalities in modern societies are not based on a hierarchy of status and accepted as a natural order, rather they emerge from the market and other societal institutions: 'Class differences are not established and defined by the laws and customs of the society (in the medieval sense of that phrase), but emerge from an interplay of a variety of factors related to the institutions of property and education and the structure of the national economy.' Citizenship rights provide only a basic level of equality and a single uniform status on which the structure of inequality builds. The introduction of social rights in the twentieth century created a universal right to real income which is not proportionate to the value the claimant can realize in the marketplace. With the changes in the welfare state in recent decades, however, the concept of citizenship is changing as well. Especially in the realm of social welfare, the notions of rights and universality are less salient and politicians are increasingly demanding that citizens recognize obligations when they claim rights (Cox 1998).

What Drives Welfare State Development?

T.H. Marshall's theory drew mainly on the British experience and hence tended to stylize a particular historical trajectory. Subsequent research has addressed the forces that have driven welfare state development comparatively (e.g., Flora/Alber 1981). The answers proffered differ significantly. Through the prisms of the functionalist and industrialization approaches the welfare state is seen as a response to growing socio-economic pressures which all modernizing societies face as a result of urbanization, population growth and economic development. As welfare gaps and social hardships began to undermine social stability and threaten economic accumulation, a state apparatus stepped in providing remedies through social provision. The emergence of the welfare state has been viewed as an outcome of the 'logic of industrialization', with the state responding to society's 'objective need' for a healthy and reliable workforce. Conventionally, the impact of economic development on the growth of welfare has been analyzed by examining the relationship between the Gross Domestic Product and social-security spending. A landmark study by Harold L. Wilensky (1975; see now 2002) found that economic growth together with the age structure of the population and the maturation of the welfare system, rather than political or ideological factors, drove welfare state development. In contrast,

the 'politicized version' of the industrialization thesis highlights modernization as a multidimensional social process that brings about economic growth and social and political mobilization, and transforms the political order through democratization and bureaucratization (for the general approach see Flora/Heidenheimer 1981).

Neo-Marxist writings *and* the Scandinavian 'power-resources approach' have criticized both positions for neglecting the causal role of political conflict between economic classes in welfare state development (O'Connor 1973; Offe 1984b; and Korpi 1983ff.; O'Connor/Olsen 1998; Gough 1979). To make the point more broadly: Although the state cannot be understood simply as an instrument of the ruling class, all political decisions are made within class relations (Jessop 2002). The state – being essentially capitalist – must maintain conditions under which capital accumulation flourishes, and it does so by securing 'labor supply' through state intervention. The power-resources approach focuses on the political and social mechanisms that lead to welfare state development. Rather than simply assuming 'participation of the masses' as being the main determinant of welfare state expansion, these theoreticians see the growing political influence of left-wing parties and trade unions as motors of welfare state expansion. This approach fundamentally questions, firstly, whether the power between various classes and groups in capitalist democracies can simply be assumed to be equally distributed, and, secondly, whether all social classes and groups are interested in collective provision. Here the welfare state is conceived as an outcome of class conflicts in which different social groups influence distributive processes within society to their advantage. The substantial variation in scope and redistributive generosity of the welfare state is seen as determined by working-class strength. Social-democratic parties and trade unions strive to bring public policies closer to wage earners' interests, and therefore promote egalitarian measures. In countries in which social-democratic parties have attained political power, then, welfare states tend to be universal and generously redistributive, whereas they are residual and less redistributive where working-class organizations have remained weak and politically fragmented.

The power-resources approach, however, provides no conceptual space for dealing with other important factors that have shaped the welfare state. Today we have considerable evidence that the welfare state cannot be fully understood simply as the final triumph of the working class; other forces and circumstances have played a decisive role in its development as well. Peter Baldwin (1990) has drawn attention to the crucial role the middle class played in establishing collective arrangements for the reapportionment of risk,¹⁷ Abram DeSwaan (1988) to the role of elites, white-collar workers and state employees with vested interests in the provision of public welfare, and Isabela Mares (2003a, b) as well as Jacob S. Hacker and Paul Pierson (2002) to employers' interest in externalizing the social costs of production through state welfare. Other authors have pointed out that through the past century women's movements have also played an essential role in achieving improvements in the care of mothers and children and more broadly in improving health care, education, housing and other aspects of social welfare (e.g., Naumann 2005).

The issue of redistribution has been central to the appraisal of social and welfare policies. For some, the central aim of welfare state intervention is the prevention of poverty and the support of vulnerable groups, while others maintain that social policies should not be directed at the poor alone but at all citizens (see Le Grand 1982; Goodin/Le Grand 1987 versus Korpi/Palme 1998). Apparently, there are different ways of looking at the issue of redistribution, and whether one sees distribution at work depends on a number of choices and conditions such as

the type of provision and risk coverage and the type of risk concerned (Hills 2004). Most social insurance schemes do not simply redistribute wealth, but are also very effective mechanisms for reapportioning misfortune and coping with risks. Moreover, economists like Nicholas Barr (2001a, 2004) argue that social insurance programs step in where markets fail. Given imperfect information and assuming rational consumer choice throughout the life cycle, there is still legitimate scope for government action to offer protection against risks such as unemployment or sickness that private insurance cannot cover or will cover only insufficiently.

The 'new social risks' perspective emphasizes that the contemporary welfare state is slowly being reformed to take into account transformations in the labor market and family structures. Most fundamental are changing family forms and gender roles which have led to increases in the rates of divorce, single parenthood, women's labor-market participation and patchwork families. At the same time, a shift can be observed in the labor market from industrial to post-industrial employment, combined with the rise of non-standard forms of employment (Crouch 1999). The new social risks associated with these changes differ from the old risks of the standard, mainly male, industrial life course, which were concerned primarily with interruptions to income from sickness, unemployment and retirement. Instead, welfare policies targeting the care of children and the elderly, more equal opportunities, the activation of labor markets and the management of needs gain importance (Bonoli 2005; Taylor-Gooby 2004a).

Welfare state research since the 1980s has shown that Western welfare states are not on a path of convergence that is propelled by the logic of industrialization. Rather, distinct worlds of welfare continue to exist (Castles/Obinger 2008), and politics matters in determining their make-up not only in the sense that 'parties matter'. Since the 1990s this 'polity-centered' or broader 'new-institutionalism' approach has demonstrated how constraining constitutionally secured 'veto points' affect both welfare state expansion and retrenchment (Orloff/Skocpol 1984; Immergut 1992, 1990; Birchfield/Crepez 1998; Tsebelis 2002; for a general overview see M.G. Schmidt 1996). Constitutional features like the dispersion of power and the number of veto points were held accountable for variation in welfare state effort. Comparative quantitative research has confirmed, for example, that the positive effect of left-wing power resources and left-wing party government on welfare state expansion and particularly on the inclination to redistribute is mediated by constitutional structures (Huber et al. 1993; Huber/Stephens 2001). Some of the institutionalist agenda rests on historical and/or rational choice arguments. But it also contains normative perspectives: Welfare states and institutions are seen as differing not only in programs but in moral logic. The normative principles embodied in the institutions of the welfare state are crucial to the forming of public support for the different systems and for feeding their long-term development (Rothstein 1998; Mau 2003).

The US case – the Western 'outlier' – featured prominently in the welfare state literature of the twentieth century:¹⁸ Qualitative research has demonstrated through historical case studies how the nature and timing of state building as well as the transformative effects of previously enacted social policies on today's welfare politics ('policy feedback') have led to a qualitatively distinct US welfare state (Amenta 1988ff.; Skocpol/Amenta 1986; Weir et al. 1988; Marmor et al. 1990; Howard 2007; Veghte 2004). Since the US is quite central to this theoretical paradigm, this case merits further elaboration. A clear view of US 'welfare exceptionalism' requires taking a step back from a state-centered social policy perspective to observe how the country's welfare needs have been channeled institutionally by the two master processes of modernization: the development of modern capitalism and state building (Katznelson 1988: 517). It is

here that the US path diverges from that of its European counterparts. To an exceptional degree in the US, industrialization occurs prior to state building (Katznelson 1988; McCormick 1979, 1986; Skocpol 1995), with two major consequences for the production of welfare: *First*, economic interest groups became powerful before the central state had become securely established. This, together with the plethora of veto points in the US constitutional system, allowed, for example, the American Medical Association to block the planned introduction of social health insurance in the New Deal (Immergut 1992, **1990**; Quadagno 2004). *Second*, since democratization preceded state building, once the central (welfare) state began to emerge after the Civil War it was immediately co-opted by patronage-based political parties and quickly acquired an extremely negative reputation (Skocpol 1996⁴/1992¹). This led both elites and unions to pursue private solutions to welfare challenges, for example collective bargaining agreements and employee benefits, rather than European-style social insurance or state provision (Stevens 1990). In short, many welfare policy spaces which the state preempted in Western Europe through public systems – whether through direct provision or regulation – were preempted in the US in the economic or civil society spheres.¹⁹ Put differently, over time, many welfare needs were channeled into these spheres rather than into the state sphere.²⁰

The first step in explaining US welfare exceptionalism is thus to broaden the analytic perspective temporally, so as to capture these slow-moving channeling processes and the consequences of the unique timing, juxtaposition and interaction of economic and political modernization in the United States for social welfare (Thelen 2000, 2003; P. Pierson 1993, 1994, 2000a, b, 2004; Hacker **2002**; Amenta et al. 2001; Jacobs/Skocpol 2005). Indeed, the lion's share of the US welfare system was formed during the century between the introduction of Veterans' Pensions after the Civil War²¹ and the Great Society programs of the 1960s, while its origins can be traced all the way back to land grants to veterans in the Revolutionary period (Jensen 1996, 2003). This analytic foil renders comprehensible the fact that Europe has not been able to develop the normative and institutional bases for an 'EU welfare state' during the community's mere half-century of existence (see Obinger et al. **2005b**).²²

Second, if modern welfare needs in Europe were largely channeled into the state sphere but in the US originally into the economic and civil-society spheres, a meaningful comparison of the US with European welfare systems requires a broadening of the analytical perspective institutionally, to include welfare-democratic outcomes beyond the state sphere (Katznelson 1988: 517; Hall/Soskice **2001a, b**; Hacker **2002**; Rieger/Leibfried 2003: chs 3, 4; Kaufmann 2003a; Beckert 2002, 2006). In diffuse lines of research on various functional equivalents of the welfare state – such as the 'warfare state' (Skocpol 1996⁴), trade policy (Rieger/Leibfried 2003: ch. 2), the private welfare state (Hacker **2002**), philanthropy (Skocpol/Fiorina 1999), the tax state (Howard 1997), and the 'regulatory state' (Sunstein 1997; Nivola 1997) – the many unconventional ways 'welfare' is provided in the US are examined, many of them going well beyond the OECD expenditure data (Adema 1999; Adema/Einerhand 1998; Adema/Ladaique 2005). One of the broader areas still underexplored in the developmental contrast of the US with Europe is the 'third sector', the non-profit 'buffer zone' (Anheier 2001; Anheier/Katz 2006; Powell/Steinberg 2006). The nascent US central government was thus not only 'late' in attaining European quantities and qualities of power, it also assumed a peculiar form which constrained the subsequent development of US welfare politics and policies in ways which 'snapshot' analyses at one point in time cannot reveal (P. Pierson 2004).

Welfare State Regimes and Typologies

In recent decades, scholars have developed comprehensive welfare state typologies. Gøsta Esping-Andersen distinguishes in his *Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism* (1990) – the most prominent example of this kind of work – three types of welfare regimes, namely liberal, conservative-continental and social-democratic ones (*Foundations* 2: 173–323). Building on the classification of welfare states by Richard M. Titmuss (1958, 1974) into residual, institutional and industrial-achievement types, and on T.H. Marshall's thesis that social citizenship is the core principle of the welfare state, Esping-Andersen clusters welfare states according to their state–market relations, their impact on stratification and their level of decommodification. 'Decommodification' refers to the state enabling citizens to make ends meet outside the labor market – that is, independent from a wage obtained in the marketplace. Liberal welfare regimes entail minimal state interference with the market, prioritize self-help and provide only residual, often means-tested benefits. Conservative regimes, in contrast, are heavily based on social-insurance schemes linked to a citizen's labor-market status, and therefore tend to preserve status differentials. The social-democratic model, finally, provides universal benefits based on citizenship status, is largely financed through general revenues and promotes social equality.

The Esping-Andersen study has become the most cited and discussed contribution to comparative social policy. It initiated an ever-expanding 'welfare-modeling business' (Abrahamson 1999). Critics of the typology note that most countries are composites of Esping-Andersen's regime types, that some countries fit these types rather poorly, or that such typecasting does not really exhaust the depth of national experiences. Others have proposed additional types, 'other worlds' (*Foundations* 2: 325–493), like the 'Latin Rim' one for Italy, Portugal, Spain, and Greece (Bonoli 1997; Ferrera 1996, 2005b), or the 'Antipodean' ones of Australia and New Zealand (Castles/Mitchell 1993) or a 'new post-Communist family of nations' (Castles/Obinger 2008). There has also been increased interest in fitting in the East Asian or 'Confucian' regime types (Jones Finer 1993; Hort/Kuhnle 2000; Rieger/Leibfried 2003: 241ff.), especially since issues like education and housing play a more prominent role here, pensions take on a different shape, and another structure of 'civil society' has mediated welfare state development for decades. Eastern European countries were seldom included in comparative welfare state research. This was partly due to the lack of comparative data, partly due to the fundamentally different character of the systems. After the fall of Communism, governments in these countries had to balance the need to manage the transition from a command to a market economy with the need to maintain or enhance social protection and thus legitimize regime change (Gáspár 1999). Though these countries went through common phases of transition, they did not arrive at one single model but diversified, with some countries already close to Western welfare states and others still disintegrated (Manning 2004).²³ For this reason it also seems questionable whether the regime typology provides an adequate framework for understanding post-Communist welfare state development in Eastern Europe.

Some scholars have criticized the typology's failure to grasp the roles of gender relations and families, both fundamental to welfare production (Orloff 1993a, 1996; Ostner/Lewis 1995).²⁴ Especially if we understand welfare state development as a process of de-familiarization, such that the welfare state took over the functions of caregiver formerly carried out by women, country differences are striking: While in Scandinavian countries an extensive public care service was and is provided, in Southern European and some other corporatist countries

women continue to perform care services within their own family at no public cost (Mingione 2001). Others have noted that this typology is too focused on social security and income transfers and hardly on the health and welfare services which are crucial features of the welfare state. Still others reject the idea of an all-purpose welfare typology since it cannot provide added value to comparative research, as it has to rely on overly static parameters for its welfare state universes or creates the illusion that there are common traits which underlie different welfare systems (Kasza 2002). And finally, one might have doubts about how important decommodification is analytically, that is, the capacity of the individual to exit the labor market and access state benefits.²⁵ This capacity is, after all, not the only objective of welfare state intervention: If one takes high labor-market participation as equally important goals of social policy, this typology no longer fits as well.

In analyzing welfare regimes we must also note that only a small sample of the best *national* literatures on the welfare state – on its scope, *malaises* and development – is actually accessible in English, so we also confront an ‘iceberg phenomenon’. This situation can be illustrated simply by pointing to some of the best national analyses on Germany (e.g., Alber 1982ff.; Lampert/Althammer 2004; Kaufmann 1998, 2003a, b, 2005; Lessenich 2003, 2005; Nullmeier 2000; M. G. Schmidt 1998, 2004; Ritter 2006; Stolleis 2003; Tennstedt 1981), France (Barbier/Théret 2004; Castel 1995; Donzelot 1984/1994; Palier 2005), Italy (Ferrera 2006; Pavolini 2003; Saraceno 2003; Ranci 2004; Boeri/Perotti 2002) and Spain (Cruz Roche et al. 1985; Fundación Argentaria 1996; Fundación FOESSA 1994; Gonzalez Temprano 2003; Guillén 1997; Maravall 1995; Pérez Díaz et al. 1998; Rodríguez Cabrero 2004; Sarasa/Moreno 1995).²⁶ This tendency culminates in small, less anglophone states, as for example in Belgium, where the welfare state played and plays an unnoticed yet central role in making or breaking the young federal union (see Obinger et al. 2005a: 344ff., inter al. note 18). In the worst case it may not be the proverbial tip of the iceberg that we see – and can more readily cope with – when we read about these national welfare states in the English literature but only a caricature of them, which flaws any comparison or attempts at generalization. Thus, the different national contours of welfare states tend to disappear: for example, the German focus on labor-market policy and co-determination (see Lampert/Althammer 2004⁷) fades behind social insurance, as does the Anglo-Saxon inclusion of education, still so prominent in T.H. Marshall’s 1949 (1992/1964) approach; mirages appear in the ‘import-export’ business of welfare reform models, sometimes cleverly exploited as founding mythologies, as E. Peter Hennock (1987) has shown so insightfully for the founding period of the British welfare state; and, as we underexplore the real differences we also squander the learning potential they contain for all concerned.

The Esping-Andersen framework and much of its refinement is based on the institutionally fully developed and robust ‘Golden Age’ welfare state of the 1970s.²⁷ Empirically focused on ‘welfare regimes’ built on decommodification and on *Politics against Markets* (Esping-Andersen 1985), such an analysis relies heavily on distinctions among and evaluation of different income-transfer programs, and it lacks tools for analyzing various logics of social coordination and the interaction between welfare states and labor markets. In times of global competition the links between the economic and the social, between work and welfare, become increasingly important for the sustainability of the welfare state (Esping-Andersen 1999).

The employer-centered ‘varieties-of-capitalism’ approach represents a more recent attempt, inspired by comparative political economy, to bridge the divide between welfare, labor-market and production regimes (Hall/Soskice 2001b; Ebbinghaus/Manow 2001; Brinegar et al. 2004;

Ebbinghaus/Kittel 2006; on some critical issues see Levy 2006b: 22ff.). The welfare state is not seen – à la Karl Polanyi – as an institutionalized counter-principle to the market or the capitalist system, but as a complementary institution, with firms relying heavily on non-market relationships to coordinate and sustain their businesses. Building on an explicit behavioral micro-foundation, the varieties-of-capitalism approach seeks to explain how the production and social-protection systems are interlinked, and it looks for feedback loops, where the presence of efficiency in one institutional constellation increases returns in the other. So social-policy measures do not simply raise wage costs for firms and grant a ‘basic wage’ that makes it difficult to hire workers at low prices; they also enhance the ability of firms to attract and retain a labor force with specific skills. Like Esping-Andersen’s analysis, this ‘varieties’ theory challenges the widely held assumption that in the long run these different OECD welfare models will converge, and it distinguishes between liberal (‘uncoordinated’) and coordinated market economies each with a particular institutional structure. Uncoordinated markets fit liberal welfare states, because training systems focus on general skills and thus there is less need for a high level of social protection. Coordinated market economies rely on a highly specialized labor force and are vulnerable to the poaching of skilled labor by other firms. A high level of social protection stabilizes production regimes by equalizing wage levels across industries, assuring a high level of unemployment compensation to retain human capital or facilitate a comprehensive system of training. In some respects this typology serves as a useful corrective to the narrowly political focus of much political-science analysis, might be criticized on similar grounds as Esping-Andersen’s, for example, as being too deterministic and unable to explain institutional change (see Crouch 2005; Ebbinghaus 2005).

New Politics in the Age of ‘Permanent Austerity’?²⁸

Welfare states are exposed to change as challenges arise from their social, political and economic environments, often condensed into the ‘post-industrial welfare state’ (Armingeon/Bonoli 2006). All OECD member states are confronted with myriad reform pressures, stemming from globalization, the shift from an industrial to a post-industrial economy, labor-market transformations, massive demographic changes and changing social and family structures. These pressures have engendered significant reforms attempting to reconstruct the old welfare state architecture. Many welfare states are also constrained by high levels of unemployment, and some by fiscal deficits. An important strand of research confronts the ‘new politics’ of the welfare state – governments’ and political actors’ attempts to break welfare state expansion, while perfecting their politics of ‘blame avoidance’ (Weaver 1986; Pal/Weaver 2003). A ‘gestalt switch’ in ideology has occurred: The publicly provided benefits – yesterday’s efficient means of redressing social inequalities and correcting market failures – are now seen as hindering economic growth, undermining individual self-sufficiency, and overburdening public budgets (Prasad 2005). In public discourse, ideological positions and political actors which see the welfare state not as part of the solution to social problems, but as part of the problem, have gained influence. A number of governments in power have explicitly committed themselves to a smaller, less bureaucratic and less expensive welfare state and have brought the dynamic of welfare-state expansion to a halt, shifting toward cost containment or even retrenchment.²⁹

Moving away from analyzing welfare expansion, researchers in the 1990s began to map out the different topography of austerity and retrenchment and to focus on the changing priorities and patterns of state intervention; they moved from the 'Golden' to the 'Silver Age of the Welfare State' (Taylor-Gooby 2002).

However, closer scrutiny of the politics of retrenchment reveals that most of the welfare states and many of their programs have proven quite resilient and difficult to change (P. Pierson 1994, **1996, 2001**). Social policies have created powerful clienteles of their own, thus changing the social preconditions of the ensuing entitlement politics (Flora 1989; King 1987). Therefore, despite strong political ambitions and tough rhetoric aimed at dismantling an 'excessive' welfare state, it has been argued that politicians have not been very successful in doing so. In contrast to welfare state expansion, in retrenchment governments pursue unpopular policies that often violate the interests of both voters and well-entrenched interest groups. This emphasis on the political strength of interest groups³⁰ such as health consumers or pensioners also challenges older welfare state theories which explained welfare state development with the role of labor organizations and political parties (for a critical reaction see Clayton/Pontusson **1998**; Korpi/Palme **2003**). When such policies are pursued, the loss of political support is often minimized by directing cuts at politically weak groups or by making cuts less visible through a 'politics of stealth'. Given that the entrenched interests are ready to defend the welfare state, the whole system seems well protected at least against short-term changes. Gøsta Esping-Andersen (1996: 24) suggests that 'established policies become institutionalized, and cultivate vested interests in their perpetuation; major interest groups define their interests in terms of how the welfare state works. Thus, social security systems that are backed by powerful interest aggregations are less amenable to radical reform and, when reform is undertaken, it tends to be negotiated and consensual'.

Measured in terms of public expenditure, a clear decline in *aggregate* spending cannot be observed across the OECD-world³¹ (Castles 2004, 2006, 2007).³² However, other measures which link up more strongly with notions like decommodification and inclusion through social rights indicate that program-specific changes have taken place which can be traced in the quality of benefits, the scope of eligibility and the strength of conditionality. Because of these features of welfare state transformation, it has been proposed that the notion of retrenchment is not complex enough to account for these changes, and that we should rather rely on the concept of welfare state 'restructuring' or 'recalibration'³³ (Ferrera et al. 2000; P. Pierson **2001**). Since many reforms are multidimensional, an exclusive focus on spending blinds us to important changes in the institutional architecture of social policy and in the means and motives of political intervention. However, countries' responses to fiscal pressures vary greatly, depending on the constellations of political actors or the institutional architecture: For example, although the literature tends to portray conservative welfare regimes as a whole as sclerotic and hard to change, this turns out to be a rather stylized picture when one looks at change at the program level (e.g., Clasen 2005; Siegel 2002; Bleses/Seeleib-Kaiser 2004). A number of contingent factors like the timing and selling strategy of policy reforms also play a role in determining the ability of different welfare states to reform. Very crucial is the role of public discourse, that is, the set of publicly communicated and interactively developed ideas about the necessity and appropriateness of reform. These discourses matter because they can be used to justify policies and win public support even when reforms violate the immediate interests of a constituency (V.A. Schmidt **2002**).

This general resilience of the welfare state is even more surprising when contrasted with the rampant privatization that has taken place elsewhere in the Western states. We refer to the privatization of public utilities and nationalized industries that has occurred since the 1980s at different times (Simmons/Elkins 2004) in most OECD-countries (Obinger/Zohlnhöfer 2005; Boix 1997; Clarke/Pitelis 1993; Clifton et al. 2006; Feigenbaum et al. 1998; Schneider et al. 2005; Toninelli 2000). As far as public utilities are concerned, one might understand their privatization as a crumbling of the outer defense lines of the welfare state proper, since public utilities are agents of interregional and interpersonal redistribution but do not take the form of Bismarck- or Beveridge-type welfare state action. At least for EU member states, all the ideological and legal arguments that have been successfully tested in the narrower domain of public utilities in principle also apply to state redistribution in general, that is, to the welfare state as a whole (Leibfried 2001b, c). In some cases, as in Australia, welfare state reform may just have been a later side or domino effect of privatization (Schwartz 2000).

The Welfare State Goes International

Although retrenchment is a central challenge to the historical welfare state trajectory, it is not the only one. In the ‘post-national constellation’, the territorial anchoring and embeddedness of many state activities is being challenged (Habermas 2001; Kapstein 2006; Leisering 2003b; Zürn/Leibfried 2005).³⁴ The fusion of territory, law, national identity and legitimacy in the ‘nation state’ can no longer be taken for granted, and the ‘container state’, for a long time the uncontested locus of all political activity, is now increasingly undermined by cross-border transactions – with international mobility of capital, goods, services and persons, the emergence of new forms of supranational regulation and the global flow of ideas and normative concepts all limiting the state’s room for maneuver.³⁵ These challenges – typically all bundled in one catchword, ‘*globalization*’ – take place at different levels. Economically, the ability of the state to levy taxes is restrained by international competition and the mobility of capital (Genschel 2005). More than ever, domestic politics are conditioned by parameters set by other countries, such as the level of taxation. Politically, states have begun to engage in various forms of inter- and supranational cooperation, to set common rules and to make reciprocally binding commitments. Although many of these activities counter global market dynamics more effectively, they also entail a shift of competencies away from the national to the supra- or international level, often forcing states to comply with rules that work to their disadvantage.

However, a number of authors argue – directed against the idea of a negative impact of globalization on the welfare state – that globalization actually goes hand-in-hand with widened state intervention (Garrett 1998a, b; Rieger/Leibfried 1998; Rodrik 1998a, b, 2002; Rieger/Leibfried 2003; Veghte et al. 2007). The welfare state is perceived as an institutional requirement for the withering away of twentieth century inter-war protectionism and as a re-insurer of trade openness since the 1970s. Globalization exposes developed market economies to greater economic vulnerability and increases the economic risks of employees. Thus it fosters a growing demand for cushioning against and compensating for the impact of globalization. In other words, economic risks are converted into political demands. Government protection performs an ‘insulation function’ (Rodrik 1998a: 13) and responds to such public demands:

(M)arket integration has not only increased the exit options of producers and investors; it has also heightened feelings of economic insecurity among broader segments of society. This situation has strengthened political incentives for governments to use the policy instruments to mitigate market dislocations by redistributing wealth and risk (Garrett 1998a: 788f.).

In the US a relatively low level of globalization – measured in terms of national trade penetration – and thus a smaller need for ‘insulation’, goes hand-in-hand with an even more pronounced lack of a universal welfare state. Some authors attribute its militant tendency toward unilateral world politics and its hegemonic approach to ‘democracy promotion’ worldwide to its well-entrenched domestic insecurity, to an ‘insulation gap’ (Rieger/Leibfried 2003: 136–86; Rieger 2005a; Leibfried/Rieger 2006). So, here we may reflect on a different negative feedback, one of the lack of a welfare state on the structure of globalization.

As a general trend, however, under globalization governments found themselves under pressure to modify their welfare state heritages. Internationally integrated product and capital markets set fiscal constraints and expose more and more sectors of the economy to international competition. Comparative research on the challenges posed by globalization to maintaining the post-war achievements of full employment, social security and social equality has shown that countries differ in their capacity to adjust. Scandinavian and Anglo-Saxon welfare states, though very different, are better suited to successfully adapting their post-war schemes, while continental European countries have a more difficult time meeting these challenges (Scharpf/V.A. Schmidt 2000). Evidence for the Swedish welfare state, for example, suggests that there are important changes to the welfare system, but there is no need to abandon the welfare state in order to survive in a global market (Steinmo 2002); on Scandinavia generally cf. Kautto et al. 2001; Kuhnle 2004; Kildal/Kuhnle 2005). It also seems that the appeal to globalization as a non-negotiable external economic constraint which entails retrenchment and convergence is empirically suspect (Hay 2004a, 2006).

Together with technological progress, globalization is a powerful agent of change in industrial production and employment patterns. The welfare state originated from a system of industrial capitalism in which most employees worked in the industrial sector. Employment was relatively stable after the 1950s and the demand for manufactured goods generated growing incomes for large parts of society. In this era, welfare state provision was designed to support employees who lost their jobs, but not to prepare them for new jobs or integrate them into the labor market. The post-industrial era has been marked by a profound transformation of production, with the role of the industrial sector diminishing as the source of employment growth and income. As a labor-intensive sector, however, the new service economy cannot yield the increases in productivity historically obtained in the industrial sector, because now labor and not goods are consumed (Baumol 1967). In sectors like personal services, health care or education, productivity growth is quite slow and allows for no major increases in wages. At the same time the human and social skills required are unlike those formerly expected from industrial workers. Many of the jobs in the tertiary sector are very skill-intensive, others require social or cultural competencies. In the new service economy welfare states may increasingly face a trade-off between employment and equality (Esping-Andersen 1999).

Continental European welfare states – with their generous social insurance schemes and relatively high degree of income compression – cannot stimulate enough service-sector jobs because high wage costs, including high non-wage labor costs, undermine all efforts to expand the service sector. Given services’ high price, demand for them is quite low. By contrast, in the

US, high income inequality is coupled with growth in the services sector. Relying on a large low-income workforce, services are offered at a low price but these incomes can hardly sustain an acceptable standard of living. Scandinavia represents a third way by placing a high priority on both earnings equality and high rates of employment, achieved mainly through public-sector service employment while sacrificing budgetary restraint (Iversen/Wren 1998; see now Iversen 2005). The equality-employment trade-off in the post-industrial age is seen by some as inescapable and conflict-ridden, and for them the final resolution depends on strategies that make industrial and post-industrial sectors more alike in terms of their productivity gains, which would simultaneously allow for employment growth and rising incomes.

But today we do not live in a world where nation states and international politics exhaust the alternatives for organizing social policies. *First* of all, the rise of fundamentalist religions in the last decades and the declining efficiency of public policy in sustaining social security indicate that the renaissance of religion and of modernization – or globalization, when we give it a more contemporary label – may not be contradictory phenomena, but could also be perceived, as it is by some authors, as two sides of one and the same social transformation. The history of religiosity in European and other countries which developed strong welfare states shows that the need for religious reassurance in one's social existence has become less pressing when greater security is provided by the secular institutions of public policy.³⁶ In other parts of the world, however, where state power has remained weak, the social institutions of religions, for example, Islamic charities in Arabic countries, Hindu castes in India and familial networks in East and Southeast Asia remained the main provider of social security. In fact, as C.A. Bayly (2004) has shown, the institutional formation, intellectual consolidation, and social mobilization of world religions is best understood as a result of the capitalist transformation of the world in the nineteenth century. The (relative) success of welfare statism – and, for a time, socialism – in the West might then be due more to its ability to supplant the Judeo-Christian forms of salvation religions than to an autonomous and irreversible logic of societal modernization. For this reason, and pointing to some functional equivalence between certain types of religiosity and secular forms of social policy, the surprising renaissance of evangelical Protestantism strongly correlates with the erosion of structures of state-provided existential and welfare guarantees (Norris/Inglehart 2004; Rieger 2005b). Though we cannot presently provide any good synthesis of this line of thought in our readings, we find the connection between religious and social-policy developments intriguing; it warrants further research not just with the origins of the welfare state in focus (see, e.g., Kahl 2005; Kersbergen/Manow 2007/08; Scheve/Stasavage 2006a, b).

Second, in the region of the world in which welfare states are most prevalent, Continental Europe, a 'third way' has emerged since 1957: *European integration* (Ferrera 2005a; Bartolini 2005;³⁷ Scharpf 2002, 2006; Giddens et al. 2006; Tsoukalis 2005²). The nature of this beast is still highly controversial, and located somewhere between the extremes of 'superstate' (Morgan 2005) and the usual 'intergovernmentalism' (Moravcsik 2006; Kleinman 2001). However we label it – supranational, *sui generis*, 'pooled sovereignties', or multi-tiered – integration has already reconfigured the welfare states of countries enmeshed in the construction of the Common Market.³⁸ In the literature concerning the social dimension of Europe there is some controversy about the issue as to whether the establishment of pan-European welfare regulation is a politically viable option. This debate has partly evolved around normative issues dealing with the question of whether the EU should or should not engage in social policy. On the politi-

cal level, as remarked by Streeck (1995: 408–9), the pro-European welfare position deploys the Marshallian view that there is an evolutionary sequence of citizenship rights development from civil rights over political rights to social rights (Marshall 1992/1964[1949]) – and there is always a ‘realist’ consideration in the background: Once the economic and political sovereignty boundaries have been Europeanized, the social-policy ones need to be supranationalized as well in order to remain relevant. It has been argued that an accountable, legitimate and supranational regime such as the European Union cannot withhold social entitlements from its citizens.

A second level of debate has addressed more specifically the question of whether supranationalization has already taken place or gained its own momentum. It has been suggested that the monopolistic control of the nation state over welfare issues has started to be undermined and that we experience a ‘gradual shift from uncoordinated social sovereignties to coordinated semi-sovereignties that are subject to the constraints and to the *Eigendynamik* of supranational governance’ (Ferrera, 2003: 647). Free movement of labor, goods, capital and services have de facto and *de jure* shaped a new European social space in which social rights became portable across borders, industrial-relations systems were reshaped (Falkner 1998), national service monopolies were de- and restructured (Schneider et al. 2005), the public-private insurance mix was tilted towards privatization in a common European insurance market and a broad anti-discrimination regime reaching far beyond nationality and gender was entrenched (for an overview: Leibfried 2005; Falkner et al. 2005). In addition, with the Common Agricultural Policy the European Union has attempted to institutionalize a veritable ‘welfare state for farmers’ (Rieger 2004).

However, there are also sceptical voices with regard to the establishment of supranational social policies or greater coordination in the social policy domain (Offe 1998, 2003; Scharpf 1999, 2002; Streeck 1995, 2000), buttressed by an increasingly heterogeneous Union characterized by a widening income inequality brought about by Enlargement (Beblo/Knaus 2001; Brandolini 2007; Burkhauser/Crouch 2007). Since the European government has only a weak popular base of its own, institutional development is mainly determined by the interests of the national governments which are duty-bound to represent what they and their constituencies consider to be in the national interest (Scharpf 1997). Welfare policies represent a special type of policy where national governments might be reluctant to give up their sovereignty, because they supposedly help to strengthen and to safeguard political legitimacy. Since greater European policy coordination could endanger the state services and benefits to which national voters are accustomed, the governments and electorates might be – and some, like the UK, definitely are – rather unwilling to relinquish their sovereignty in the social policy realm.

These debates have implications for larger issues concerning the relationship between the national, the supranational and the global. Can ‘Europe’, under the conditions of Eastern Enlargement (Barysch 2006; Guillén/Palier 2004; Mayhew 1998; Funke/Pizzati 2002; Rys 2001) – which Nicholas Barr headlines as ‘shifting tectonic plates’ in a course syllabus – set an example as a halfway house between the world of nation states that has become too small, and a global social ambition that, as yet, finds no proper political place? Europe already does so to some extent by influencing global agencies, like the WTO, the WHO and ILO, in their social activities. It sets a *procedural* example by combining expertise, regulatory ambition and some democratic legitimation in the international realm (Joerges/Petersmann 2006). The jury has been out for quite some time on whether it might also set an *organizational* example and inspire organizations like NAFTA, Mercosur and Asean.

Much welfare state research concentrates on Western OECD welfare states, and there have been few attempts to expand the scope to other countries or regions. Although Western welfare states pioneered the introduction of state-funded social-security schemes, and are still role models for latecomers, today a global perspective on social-policy development is necessary (Gough 2006; Mares 2005). This is so not only because other parts of the globe are clamoring for attention, but also because today the question arises: How may we combine a global economy with social goals? Starting from 'development' discourse, a new field of research has matured which highlights the role of a range of new supranational and global actors, be they international organizations or non-governmental collective actors, as well as the function of global social regulation as it shapes national social policies. In the post-Communist countries of Central and Eastern Europe, as well as in the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America,³⁹ formal inter-governmental and international organizations such as the World Bank, the IMF, the ILO and the EU act as important players influencing social policy discourses, political climates and legislative opportunities (Deacon et al. 1997⁴⁰). However, global social policy is shaped not only by pressures from above, but also by widespread activities of NGO and civil-society movements from below (Wood/Gough 2004). The new global dynamics of social regulation also raise a series of normative issues concerning the legitimacy of intervention beyond the nation state, the role of redistributive measures at the supranational level and the tension between national and global concepts of social justice.

Welfare State Justification and Contestation

Although much writing on the welfare state concerns the political dynamics and processes of welfare state change, the welfare state is ultimately also a normative endeavor. John Rawls' (1971, 1986) dictum that justice is the first virtue of social institutions makes clear that social and political institutions do not operate in a normative vacuum but need to be built on morally plausible justifications. The moral and cultural ideas which institutions encapsulate provide them with a permanent normative foundation, which enable them to exact compliance. The inherent meanings of institutions motivate individual actions and foster a commitment to their norms and values. Bo Rothstein (1998: 138) remarks: 'The idea is that institutions not only influence what political actors find to be a rational course of action, seen from the standpoint of their self-interest, but also what we consider to be morally a defensible behavior.' Indeed, a successful institution is built in such a way that it evokes from its members a 'corresponding sense of justice ... [and] ... an effective desire to act in accordance with its rules' (Rawls 1971: 261).

Justice is broadly defined as a fair distribution of burdens and benefits within society. While this definition is by and large consensual, there is some controversy about the ends to which one should ultimately subscribe. The most influential theory of social justice, put forward by John Rawls, suggests two sets of principles: First, each person should have an equal right to the most extensive system of equal basic liberties that is compatible with similar liberties for all; second, social and economic inequalities are justified only insofar as they benefit the least advantaged and as long as offices and positions are accessible to all. David Miller (1999) and Michael Walzer (1983) have argued forcefully that there is no single model of social justice against which welfare distribution can be evaluated. They draw attention to the very different

social spheres in which distribution takes place. As regards citizenship rights, for example, where people are connected through political and legal structures, equality should prevail. In respect to poverty and material destitution, meeting social needs and relieving social distress is the primary justification for state intervention (Goodin 1988; Nussbaum 1990). In other sectors of the welfare state, like social-insurance schemes, the notion of 'just desert' and what is 'due' links people's contributory efforts to their entitlements. A deeper understanding of the normative foundations is not only a philosophical exercise but also politically important since the welfare state is contested terrain, a battleground for normative claims (Ringen 2006). Within public-welfare discourse, issues of normative justification are relevant for all groups jostling for their share of benefits and attempting to establish a legitimate claim to needs (Fraser 1990). Given the recent and ongoing reconstruction of many Western welfare states, the issue of sustainable justice – in which financial sustainability is combined with a set of normative principles that respond to societal needs and can attract lasting public support – will be high on the agenda (Esping-Andersen et al. 2002; Diamond 2006).

Although the reasons for the invention and development of the welfare state are often central to political scientists, social-science disciplines have also been interested in the outcomes of the welfare state (*E pluribus unum*: Smeeding 2006a, b). Welfare state activities are only justifiable if they achieve desirable ends. Are welfare states living up to their own ambitions to eliminate poverty, stabilize income over the life cycle and reduce inequality? Large-scale data sets in the social sciences, such as the Luxembourg Income Study (LIS) or the European Community Household Panel Study (ECHP),⁴¹ in which the socio-economic position and income portfolio of individuals and households in different countries are captured, have allowed us to assess the performance of the welfare state comparatively (Kenworthy 1999; Smeeding 2005; Fahey/Saraceno 2008). Despite explicit commitments to certain distributive goals, not all welfare states are accomplishing their objectives (Goodin et al. 1999; Merkel 2002). The widespread idea that the welfare state is mainly a redistributive undertaking, shifting resources from the rich to the poor, needs to be qualified in light of empirical findings: Most redistribution takes place within classes and across the individual life-cycle, and does not alter the structure of social inequality fundamentally. Contribution-based social insurance schemes, for example, reproduce the unequal distribution of the labor market. This does not, however, imply that welfare policies explicitly designed to lift people out of poverty and targeted on low-income groups are by definition more redistributive. A 'paradox of redistribution' seems to obtain: Comprehensive welfare systems which include the middle classes tend to have larger redistributive budgets, and hence benefit the disadvantaged more than targeted systems do (Korpi/Palme 1998).⁴²

While it is hard to object to a publicly provided safety net on its own grounds, there are also other goals of state activity which might conflict with welfare state transfer schemes. In the US and Western Europe many observers see a trade-off between (welfare, public monetary transfer) incomes and jobs (Mares 2006, 2004). Relatively high replacement rates lead to little job creation and unemployment, especially at the lower end of the income scale, where the wage at which a job seeker is willing to take up employment increases with the transfer income available. Labor-market rigidity and pay equality are also likely to reduce the growth of employment, most strikingly in private-sector, consumer-oriented and social or community services (see Iversen/Wren 1998; Kenworthy 2003ff.). However, if one compares Continental European social market economies with Anglo-American liberal economies, it seems that a steep

equality-efficiency trade-off and the hopelessness of egalitarianism in a global economy do not bear out fully, especially if one considers public investment in education or active labor-market policy (Pontusson 2005).

Although most welfare state researchers emphasize the achievements and merits of the welfare state, various types of criticism have been voiced, ranging from fundamental objections to welfare state intervention for undermining the efficiency of markets and restraining individual freedom and choice, to more modest criticisms of inefficiencies and excessive bureaucracy as normal outcomes of large-scale institutions. Since the 1980s (Hecló 1995), neo-conservative critics have drawn attention to what they perceive to be the permissive character of the welfare state which is said to lead to welfare dependency (Murray 1984; Mead 1986, 1997). If programs set no serious behavioral requirements and entitlements are given without obligation, the welfare state undermines the norms required for the public functioning of citizens – as Margaret Thatcher expounds in her epigraph. The outcome of the compensatory and redistributive efforts of the welfare state is deemed disappointing as the system perpetuates and deepens the problems it is meant to repair ('Losing Ground'). Because conventional programs are inappropriately designed, they often reward dependency and a lack of self-reliance, instead of helping people to stand on their own feet (Field 1995). Economically, the welfare state has been a success in mitigating inequality, diminishing economic uncertainty, and providing public benefits such as education and care, which are not sufficiently produced by the market, but the marginal contribution of the welfare state falls as spending increases (Lindbeck 1988). Comprehensive and costly welfare states are said to distort prices and generate high dead-weight costs. In addition, generous benefit systems and high tax rates to finance the system affect labor supply, with certain services and functions shifting from the market to the household and entrapping people in unemployment (Lindbeck 1997a, b; Lindbeck/Snowder 2001).

As part of the debate on social policy we find a growing interest in human agency pursuing the question 'On which model of human behavior do we build our theories?' (e.g., Deacon/Mann 1999). This interest was fueled by welfare state reforms, most prominently the Third Way agenda in the United Kingdom. Here, public discourse was about the distinction between 'passive' and 'active' welfare, alleging that certain programs set the wrong incentives. At the same time, policy-makers wondered whether amorphous concepts like solidarity or altruism were structurally reliable, and were reluctant to give them a central place. The solution offered was to accept the fundamental role played by self-interest in human motivation. 'The job of a welfare reconstruction is to plan a series of benefit reforms which allow self-interest to operate in a way that simultaneously promotes the public good' (Field 1995: 20), some would-be policy-makers asserted. In many areas of social policy implicit contractual and achievement-oriented principles were enforced. A welfare state grounded on such principles was thought to be more robust institutionally and to correspond better with individual motivation. These solutions represent a policy approach which Robert Goodin (1996: 41) labeled 'designing institutions for knaves', an institutional design based on a calculus account of human behavior. Julian Le Grand (1997, 2003) examined this shift in social policy and concluded: The old welfare state was largely based on the assumption that people would either behave like public-spirited altruists ('knights') or passive recipients of state benefits ('pawns'), whereas in the more recent political shifts it is assumed that people behave more like self-interested individuals ('knaves'). Peter Taylor-Gooby (1998: 216) summarizes:

The shift from altruism to self-interest as the assumed primary motivation is associated with a shift from a cultural to an instrumentally rational account of behaviour. In the former model, professional and public service ethics and a citizenship that included a willingness to finance services for the more needy members of the community were seen as guaranteeing the service of the common interest. The new public policy is based on the assumption that the rational pursuit of self-interest is the major motivating force.

These changes lead to a resurgence in scientific examination of the interaction between institutions and individuals, especially in asking: How do institutions condition and influence human behavior and motivation? A part of this 'motivational turn' is the growing interest in attitudes towards the welfare state. Different aspects are at stake: First, researchers have empirically tested issues of legitimacy and public support for the welfare state, following up on the thesis of 'the legitimacy crisis of the welfare state' (Kaase/Newton 1995); second, concern grew for the way in which the welfare state changes class relations by forging new alliances and pacifying class conflicts. Especially from a cross-national perspective the issue was raised: To what extent do attitudinal differences between classes – for example, pertaining to government intervention for redistributive purposes or for ameliorating income inequality – still prevail, and how were they affected by welfare state policies (Svallfors 1997, 2006; Taylor-Gooby/Svallfors 2002; Mau/Veghte 2007)? Regarding a real or just perceived shift away from social homogeneity to increased ethnic, cultural and social heterogeneity in many Western welfare states, researchers finally asked: Is the welfare consensus and the commitment to publicly institutionalized solidarity sustainable? The welfare state may lose its support if people begin to distinguish more between 'we' and 'they' (Gilens 1996; 1999; Ullrich 2002, 2000; Oorschot 2000; Hinrichs 2003), if they believe welfare schemes to have a strong redistributive bias benefiting groups seen as different from 'them' or less deserving and if greater fragmentation and individualization undermine the commitment to welfare provision for the needy.

This last issue, in particular, has been thoroughly discussed in respect to migration and multicultural policies. Looking back to the development of the post-war welfare state demonstrates that there can be an underlying tension between social and cultural heterogeneity and social spending, but it is mediated and conditioned by the structure of political institutions (Banting 2000; Lieberman 2002). Immigration into many Western welfare states has changed the composition of the population and of the beneficiaries of national welfare schemes profoundly. The main evolution in social rights has been the increasing irrelevance of national citizenship for enjoying welfare benefits (Guiraudon 2002; Soysal 1995). In most Western welfare states⁴³ access to social-protection schemes, be they contributory or non-contributory, is no longer linked to nationality, but to residential status with some restrictions attached to the duration of stay. While some immigrants are over-represented among non-claimants for welfare benefits to which they are entitled due to language difficulties or ignorance of the benefit system, others rely heavily on welfare state support and may be over-represented among social-assistance or unemployment benefit recipients (Boeri et al. 2002). Not only does the welfare dependency of immigrant groups place financial burdens on the welfare state, the increased influx of migrants, it is said, also threatens to undermine the sense of community which supposedly backs comprehensive welfare systems (Alesina/Glaeser 2004⁴⁴). The empirical evidence for a negative association between the influx of migrants and support for the welfare state, though, is far from clear-cut, and at the cross-national level there is evidence that other factors are more decisive for long-term sustainability (Banting/Kymlicka 2004). Nevertheless,

based on ethnic and socio-cultural divisions within a society, public debates often construe and instigate increasing distributional conflicts which become relevant to politicians, social actors and, in the end, often to political outcomes.

The welfare state is also highly relevant for gender relations, an issue which already featured prominently in our discussion of the adequacy of welfare state typologies. A number of these typologies have been criticized for being gender-blind, because many mainstream researchers did not note the differential impact of welfare state activities on men's and women's life chances and ignored women as agents in the making and administration of social policy, while welfare state institutions themselves were built on and reproduce gender inequality (Lewis 1992, 2002; Orloff 1993a, 1996; Sainsbury 1994ff.). Often highlighting welfare state achievements in mitigating socio-economic inequality, feminist researchers criticized the strong reliance of most approaches on a stylized ideal-typical citizen, usually the male breadwinner and wage earner. Women's status in employment, their role in the household production of welfare, their share in caring and child-raising work and the unequal private division of labor call for more attention to be paid to the gendering effects of the welfare state (Fraser 1997; Stier et al. 2001). In another strand of literature, researchers have exposed the historical role of women's agency and political organization in shaping welfare state development. Theda Skocpol's (1996⁴/1992¹) historical study *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers* details the evolution of early forms of social provision in the United States starting with Civil War pensions after reconstruction. Arguing in a 'polity-centred' perspective, Skocpol holds party structure, reform-oriented professionals and gender-driven, locally rooted women's movements responsible for forging early American social policy.⁴⁵

The welfare state not only contributes to shaping relations between classes, ethnic groups⁴⁶ and sexes, and is shaped by them, it is also crucial for determining the relations between generations. One of the central achievements of welfare state maturation was to institutionalize the idea and concept of retirement as a distinct stage of life characterized by independent access to state-provided means of subsistence, not – as in former times – part and parcel of poverty (Kohli et al. 1991). Together with and buoyed by rising affluence after the Second World War, pension schemes have been responsible for the eradication, or at least containment, of old-age poverty and in many Western welfare states some retirees enjoy living standards on a par with the household of the average worker (OECD 2001). However, the established and institutionalized 'generational contract', which has been the foundation of income redistribution from the working generation to the elderly, does not seem sustainable in the face of rapid population aging and fiscal constraints. Demographic change, with a larger share of people retiring and increasing retirement costs, is placing a high burden on the welfare state. Since the elderly are an important electoral group, pronounced resistance to pension retrenchment will cause high immobility of public pension schemes, after all '[t]hey are the "grey giants" of the welfare state and, like fully grown elephants, difficult to move' (Hinrichs 2001: 79). Nevertheless, this has not halted the serious erosions of the real value of the state pension in the UK since the 1980s or of occupational pensions⁴⁷ or similar though milder developments in Germany (see Alber 2000: 242ff.). However, although room for maneuver is limited, most OECD countries have started to introduce reforms enhancing the sustainability of public pension schemes. These countries were able to negotiate reform packages which in most cases protected the current generation of pensioners and disadvantaged future cohorts of beneficiaries.

Such changes undermine established notions of intergenerational equity by giving different cohorts unequal access to public benefits. The ‘generational-accounting’ approach emphasizes that the legitimacy of public pension schemes rests on generations being treated equally. More specifically, ‘generations born in the future should not pay a higher share of their life-time income to the government than today’s newborns’ (Auerbach et al. 1994: 84) – though this is a century-old problem, with taxes rising as much for warfare as for welfare state reasons since the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth century, with not much worry about equity until recently. If we were to draw up a balance sheet for each successive cohort that registers the contributions paid to the pension system against the benefits received, it would seem that the lifetime balance of welfare-related burdens and benefits works to the disadvantage of younger generations. However, it requires sophisticated analysis to establish whether generational inequity really exists. If one compares cumulative payments and receipts not only in the pension system but for education, health and individual social security branches, the picture is less clear-cut.⁴⁸ John Hills’ (2004: ch. 8) analysis of the British case, for example, suggests that the later generations do not necessarily lose out, provided that the system is not changing drastically.

Although inequities in the pension system may represent a serious distributive challenge, a fundamental opposition of generations is not (yet) discernible. It has been stressed that public transfers from the young to the old interact with private transfers from the old to the young. Public transfers from the working population to pensioners are in part ‘returned’ by the latter through private transfers, a flow which diminishes potential conflict over public transfers (Kohli 1999). Then, the pension system has not played out ‘the old’ against ‘the young’, but ‘the public contract between generations is a model of generational solidarity from which private contracts between family generations are negotiated’ (Attias-Donfut/Arber 2000: 18). It also seems that divides *within* a generation become increasingly significant, with a group of affluent and well-protected retirees on the one hand, and a growing group on the other hand that has no relevant access to private schemes and made insufficient contributions to public schemes, leaving it fully dependent on diminishing public benefits (Myles 2002a). This goes hand-in-hand with a gender divide, with women over-represented among the poorest pensioners – and of course they are the majority of pensioners since women everywhere outlive men. Likely to be over-represented are also the long-term disabled and immigrants. In the discussion of the costs of an aging population, however, one should avoid assumptions that current demographic patterns will persist into the distant future. Birthrates could rise again, as they did in 1940s and 1950s following predictions of demographic gloom due to the birthrate decline of the 1920s and 30s; and migration could change the demographic structure of many countries, as it did in some regions during the nineteenth century.

Outlook: Beyond the Welfare State?

Since the 1970s (and earlier, see Flora 1981) there have been numerous declarations of the welfare state’s retreat or demise; it was ‘withering away’, on a definitive ‘race to(ward) the bottom’. None of these ‘varieties-of-death’ have come true (Castles 2004; Obinger et al. 2005a for federal states).⁴⁹ ‘The reports of my death are greatly exaggerated’, noted Mark Twain in a cable sent from London after his obituary had been mistakenly published in the *New York Journal* on June 2, 1897.

These three volumes demonstrate that the welfare state is alive and kicking. However, as we have also seen, the welfare state faces myriad challenges. From the outside it is confronted with globalization and supranationalization, both clearly limiting its ability to act and its freedom in the choice of means. There are also, on the inside, profound transformations of the labor market under way, with a greater role for service-sector employment and a new set of social risks fostered by more flexible and de-standardized employment. At the same time, the rise of knowledge-intensive industries calls for new and more comprehensive types of investment in human capital, challenging education and training systems which had originally provided entry tickets to a lifelong career. Changes in gender relations and in patterns of family formation upset the institutional underpinnings of the traditional male breadwinner family and of the standard gendered life course. Similarly, socio-demographic changes such as the aging of the population jeopardize the 'old' architecture of the welfare state, particularly of the pension and health-care systems, and affect the streams of intergenerational transfers (Kohli 2004). Finally, migration and greater social diversity may make it more demanding to organize and legitimize institutional solidarity.

The future of the welfare state,⁵⁰ therefore, will be shaped by a number of intersecting, multifaceted processes: the realignment of work and welfare in post-industrial society; the finding of a new balance between maintaining financial viability and meeting societal needs; the redesign of the interaction among national welfare states; and processes of supra-, inter- and transnationalization. Given these profound changes and challenges, welfare state researchers must strive for a better understanding of the social, political and economic forces that drive welfare state development, the rationales of welfare state restructuring and, finally, the outcomes of such 'recalibration'. It is often deceptive to talk about 'the' welfare state, since very different welfare states exist, and each one is made up of quite different programs and institutions. Analysis, therefore, needs to be sensitive to the various perspectives and parameters essential to evaluating the welfare state and determining its future. In this undertaking these volumes provide guidance, as well as an overview of the ongoing discussion about the trajectories and futures of the welfare state.

In addition, the future of the welfare state cannot be isolated from changes in the nature of the state in general. In most OECD nations almost one-third of GNP is 'invested' in the welfare state, but most *scholars of the state* focus on political systems, parties and policy-making in non-welfare areas like public finance, education, environmental protection, national defense, foreign policy, and so on, usually ignoring the welfare component of this spending, which is mostly left to another subset of specialists. For this majority of political scientists the state is always spelled with a capital S, and welfare, if mentioned at all, with lower-case w. But *scholars of the welfare state* – capital W, small s – have likewise ignored the outcomes for the state at large which result from the permanent exercise of 'recalibration'.⁵¹ Yet they increasingly need to confront the question: How does welfare state change affect the make-up of the nation state (Rothgang et al. 2006; Leibfried/Zürn 2005; Hurrelmann et al. 2007)? And vice versa. Welfare state scholars need to embark on a major analytic 'outreach' effort, be it simply to keep up with the movement of the welfare state itself or with the movement of the surroundings – as in privatization – that affect it. Likewise they need to pierce the nation state shell and confront the international/domestic interface of welfare state development (for the US see Rodgers 1998; Katznelson/Shefter 2002).

These challenges posed to welfare state research are, indeed, enduring ones. While Mark Twain died some fifteen years later on April 21, 1910, the welfare state – or better, the 'war'

between ‘citizenship and the capitalist class system’, as T.H. Marshall described it in the epigraph from 1949 – may well turn out to be just as immortal as are democracy and the rule of law.

Notes

1. We are very grateful to Nicholas Barr, Francis G. Castles, Neil Gilbert, Ana M. Guillén, Ian Gough, Jane Lewis, Herbert Obinger, Elmar Rieger, Pat Thane, Patrick Sachweh and Benjamin W. Veghte for their suggestions and generous help, and we also thank three initially anonymous reviewers for their diagnoses. In a comprehensive undertaking such as this one we depended on such assistance – but still all reporting biases and mistakes remain fully ours. All citations with more than two authors are cited as ‘author et al. year’. A superscript number after the publication year (e.g., 2004⁶) refers to the edition.
2. This trajectory of historical development could have stimulated comparative welfare state history. Yet after the heyday of *sweeping* macro-historical comparisons in the 1980s (Alber 1982; Baldwin 1990; Flora 1986–87; Flora/Heidenheimer 1981; Flora/Alber 1981; etc.), the few *comparisons* offered nowadays zero in on mezzo and micro areas like ‘age’ (Macnicol 2006; Thane 2005; Lynch 2006; etc.), and also on more recent health policy trajectories (Giaimo 2002; Maioni 1998) and diverse labor market entry issues (Müller/Gangl 2003; Gangl 2005). Most research remains focused on *national* historical junctures (Amenta 2006; Tennstedt 2004; Thane 2000; Smith 2003, 2004; etc. – encyclopedic BMA and Bundesarchiv 2001ff. [cf. for a review Leibfried/Veghte 2002] as well as Born and Tennstedt 1991ff.). Peter H. Lindert (2004), E. Peter Hennock (2007), and Daniel T. Rodgers (1998) – each in a very different way – do not fit the pattern, and are very welcome late-comers or, maybe, the forerunners of a new, broad examination of welfare state history.
3. Herbert Obinger and Uwe Wagschal (2000) label them ‘*gezügelte*’, ‘restrained’ welfare states.
4. A look at some thirty or so middle-income countries all around the periphery of our Western European-cum-US focus is presented by Miguel Glatzer and Dietrich Rueschemeyer (2005).
5. The volume by Christopher Pierson and Francis G. Castles (2006²) takes all the shortcuts of an introductory volume. The volumes presented here are not introductory in that elementary sense but aim at the comprehensive coverage necessary at the graduate level and they present the full text.
6. *Foundations* and *Welfare States* overlap only marginally: In Vol. 1, Part II *Welfare States* also makes use of T.H. Marshall’s seminal ‘Citizenship and Social Class’ (*Foundations* 1: 3–60) and in Vol. 2, Part I on Gøsta Esping-Andersen’s equally seminal piece ‘The three political economies of the welfare state’ (*Foundations* 2: 175–201) and also in Part II on Paul Pierson’s ‘The New Politics of the Welfare State’ (*Foundations* 2: 425–61). Where we cite articles in the bibliography which are reprinted in *Foundations*, we indicate where they can be found in these volumes.
7. In *Economic Theory* pensions are topical in Volume 2, Part I B, C (61–272).
8. We are grateful to Nicholas Barr for advising us on how he updates his volumes in his LSE teaching.
9. Here we refer mainly to T.H. Marshall and Richard M. Titmuss.
10. The notion of austerity, applied *literally*, sits very uneasily with an average increase in OECD-spending as a percentage of GDP of about 18% since 1980, the vast increase in *real* spending per capita on most welfare programs (not all) and the invention of whole new programs vis-à-vis new social risks (see Castles 2004). The ‘era of austerity’ – where it does not apply to some particular programs in a straightforward way, which it often may in crucial areas like poverty and unemployment policy – is at its core about a reining in of the *potential* growth rates of these programs and of the welfare state as such, which would have been much higher still, had the growth not been curbed (for a German example – pensions since the 1980s – see Alber 2000). And the ‘era of austerity’ is, finally, about shifting the burden of proof in the *ideological* warfare about the welfare state: satisfaction of needs by government policy is no more assumed to be automatically a good thing. That makes changes in the normative dimension quite crucial.

11. How surprised most researchers were by this turn of events is revealed if one is forced to state the original question that inspired retrenchment research: How could they get away with it?
12. Publications with years in **bold** are included in the three volume collection.
13. For information on datasets of the ILO and OECD see <http://www.esds.ac.uk/>. For information on LIS data see <http://www.lisproject.org/>.
14. For a general comparison of Fascism and Nazism in this respect see Mark Roseman (1996).
15. One of these detours is to confer benefits by non-state means, which in some cases has inspired the discussion of new welfare state types, as in the ‘wage-earner’s welfare state’ (Castles/Mitchell 1993) for the Antipodes; Richard M. Titmuss makes the same point when he talks about ‘occupational welfare’ as an alternative to state provision (1976 [1958]: 50ff.).
16. To include education in the welfare state sphere is conventional from T.H. Marshall to Nicholas Barr (*Economic Theory* 3: 311–623; and now Barr/Crawford 2005) but does not conform to continental European thinking and practice (see Allmendinger/Leibfried 2003). There the welfare state is mostly limited to social insurance-cum-poverty measures. (We should note, though, that Harold L. Wilensky [1975] explicitly excluded education from the welfare state.)
17. Peter Baldwin did so for Scandinavia.
18. *Foundations*, instead, focuses on the British case (2: 1–172) as the ‘mother of all welfare states’. The literature’s focus on the US has led to a relative neglect of the other ‘restrained [*gezügelt*] welfare states’ (Obinger/Wagschal 2000), that is, of Canada (Banting 2005), Australia (Castles/Uhr 2005), and New Zealand (Boston et al. 1999; McClure 1998; Starke 2007) – the latter two are sometimes treated under one ‘Antipodean’ perspective (Castles 1985; Castles et al. 1996). These states had developed in a relatively less restrained manner than the US, even though some researchers consider all of them ‘welfare state laggards’. Therefore, these three states provide interesting examples for real welfare state development beyond – and outside – European horizons.
19. On the notion of policy preemption see Paul Pierson and Stephan Leibfried (1995: 21f.). This notion may well apply also to the other English-speaking and Swiss welfare states in virtue of their early democratization and relative affluence. This relativizes US exceptionalism.
20. This also led to a rather self-contained, exclusively inward-looking welfare reform trajectory in the US since the Second World War, in which the state penal element plays a pronounced role (Western 2006). Comparisons with the rest of the world play hardly any role – with small exceptions for health insurance, where the US itself senses the incompleteness of its security system (for general US literature see: Grogger/Karoly 2005; Haskins 2006; Weaver 2007b; Freeman 2007; for background studies see: Fischer/Hout 2006). The contrast is sharply visible in Daniel T. Rodgers’s (1998) *Atlantic Crossings*, though the focus on the UK/US comparison dominates (for today’s comparisons see inter al. King 1995, 1999).
21. Ad hoc state-building in the US happened first and only in military affairs in the Civil War. Therefore, at first, the welfare state could only take hold within the warfare state itself. More universal state-building starts with the Progressive Era around the turn of the last century and allows for a broader welfare state approach later in the New Deal.
22. From all this one might also conclude that the longer the process, the weaker it is likely to be. Later democratizing and industrializing societies created their welfare states more rapidly. That might suggest that Europe, now 50 years old, has missed the boat, like the US.
23. Comparative studies of Eastern European welfare state development have been most prominent in economics and by ‘sector’ (see Atkinson/Micklewright [1992] on poverty/incomes; Barr [2005] on labor markets; Kornai/Eggleston [2001] on health; Müller [1999ff.] and Müller et al. [1999], Schmähl/Horstmann [2002], and also Rein/Schmähl [2003] on pensions; Aidukaite [2004] on welfare states in general in the Baltic states; Kornai et al. [2001] on fiscal and welfare reform; and Castles/Obinger (2008) on a distinct post-Communist welfare state type. For a general synthesis see Linda J. Cook (2007a, b).
24. This point is discussed in more detail below under the heading ‘Welfare State Justification and Contestation’.
25. One should also note that decommodification, as it was originally conceived by Karl Marx, Karl Polanyi and Thomas H. Marshall, was not about *exiting* the labor market, but strengthening the *bargaining* position of the wage-earner (Iverson/Soskice 2001).

26. We are grateful to Bruno Palier, Ana M. Gulli n and Maurizio Ferrera for pointing us to these literatures.
27. The ‘Golden Age’ metaphor refers to the main welfare schemes such as old-age pensions, unemployment compensation, health insurance and workman’s compensation – and to the unquestioned assumption of never-ending welfare state progress. The transition into the Silver Age since then does not preclude that most countries have developed a host of new programs, mostly proliferating in the area of in-kind service provision for the aged and families; also one new program type has developed since then in some countries: care insurance.
28. On the perplexing three-level range of the notion of ‘austerity’ see note 10, above.
29. Since retrenchment has been relatively more effective in programs outside the welfare state (Castles 2006, 2007) the welfare state ‘half’ of the budget has acquired an even more prominent and expansive status as an ‘immovable object’.
30. Paul Pierson’s concept of interest groups relied heavily on welfare clients, beneficiaries and users. However, one could also highlight the relevance of special interest groups whose members are not identical with the beneficiaries of specific welfare programs such as the Child Poverty Action Group in the UK or trade unions in welfare state development or, for that matter, business organizations (Hacker/Pierson 2002; Mares 2003a, b) or provider groups, especially in the health sector (Immergut 1990, 1992).
31. Naturally, we can see some spending declines in *some* policy sectors in *some* countries.
32. In addition, there are massive bodies of literature by sector, of which we only picked up a few in selected areas: *pensions/aging* (e.g., Arza/Kohli 2007; Bonoli 2000; Bonoli/Shinkawa 2005; Immergut et al. 2006; Ebbinghaus 2006; Maltby et al. 2004), *health* (e.g., Rothgang et al. 2005; Giaimo 2002), *(un)employment* (e.g., Becker/Schwartz 2005; Blank et al. 2006; Gallie 2004; L demel/Trickey 2001; Sarfati/Bonoli 2002), and *family* (e.g., Lewis 2006; Moynihan 2004; Pedersen 1993; Hakim 2000, 2003) cum *gender* (e.g., Jacobs/Gerson 2004; Ostner 2006).
33. This term has achieved some prominence since 2000 and actually seems to have been invented by Jonathan Zeitlin during a seminar in Florence in 1998.
34. Here we view the world by placing ourselves at the OECD centre; an extensive bibliography on ‘globalization and the welfare state’ in this perspective is provided by Elmar Rieger and Stephan Leibfried (2003: 336–95), who also point to the start of the global challenge to social policy already before the First World War (see also Herren 1993). If we assume a perspective on this Western formation looking from the periphery to the West, we can discern quite a different set of challenges, especially for the *global* welfare politics of the core OECD states (cf. Birdsall 1998; Bradshaw/Wallace 1996; McGrew/Poku 2006; Pogge 2002; Wade 2005; Wade/Wolf 2002).
35. Since 2001 this is topical in the journal *Global Social Policy*.
36. Therefore, the institutionalized collective insecurity in the US (Leibfried/Rieger 2006), whether or not one labels the US a ‘welfare state’, and its Christian fundamentalism also correspond.
37. For a review of this major study see Glyn Morgan (2006) and Andrew Moravcsik (2006).
38. Since 1991 this is topical in the *Journal of European Social Policy*. In addition the *Journal of European Public Policy* (1994ff.) has published increasingly on the social dimension of European integration.
39. There is also a blossoming literature on welfare state development in Latin America to which we cannot do justice here; for an introduction to the topic see Evelyne Huber, Fran ois Nielsen, Jenny Pribble and John Stephens (2006) and Evelyne Huber (2005).
40. A good part of the change may not be due to ‘global impacts’ on social policy, but to the reconstitution of the state and the changing forms of national economic governance (on Hungary: Philipps et al. 2006), which may, though, themselves be affected by global constellations.
41. On the ECHP see: <http://epunet.essex.ac.uk/echp.php>.
42. If one uses *time* rather than money – or the *combination* of both – as *the* measuring rods for (re-)distribution, the result is quite a substantial change in the perception of welfare, household and gender regimes; see Robert Goodin, James Mahmud Rice, Antiti Parpo and Lina Eriksson (2007).
43. There are important exceptions like the UK where the government is strongly resisting proposals to shift pensions from an ‘insurance’ to a residence basis. Non-citizens have restricted rights to

- many benefits, some groups far more restricted than others, and restrictions have grown over recent decades.
44. For a review and critique of the argumentation of these two economists see Jonas Pontusson (2006) from political science in the US and Peter Taylor-Gooby (2005b) from social policy/sociology in the UK.
 45. On a proposed comparison of the ‘maternalist’ early welfare state in the US with the ‘paternalist’ one in the UK see Theda Skocpol and Gretchen Ritter (1991). This early perspective on the UK has been revised by Pat Thane (1991, 1993, 1996², 2001) and on the USA by Molly Ladd-Taylor (1993): From the turn of the last century UK ‘maternalist’ welfare legislation did stand on its own feet; even widows’ and orphans’ pensions, introduced in 1925, cannot be seen simply as ancillary to male national insurance and were proposed and supported by feminist organizations; also, UK institutional changes proved to be lasting, while the US programs were seriously cut back from the end of the 1920s. Consult further on the UK/US comparison on gender and more generally Ann. S. Orloff and Theda Skocpol (1984), and also Edwin Amenta, Chris Bonastia, and Neal Caren (2001). For gendered comparisons across more countries see Seth Koven and Sonya Michel (1993), Gisela Bock and Pat Thane (1991), and now Rebecca J. Plante (2007), as well as Lynne Haney, Sonya Michel, and Lisa Pollard (2007), Sonya Michel and Rianne Mahon (2002). (On the US only see Sonya Michel [1999].)
 46. This ethnic variant has been best studied for Canada, most recently again by Keith G. Banting (2005) and Keith G. Banting and Will Kymlicka (2004). One of the most interesting recent cases here is Belgium.
 47. For studies of the history and present condition of pensions in the UK, with comparisons to Europe, see Hugh Pemberton, Pat Thane and Noël Whiteside (2006).
 48. Also, one would have to compare and weigh the different living conditions and life courses as these generations move on: a later retirement age is combined with (on average) later entries into the labor market of the young, jobs are less physically demanding for the young than they had been for the already old; the now young and middle-aged will be much fitter at later ages than those now old, and so on – and much of this improvement may be seen to some degree as an outcome of the efforts of the older generations.
 49. Some ‘varieties-of-death’ have just been transsubstantiations or reincarnations, as when the US froze the New Deal welfare landscape (Osterman et al. 2001) and turned instead to a costly regulatory (welfare) state built on anti-discrimination legislation (Nivola 1997). On the labor relations background see Michael J. Piori and Sean Stafford (2006), Richard B. Freeman (2007) and Bernhard Ebbinghams and Bernhard Kittel (2005).
 50. The future of the welfare state was quite topical at the millennium; see inter al. Howard Glennerster (1999), John Myles and Jill Quadagno (2000) and Stephan Leibfried (2000).
 51. Herbert Obinger, Stephan Leibfried and Frank Castles (2005a: xii) make this point on federalism and the welfare state, but the point is actually of much broader significance.

Bibliography*

A Note on Anglo-American Journals: Going beyond the general national and international political science, sociology, and economics journals there are some specialized journals in which the debates on the challenges to the welfare state are best traced: In the UK with Cambridge University Press there is the *Journal of Social Policy* (1972ff.), complemented by *Social Policy*

* Where we cite articles in the bibliography reprinted in *Foundations* (Goodin/Mitchell 2000) or in *Economic Theory* (Barr 2001), we indicate their whereabouts in these volumes [in brackets] at the end of the reference. We also indicate the contributions to *Welfare States* by volume in a similar manner and by continuing to mark the year of publication in **bold**. Different editions are marked through a superscription of the edition to the year of publication, as in 2004⁶.

and *Society* (2002ff.) and the *Social Policy Digest* (online, 2003ff.; <http://journals.cambridge.org/spd/action/home>), contrasted by *Critical Social Policy* (1981ff.; Sage) and supplemented by *Social Policy & Administration* (1967ff.; Blackwell). In addition there are more specialized journals focusing on aging (*Ageing and Society*, 1981ff., Cambridge University Press), health (*Health Economics, Policy and Law*, 2006ff., Cambridge University Press) or the gender (*Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 1994ff., Oxford University Press) and labor-market (like *LABOUR: Review of Labour Economics and Industrial Relations*, 1986ff., Blackwell) interface.

In the US, publications on welfare state issues are all in the disciplinary journals with no special culture of social policy journals on which to rely. The interesting journals that address broad welfare state debates in the US would be *The American Prospect* (1990ff., on the left, with Princeton University Press) *Society* (more or less centrist, 1962ff., with Transaction Press) and *The American Enterprise* (on the right, 1990ff., published by the American Enterprise Institute). These publications are more like magazines than conventional academic journals and cater to a more general audience. They can be considered academic/trade publications. Among the strictly academic publications, which tend to be more narrowly and technically focused, *Evaluation Review. A Journal of Applied Social Research* (1980ff., Sage) and the *Journal of Public Policy Analysis and Management* (1981ff., John Wiley & Sons) provide probably the best coverage of welfare state program evaluations; the *Social Service Review* (1927ff., University of Chicago Press) occasionally addresses broader issues of the welfare state; after that the other academic journals tend to be rather specialized, focusing on child policy (e.g. *Child and Youth Services Review*), health (*Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law*), mental health, aging, etc.

Another universe is that of the comparative journals, like the *Journal of Comparative Public Policy* (1999ff., Routledge) and *West European Politics* (1978ff., Taylor & Francis), which recurrently touch on welfare state matters, as does *Politics and Society* (1970/71ff., Sage). An international, though practitioner's journal is the *International Social Security Review* (1947ff.) published by the International Social Security Association in Geneva. And, still another flourishing branch are the journals focusing on European integration, quite a few of them with quite a broad topical and/or disciplinary scope (i.e., *Journal of European Public Policy*, 1994ff., Routledge; *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 1962ff., Blackwell; *European Law Journal*, 1995ff., Blackwell); but one of these concentrates on the fate of national social policy in European integration and on Europe's social dimension, the *Journal of European Social Policy* (1991ff., now Sage).

Abrahamson, Peter (1999) The Welfare Modelling Business, *Social Policy and Administration* 33: 394–415.

Adema, Willem (1999) Net Social Expenditures, Paris: OECD (*Labor Market and Social Policy Occasional Papers* No. 39).

— and Marcel Einerhand (1998) The Growing Role of Private Social Benefits, Paris: OECD (*Labor Market and Social Policy Occasional Papers* No. 32).

— and Maxime Ladaique (2005) Net Social Expenditure, 2005 Edition. More Comprehensive Measures of Social Support, Paris: OECD (*Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers* No. 29).

Aidukaite, Jolanta (2004) *The Emergence of the Post-Socialist Welfare State. The Case of the Baltic States: Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania*, Södertörns: Södertörns högskola University College.

Akerlof, George A. (2002) Behavioral Macroeconomics and Macroeconomic Behavior, *American Economic Review* 92 (3, June): 411–33.

- Albaek, Erik, Leslie Eliason, Asbjørn Sonne Noergaard, and Herman Schwartz, eds. (2005) *Crisis, Miracles and Beyond: Negotiated Adaptation of the Danish Welfare State*, Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Alber, Jens (1982) *Vom Armenhaus zum Wohlfahrtsstaat. Analysen zur Entwicklung der Sozialversicherung in Westeuropa*, Frankfurt a.M. etc.: Campus
- (1989) *Der Sozialstaat in der Bundesrepublik 1950–1983*, Frankfurt a.M. etc.: Campus.
- (2000) Der deutsche Sozialstaat in der Ära Kohl: Diagnosen und Daten, in: Stephan Leibfried and Uwe Wagschal, eds., *Der deutsche Sozialstaat. Bilanzen – Reform – Perspektiven*, Frankfurt a.M. etc.: Campus, 235–75.
- (2001a) Hat sich der Wohlfahrtsstaat als soziale Ordnung bewährt?, in: Karl-Ulrich Mayer, ed., *Die beste aller Welten? Marktliberalismus versus Wohlfahrtsstaat*, Frankfurt a.M. etc.: Campus, 59–111.
- (2001b) *Recent developments of the German Welfare State: Basic Continuity or a Paradigm Shift?* Bremen: University of Bremen, Centre for Social Policy Research (CS WP 06/01), in: Neil Gilbert and Rebecca A. Voorhis, eds., *Changing Patterns of Social Protection*, New Brunswick, NJ; London: Transaction Publishers 2003, 9–73.
- (2002) Modernisierung als Peripetie des Sozialstaats?, *Berliner Journal für Soziologie* 12 (1): 5–35.
- (2006) The European Social Model and the United States, *European Union Politics* 7 (3): 393–419 (expanded German version: Id., Das ‘europäische Sozialmodell’ und die USA, *Leviathan* 2006 34 (2): 208–41).
- Tony Fahey, and Chiara Saraceno, eds. (2008) *Handbook of Quality of Life in the Enlarged Europe*, London: Routledge (forthcoming).
- Alesina, Alberto, and Edward L. Glaeser (2004) *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Allmendinger, Jutta, and Stephan Leibfried (2003) Education and the Welfare State: The Four Worlds of Competence Production, *Journal of European Social Policy* 13 (1): 63–81.
- Aly, Götz (2006⁴) *Hitlers Volksstaat: Raub, Rassenkrieg und nationaler Sozialismus*, Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer, corr. and exp. edn. (2005¹).
- Amenta, Edwin (1988) The Formative Years of US Social Spending Policies: Theories of the welfare state and the American states during the great depression, *American Sociological Review* 53 (5): 661–78.
- (1998) *Bold Relief: Institutional Politics and the Origins of Modern American Social Policy*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- (2003) What We Know About the Development of Social Policy. Comparative and Historical Research in Comparative and Historical Perspective, in: Mahoney/Rueschemeyer 2003, 91–130 [*Welfare States*, vol. 1: 22–61].
- (2006) *When Movements Matter: The Townsend Plan and the Rise of Social Security*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Chris Bonastia, and Neal Caren (2001) US Social Policy in Comparative and Historical Perspective: Concepts, Images, Arguments, and Research Strategies, *Annual Review of Sociology* 27: 213–34.
- Andersen, Jørgen Goul, Jochen Clasen, Wim van Oorschot, and Knut Halvorsen, eds. (2002) *Europe’s New State of Welfare. Unemployment, Employment Policies and Citizenship*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Andersen, Jørgen Goul, Anne Marie Guillemand, Per H. Jensen and Birgit Pfau-Effinger, eds. (2005) *The Changing Face of Welfare: Consequences and Outcomes from a Citizenship Perspective*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Anheier, Helmut K. (2001) Dimensions of the Third Sector: Comparative Perspectives on Structure and Change, *Journal of Youth Studies* 4 (2): 3–27 (= in: id. and Avner Ben-Ner, eds., *The Study of Non-Profit Enterprise: Theories and Approaches*, New York; Plenum/Kluwer 2003, 147–276).
- and Hagai Katz (2006) Learning from History. Comparative Historical Methods and Researching Global Civil Society, in: Marlies Glasius, Mary Calder, and Helmut K. Anheier, eds., *Global Civil Society 2005/06*, London: Sage, 240–65.
- Archibugi, Franco (2000) *The Associative Economy: Insights beyond the Welfare State and into Post-capitalism*, London: Macmillan.
- Armingeon, Klaus, and Michelle Beyeler, eds. (2004) *The OECD and European Welfare States*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

- Armingeon, Klaus, and Giuliano Bonoli, eds. (2006) *The Politics of Post-Industrial Welfare States. Adapting Post-war Social Policies to New Social Risks*. London: Routledge.
- Atkinson, Anthony B., and John Micklewright (1992) *Economic Transformation in Eastern Europe and the Distribution of Income*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Attias-Donfut, Claudine, and Sara Arber (2000) Equity and Solidarity across Generations, in: Sara Arber and Claudine Attias-Donfut, eds., *The Myth of Generational Conflict. The Family and State in Ageing Societies*, London/New York: Routledge, 1–21.
- Auerbach, Alan J., David Card, and John M. Quigley, eds. (2006) *Public Policy and the Income Distribution*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Auerbach, Alan J., Jagadeesh Gokhale, and Laurence J. Kotlikoff (1994) Generational Accounting: A meaningful way to evaluate fiscal policy, *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 8 (1): 73–94.
- Arza, Camila, and Martin Kohli, eds. (2007) *The Political Economy of Pension Reform*, London: Routledge (forthcoming).
- Baldwin, Peter (1990) *The Politics of Social Solidarity: Class Bases of the European Welfare State 1875–1975*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [Introduction: Welfare, Redistribution and Solidarity, pp. 1–54 = *Welfare States*, vol. 1: 423–76].
- (1999) *Contagion and the State in Europe, 1830–1930*, Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press.
- Banting, Keith G. (2000) Looking in Three Directions: Migration and the European Welfare State in Comparative Perspective, in: Michael Bommes and Andrew Geddes, eds., *Immigration and the Welfare State*, London and New York: Routledge, 13–33 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 410–34].
- (2005) Canada: Nation-building in a Federal Welfare State, in: Obinger/Leibfried/Castles 2005a, 89–137.
- and Will Kymlicka (2004) Do Multiculturalism Policies Erode the Welfare State?, in: Philippe van Parijs, ed., *Cultural Diversity versus Economic Solidarity*, Brussels: Deboeck Université Press, 227–84 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 435–92].
- Barbier, Jean-Claude, and Bruno Théret (2004) *Le nouveau système français de protection sociale*, Paris: La Découverte.
- Barr, Nicholas (1992) Economic Theory and the Welfare State: A Survey and Interpretation, *Journal of Economic Literature* XXX (2): 741–803 (= *Economic Theory* 1: 24–86).
- (1994) *Labor Markets and Social Policy in Central and Eastern Europe: The Transition and Beyond*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2001a) *The Welfare State as a Piggy Bank: Information, Risk, Uncertainty, and the Role of the State*, Oxford: Oxford University Press [Ch. 2: The Market and Information, pp. 11–25 = *Welfare States*, vol. 1: 477–96].
- ed. (2001b) *Economic Theory and the Welfare State*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 3 vols.
- (2004⁴) *The Economics of the Welfare State*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ed. (2005) *Labor Markets and Social Policy in Central and Eastern Europe: The Accession and Beyond*, Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- (2006) Pensions: Overview of the Issues, *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 22 (1): 1–14 (<http://oxrep.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/22/1/1?ikey=xUhuLJ3z5zjh3d8&keytype=ref>).
- and Iain Crawford (2005) *Financing Higher Education: Answers from the UK*, London: Routledge.
- and Peter Diamond (2006) The Economics of Pensions, *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 22 (1): 15–39 (<http://oxrep.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/22/1/15?ikey=9DjQZbG8zPR17qI&keytype=ref>).
- Bartolini, Stefano (2005) *Restructuring Europe: Centre Formation, System Building, and Political Structuring between the Nation State and the European Union*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barysch, Katinka (2006) East versus West? The European Economic and Social Model after Enlargement, in: Giddens et al. 2006, 52–69.
- Baumol, William J. (1967) The Macroeconomics of Unbalanced Growth, *American Economic Review* 75: 415–26.
- Bayly, Christopher A. (2004) *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780–1914: Global Connections and Comparisons*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Beblo, Miriam, and Thomas Knaus (2001) Measuring Income Inequality in Euroland, *Review of Income and Wealth* 47 (3): 301–20.

- Becker, Uwe, and Herman Schwartz, eds. (2005) *Employment Miracles: A Critical Comparison of the Dutch, Scandinavian, Swiss, Australian and Irish cases versus Germany and the US*, Amsterdam/Chicago: University of Amsterdam Press/Chicago University Press.
- Beckert, Jens (2002) *Beyond the Market: The Social Foundations of Economic Efficiency*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- (2006) Wer zählt den Kapitalismus?, in: Beckert et al. 2006, 425–42.
- Bernhard Ebbinghaus, Anke Hassel, and Philip Manow, eds. (2006) *Transformationen des Kapitalismus*, Frankfurt a.M.: Campus.
- Beyeler, Michelle (2003) Globalization, Europeanization and Domestic Welfare State Reforms: New institutionalist concepts, *Global Social Policy* 3 (2): 153–72.
- Birchfield, Vicki, and Markus Crepaz (1998) The Impact of Constitutional Structures and Competitive and Collective Veto Points on Income Inequality in Industrialized Democracies, *European Journal of Political Research* 34 (2): 175–200.
- Birdsall, Nancy (1998) Life is Unfair: Inequality in the World, *Foreign Policy* 111 (Summer): 76–93 (=http://bss.sfsu.edu/jmoss/resources/635_pdf/No_09_Birdsall.pdf—accessed 1/13/97).
- Blank, Rebecca M., Sheldon H. Danziger, and Robert F. Schoeni, eds. (2006) *Working and Poor: How Economic and Policy Changes are Affecting Low-Wage Workers*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Blank, Robert, and Viola Burau (2004) *Comparative Health Policy*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bleses, Peter, and Martin Seeleib-Kaiser (2004) *The Dual Transformation of the German Welfare State*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- BMA [Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Sozialordnung] and Bundesarchiv, eds. (2001 ff.) *Geschichte der Sozialpolitik in Deutschland seit 1945*, Baden-Baden: Nomos, 12 vols. (synthesis in volume 1: Hans Günter Hockerts, ed., *Grundlagen der Sozialpolitik* 2001).
- Bock, Gisela and Pat Thane (1991) *Maternity and Gender Policies. Women and the Rise of the European Welfare States, 1880s-1950s*, London etc.: Routledge.
- Boeri, Tito, Gordon H. Hanson, and Barry McCormick, eds. (2002) *Immigration Policy and the Welfare System*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Boeri, Tito, and Roberto Perotti (2002) *Meno pensioni, piu welfare*, Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Boix, Carles (1997) Privatizing the Public Business Sector in the Eighties: Economic Performance, Partisan Responses and Divided Governments, *British Journal of Political Science* 27 (4): 473–96.
- (2003) *Democracy and Redistribution*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bonoli, Giuliano (1997) Classifying Welfare States: A Two Dimensional Approach, *Journal of Social Policy* 26 (3): 351–72 [*Welfare States*, vol. 2: 78–99].
- (2000) *The Politics of Pension Reform: Institutions and Policy Change in Western Europe*, Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press.
- (2005) The Politics of the New Social Policies. Providing Coverage Against New Social Risks in Mature Welfare State, *Policy and Politics* 33 (3): 431–49 [*Welfare States*, vol. 1: 497–516].
- and Martin Powell, eds. (2004) *Social Democratic Parties in Contemporary Europe*, London etc.: Routledge.
- and Toshimitsu Shinkawa, eds. (2005) *Ageing and Pension Reform around the World: Evidence from Eleven Countries*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Born, Karl-Erich, and Florian Tennstedt, eds. (1994ff.) *Quellensammlung zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sozialpolitik 1867 bis 1914*, now: Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft (19 of 34 volumes have appeared).
- Boston, Jonathan, Paul Dalziel and Susan St John, eds. (1999) *Redesigning the Welfare State in New Zealand: Problems, Policies, Prospects*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bradshaw, York W., and Michael Wallace (1996) *Global Inequalities*, Thousand Oaks, CA etc.: Pine Forge Press.
- Brandolini, Andrea (2007) Measurement of Income Distribution in Supranational Entities: The case of the European Union, in: Stephen P. Jenkins and John Micklewright, eds., *Inequality and Poverty Re-examined*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 62–83.
- Brinegar, Adam P., Seth K. Jolly, and Herbert Kitschelt (2004) Varieties of Capitalism and Political Divides

- over European Integration, in: Gary Marks and Marco R. Steenbergen, eds., *European Integration and Political Conflict*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 62–89.
- Burawoy, Michael (1985) *The Politics of Production*, London: Verso.
- Burchardt, Tania, Julian Le Grand, and David Piachaud (2002) Introduction, in: Hills et al. 2002, 1–12.
- Burkhauser, Richard V., and Kenneth A. Crouch (2007) Are United States Inequality and Mobility Trends in the European Union's Future? Paper presented at the Conference on Attractiveness of the European and the American Social Models, Berlin: WZB, 7–8 May.
- Castel, Robert (1995) *Les métamorphoses de la question sociale: une chronique du salariat*, Paris: Fayard.
- Castles, Francis G. (1985) *The Working Class and Welfare: Reflections on the Political Development of the Welfare State in Australia and New Zealand, 1890–1980*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- (2004) *The Future of the Welfare State: Crisis Myth and Crisis Realities*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2006) *The Growth of the Post-war Public Expenditure State: Long-term Trajectories and Recent Trends*, Bremen: University of Bremen, Research Center Transformations of the State (TranState WP 35).
- ed. (2007) *The Disappearing State? Retrenchment Realities in an Age of Globalisation*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Rolf Gerritsen and Jack Vowles, eds. (1996) *The Great Experiment: Labour Parties and Public Policy Transformation in Australia and New Zealand*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- and Deborah Mitchell (1993) Worlds of Welfare and Families of Nations, in: Francis G. Castles, ed., *Families of Nations: Patterns of Public Policy in Western Democracies*, Aldershot: Dartmouth, 93–128 [*Welfare States*, vol. 2: 100–135].
- and Herbert Obinger (2007) Social Expenditure and the Politics of Redistribution, *Journal of European Social Policy* 17 (3): 206–22.
- and Herbert Obinger (2008) Worlds Families, Regimes: On the Coherence and Persistence of Country Clusters in European and OECD Area Public Policy, *West European Politics* 31 (forthcoming).
- and John Uhr (2005) Australia: Federal Constraints and Institutional Innovations, in: Obinger/Leibfried/Castles 2005a, 51–88.
- Cherubini, Arnaldo, and Italo Piva (1998) *Dalla libertà all'obbligo: la previdenza sociale fra Giolitti e Mussolini*, Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Clark, Gordon L., Alicia H. Munnell, and J. Michael Orszag, eds. (2006) *The Oxford Handbook of Pensions and Retirement Income*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clarke, Thomas, and Christos Pitelis, eds. (1993) *The Political Economy of Privatization*, London etc.: Routledge.
- Clasen, Jochen (2005) *Reforming European Welfare States. Germany and the United Kingdom Compared*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- and Nico A. Siegel, eds. (2007) *Investigating Welfare State Change. The 'Dependent Variable Problem' in Comparative Analysis*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Clayton, Richard, and Jonas Pontusson (1998) Welfare-state Retrenchment Revisited: Entitlement Cuts, Public Sector Restructuring, and Inegalitarian Trends in Advanced Capitalist Societies, *World Politics* 51 (1): 67–98 [*Welfare States*, vol. 2: 329–60].
- Clifton, Judith, Francisco Comin, and Daniel Diaz Fuentes (2006) Privatizing Public Enterprises in the European Union 1960–2002: Ideological, Pragmatic, Inevitable?, *Journal of European Public Policy* 13 (5): 736–56.
- CNEL [Consiglio nazionale dell'economia e del lavoro] (1963), Sintesi storica della previdenza sociale in Italia e dei suoi progetti di riforma, appendice A, in: *ibid.*, *Relazione preliminare sulla riforma della previdenza sociale*, Roma: Ist. poligrafico dello Stato, 265–345.
- Cook, Linda J. (2007a) *Postcommunist Welfare States: Reform Politics in Russia and Eastern Europe*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- (2007b) Negotiating Welfare in Postcommunist States, *Comparative Politics* 40 (1) (in press).
- Cox, Robert H. (1998) The Consequences of Welfare Reform: How Conceptions of Social Rights Are Changing, *Journal of Social Policy* 27 (1): 1–16 [*Welfare States*, vol. 1: 148–63].

- Crepaz, Markus Michael L. (2001) Veto Players, Globalization and the Redistributive Capacity of the State: A panel study of 15 OECD countries, *Journal of Public Policy* 21 (1): 1–22.
- Crouch, Colin (1999) *Social Change in Western Europe*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2005) *Capitalist Diversity and Change: Recombinant Governance and Institutional Entrepreneur*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cruz Roche, Ignacio, Aurelio Desdentado Bonete, and Gregorio Rodríguez Cabrero (1985) *Política social y crisis económica. Aproximación a la experiencia española*, Madrid: Siglo XXI de España.
- Cusack, Thomas R., Torben Iversen, and Philip Rehm (2006) Risks at Work: The Demand and Supply Sides of Government Redistribution, *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 22 (3): 365–89.
- Daly, Mary (2000) *The Gender Division of Welfare*, Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press.
- Deacon, Alan, and Kirk Mann (1999) Agency, Modernity and Social Policy, *Journal of Social Policy* 28 (3): 413–35 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 306–28].
- Deacon, Bob, Michelle Hulse, and Paul Stubbs (1997) *Global Social Policy. International Organizations and the Future of Welfare*, London: Sage [Ch. 6: The Prospects for Global Social Policy, 195–221 = *Welfare States*, vol. 2: 629–57].
- Deakin, Nicholas, Catherine Jones Finer, and Bob Matthews, eds. (2004) *Welfare and the State: Critical Concepts in Political Science*, London: Routledge, 3 vols.
- De Grazia, Victoria (1992) *How Fascism Ruled Women: Italy, 1920–1945*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- DeSwaan, Abram (1988) *In Care of the State. Health Care, Education and Welfare in Europe and the USA in the Modern Era*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Diamond, Patrick (2006) Social Justice Reinterpreted: New Frontiers for the European Welfare State, in: Giddens et al. 2006, 172–92.
- Diamond, Peter A. (2004) Social Security, *American Economic Review* 94 (1, March): 1–24.
- DiPrete, Thomas A., ed. (2005) Labor Markets, Inequality, and Change: A European Perspective, *Work and Occupation*, 32 (2): 119–39, Special Issue.
- Donzelot, Jacques (1984¹) *L'invention du social: essai sur le déclin des passions politiques*, Paris: Fayard (2nd rev. edn. 1994 Ed. du Seuil).
- Doyal, Len, and Ian Gough (2001) *A Theory of Human Need*, New York: The Guilford Press.
- Ebbinghaus, Bernhard (2005) *Can Path Dependence Explain Institutional Change? Two approaches applied to welfare state reform*, Cologne: Max-Planck-Institute for the Study of Societies (DP 05/2; available online).
- (2006) *Reforming Early Retirement in Europe, Japan and the USA*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- and Bernhard Kittel (2005) European rigidity vs. American Flexibility? The Institutional Adaptability of Collective Bargaining, *Work and Occupations* 32 (5): 163–95.
- and Bernhard Kittel (2006) Europäische Sozialmodelle à la carte: Gibt es institutionelle Wahlverwandtschaften zwischen Wohlfahrtsstaat und Arbeitsbeziehungen?, in: Beckert et al. 2006, 223–46.
- and Philip Manow, eds. (2001) *Comparing Welfare Capitalism. Social Policy and Political Economy in Europe, Japan and the USA*, London and New York: Routledge.
- and Jelle Visser (2000) *Trade Unions in Western Europe since 1945*, London: Macmillan.
- Esping-Andersen, Gøsta (1985) *Politics against Markets: The Social Democratic Road to Power*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Cambridge: Polity Press; Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press [Chs. 1–3: The Three Political Economies of the Welfare State, De-Commodification in Social Policy, and The Welfare State as a System of Stratification, pp. 9–78 *Welfare States*, vol. 2: 3–77].
- (1996) *Welfare States in Transitions: National Adaptations in Global Economies*, London: Sage.
- (1999) *Social Foundations of Postindustrial Economies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press [Ch. 6: The Structural Bases of Postindustrial Employment, pp. 99–119 *Welfare States*, vol. 2: 485–506].
- with Duncan Gallie, Anton Hemerijk, and John Myles (2002) *Why we Need a New Welfare State*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Estevez-Abe, Margarita, Torben Iversen, and David Soskice (2001) Social Protection and the Formation of Skills: A Reinterpretation of the Welfare State, in: Hall/Soskice 2001a, 145–83.

- Estrin, Saul (1994), The Inheritance, in: Barr 1994, 53–76.
- Falkner, Gerda (1998) *EU Social Policy in the 1990s. Towards a Corporatist Policy Community*. London: Routledge.
- Oliver Treib, Miriam Hartlapp, and Simone Leiber (2005) *Complying with Europe. EU Harmonization and Law in Member States*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Farber, Henry S., and Bruce Western (2001) Accounting for the decline of unions in the private sector, 1973–1998, *Journal of Labor Research* 22 (3): 459–85.
- Feigenbaum, Harvey, Jeffrey Henig, and Chris Hamnett (1998) *Shrinking the State. The Political Underpinnings of Privatization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Feldstein, Martin (2005) Structural Reform of Social Security, *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 19 (2, Spring): 33–55.
- Ferrera, Maurizio (1996) The ‘Southern Model’ of Welfare in Social Europe, *Journal of European Social Policy* 6 (1): 17–37.
- (2003) European Integration and National Social Citizenship. Changing Boundaries, New Structuring, *Comparative Political Studies* 36 (6): 611–52.
- (2005a) *The Boundaries of Welfare: European Integration and the New Spatial Politics of Social Protection*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ed. (2005b) *Welfare State Reform in Southern Europe. Fighting Poverty and Social Exclusion in Greece, Italy, Spain and Portugal*, London: Routledge.
- (2006) *Le politiche sociali. L’Italia in prospettiva comparata*, Bologna: Il Mulino.
- and Elisabetta Gualmini (2004) *Rescued by Europe. Social and Labor Market Reforms in Italy from Maastricht to Berlusconi*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Anton Hemerijck, and Martin Rhodes (2000) *The Future of European Welfare States: Recasting Welfare for a New Century*, Oeiras: Celta.
- Anton Hemerijck, and Martin Rhodes (2001) The Future of the European ‘Social Model’ in the Global Economy, *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice* 3: 163–90.
- Field, Frank (1995) *Making Welfare Work: Reconstructing Welfare for the Millennium*, London: Institute of Community Studies.
- Fischer, Claude and Michael Hout (2006) *Century of Difference: How America Changed in the Last One Hundred Years*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Fix, Birgit, and Elisabeth Fix (2002) From Charity to Client-oriented Social Service Production: A social profile of religious welfare associations in Western European comparison, *European Journal of Social Work* 5 (1): 55–62.
- (2005) *Kirche und Wohlfahrtsstaat: Soziale Arbeit kirchlicher Wohlfahrtsorganisationen im westeuropäischen Vergleich*, Freiburg i. Br.: Lambertus.
- Flora, Peter (1981) Solution or Source of Crisis? The Welfare State in Historical Perspective, in: Wolfgang Mommsen, ed., *The Emergence of the Welfare State in Britain and Germany 1850–1950*, London: Croom Helm, 343–89.
- (1986–1987) *Growth to Limits. The Western European Welfare States since World War II*, vol. 1: *Sweden, Norway, Finland, Denmark*; vol. 2: *Germany, United Kingdom, Ireland, Italy*; vol. 4: *Appendix: Synopses, Bibliographies*, Berlin: de Gruyter.
- (1989) From Industrial to Postindustrial Welfare State? *Annals of the Institute of Social Science* (Tokyo: Institute of Social Science, focus issue on *The Advanced Industrial Societies in Disarray: What are the Available Choices?*), 149–62.
- and Jens Alber (1981) Modernization, Democratization and the Development of Welfare States in Western Europe, in: Flora/Heidenheimer 1981, 37–80 [*Welfare States*, vol. 1: 167–210].
- and Arnold Heidenheimer, eds. (1981) *The Development of Welfare States in Europe and America*, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Fraser, Nancy (1990) Talking About Needs: Interpretative Contests as Political Conflicts in Welfare State Societies, in: Cass R. Sunstein, ed., *Feminism and Political Theory*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 159–81.
- (1997) After the Family Wage: A Post-industrial Thought Experiment, in: id., *Justice Interruptus. Critical Reflections on the ‘Postsocialist’ Condition*, New York: Routledge, 41–68 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 41–63].

- and Linda Gordon (1994) A Genealogy of Dependency: Tracing a Keyword of the U.S. Welfare State, *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 19 (2): 309–36.
- Freeman, Richard B. (2007) *America Works: Critical Thoughts on the Exceptional US Labor Market*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Funck, Bernard, and Lodovico Pizzati, eds. (2002) *Labor, Employment, and Social Policies in the EU Enlargement Process*, Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Fundación Argantaria [Berta Álvarez-Miranda et al.] (1996) *Dilemas del Estado del Bienestar*, Madrid: Fundación Argantaria, Visor.
- Fundación FOESSA (1994) *V Informe sociológico sobre la situación social en España*, Madrid: Fundación FOESSA.
- Gallie, Duncan, ed. (2004) *Resisting Marginalization: Unemployment Experience and Social Policy in the European Union*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gamble, Vanessa Northington, and Deborah A. Stone (2006) U.S. Policy on Health Inequities: The Interplay of Politics and Research, *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* 31 (1, February): 93–126.
- Gangl, Markus (2005) Income Inequality, Permanent Incomes, and Income Dynamics, Comparing Europe to the United States, *Work and Occupations* 32 (2): 140–62.
- Garrett, Geoffrey (1998a) *Partisan Politics in the Global Economy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1998b) Global Markets and National Politics: Collision Course or Virtuous Circle? *International Organization* 52 (4): 787–824 [*Welfare States*, vol. 2: 389–430].
- (2001) Globalization and Government Spending around the World, *Studies in comparative international development* 35 (4): 3–29.
- Gáspár, Fajth (1999) Social Security in a Rapidly Changing Environment: The Case of the Post-Communist Transformation, *Social Policy and Administration* 33 (4): 416–36.
- Genschel, Philipp (2004) Globalization and the Welfare State: A Retrospective, *Journal of European Public Policy* 11 (4): 613–36.
- (2005) Globalization and the Transformation of the Tax State, in: Stephan Leibfried and Michael Zürn, eds., *Transformations of the State?* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 53–71.
- Gerhard, Ute, Trudi Knijn, and Amja Weckwert, eds. (2005) *Working Mothers in Europe: A Comparison of Policies and Practices*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Giaimo, Susan (2002) *Markets and Medicine. The Politics of Health Care Reform in Britain, Germany, and the United States*, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Giddens, Anthony, Patrick Diamond, and Roger Liddle, eds. (2006) *Global Europe, Social Europe*, Cambridge: Polity Press (see also <http://www.progressive-governance.net/events/events.aspx?year=2006&id=898>).
- Gilbert, Neil (2002) *Transformation of the Welfare State: The Silent Surrender of Public Responsibility*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- and Paul Terrell (2005⁶) *Dimensions of Social Welfare Policy*, Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.
- (2006) *Gender and Social Security Reform: What's Fair for Women?*, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Gilens, Martin (1996) 'Race-Coding' and White Opposition to Welfare, *American Political Science Review* 90 (3): 593–604 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 369–80].
- (1999) *Why Americans Hate Welfare: Race, Media, and the Politics of Antipoverty Politics*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Glatzer, Miguel, and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds. (2005) *Globalization and the Future of the Welfare State*, Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Glazer, Nathan (1998) The American Welfare State: Exceptional No Longer?, in: Henry Cavanna, ed., *Challenges to the Welfare State: Internal and External Dynamics for Change*, Cheltenham, UK etc.: Edward Elgar, 7–20.
- Glennester, Howard (1999) Which Welfare States Are Most Likely to Survive?, *International Journal of Social Welfare* 8: 2–13.

- and John Hills, eds. (1998²) *The State of Welfare: The Economics of Social Spending*, Oxford: Oxford University Press (1990¹, with other eds and subtitle).
- (2007³) *British Social Policy: 1945 to the Present*, Malden et al.: Blackwell (1995¹).
- González Temprano, Antonio, ed. (2003) *La consolidación del Estado del Bienestar en España*, Madrid: Consejo Económico y Social.
- Goodin, Robert E. (1988) *Reasons for Welfare. The Political Theory of the Welfare State*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press [Ch. Introduction, pp. 3–22 = *Welfare States*, vol. 3: 19–40].
- (1996) Institutions and Their Design, in: Robert E. Goodin, ed., *The Theory of Institutional Design*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–53.
- Bruce Headey, Ruud Muffels, and Henk-Jan Dirven (1999) *The Real Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- and Julian Le Grand (1987) *Not Only the Poor*, Allen & Unwin: London.
- and Deborah Mitchell (2000) *Foundations of the Welfare State*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 3 vols.
- and Martin Rein (2001) Regimes on Pillars: Alternative Welfare State Logics and Dynamics, *Public Administration* 79 (4): 769–801.
- James Mahmud Rice, Antiti Parpo, and Lina Eriksson (2007) *Discretionary Time: A New Measure of Freedom*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gottschalk, Marie (2006) *The Prison and the Gallows: The Politics of Mass Incarceration in America*, Cambridge [u.a.]: Cambridge University Press.
- Gough, Ian (1979) *The Political Economy of the Welfare State*, London: Macmillan.
- (2006) European Welfare States: Explanations and Lessons for Developing Countries, in: Anis Dani and Arjan de Haan, eds., *From Subject to Citizen: Institutions for Inclusive States*, Washington, DC: World Bank (in preparation).
- Grözinger, Gerd, Michael Maschke, and Claus Offe, eds. (2006) *Die Teilhabegesellschaft. Modell eines neuen Wohlfahrtsstaates*, Frankfurt a.M.: Campus.
- Grogger, Jeffrey, and Lynn A. Karoly (2005) *Welfare Reform: Effects of a Decade of Change*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Guillén, Ana M. (1997) Regímenes de bienestar y roles familiares: un análisis del caso español, *Papers. Revista de Sociología*, 53: 45–63.
- and Bruno Palier, eds. (2004) *EU Enlargement, Europeanization and Social Policy*, London: Sage.
- Guiraudon, Virgine (2002) Including Foreigners in National Welfare States: Institutional Venues and Rules of the Game, in: Bo Rothstein and Sven Steinmo, eds., *Restructuring the Welfare State: Political Institutions and Policy Change*, New York: Palgrave, 129–56.
- Haase, Christian (2006) Democratic Citizenship in the Industrial Age. The British Sociologist T.H. Marshall and the Democratization of West Germany, in: Arnd Bauerkämper and Christiane Eisenberg, eds., *Britain as a Model of Modern Society? German Views*, Augsburg: Wißner, 89–110.
- Habermas, Jürgen (2001) *The Post-national Constellation*, Cambridge MA: MIT Press (first publ. in German in 1998).
- Hacker, Jacob S. (2002) *The Divided Welfare State. The Battle over Public and Private Social Benefits in the United States*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [Ch. 1: The Politics of Public and Private Social Benefits, pp. 28–66 = *Welfare States*, vol. 1: 609–59].
- (2004) Privatizing Risk without Privatizing the Welfare State: The Hidden Politics of Social Policy Retrenchment in the United States, *American Political Science Review* 98 (2): 243–60.
- (2006) *The Great Risk Shift: The Assault on American Jobs, Families, Health Care, and Retirement and How You Can Fight Back*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- and Paul Pierson (2002) Business Power and Social Policy: Employers and the Formation of the American Welfare State, *Politics & Society* 30 (2): 277–325.
- Hakim, Catherine (2000) *Work-Lifestyle Choices in the 21st Century: Preference Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2003) *Models of the Family in Modern Societies: Ideals and Realities*, Aldershot, Hants/Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Hall, Peter A., and David Soskice, eds. (2001a) *Varieties of Capitalism. The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- (2011b) An Introduction to Varieties of Capitalism, in: Hall/Soskice 2001a, [ch. 1] 1–68 [*Welfare States*, vol. 2: 159–235].
- Haney, Lynne, Sonya Michel, and Lisa Pollard, eds. (2007) *Families of a New World: Gender, Politics, and State Development in Global Context*, New York: Routledge (forthcoming).
- Haraszti, Miklos (1977) *Workers in a Workers' State*, transl. by Michael Wright, London: Penguin.
- Harris, Margaret and Colin Rochester, eds. (2000) *Voluntary Organisations and Social Policy: Perspectives on Change and Choice*, London: Macmillan.
- Haskins, Ron (2006) *Work over Welfare: The Inside Story of the 1996 Welfare Reform Law*, Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Hay, Colin (2004a) Common Trajectories, Viable Paces, Divergent Outcomes? Models of European Capitalism under Conditions of Complex Economic Interdependence, *Review of International Political Economy* 11 (2): 231–62.
- (2004b) Ideas, Interests and Institutions in the Comparative Political Economy of Great Transformations, *Review of International Political Economy* 11 (1): 204–26.
- (2006) What's Globalization Got to Do with It? Economic Interdependence and the Future of the European Welfare State, *Government and Opposition* 41 (1): 1–22.
- Hecllo, Hugh (1974) *Modern Social Politics in Britain and Sweden*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- (1989) Welfare and the American Political Tradition, in: Robert L. Utley Jr., ed., *The Promise of American Politics: Principles and Practice after Two Hundred Years*, New York: University Press of America, 143–59.
- (1995) The Social Question, in: Katherine McFate, Roger Lawson, and William Julius Wilson, eds., *Poverty, Inequality and the Future of Social Policy*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 665–91.
- (2007) *Christianity and American Democracy*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hemerijck, Anton C., and Mark I. Vail (2006) The Forgotten Center: State Activism and Corporatist Adjustment in Holland and Germany, in: Levy 2006a, 57–92 (396–9 endnotes).
- Hemerijck, Anton C., and Jelle Visser (2001) The Dutch Model: An Obvious Candidate for the 'Third Way'? *Archives Européennes de Sociologie* 42 (1): 221–39.
- Hennock, E. P. [Ernest Peter] (1987) *British Social Reform and German Precedents: The Case of Social Insurance 1880–1914*, Oxford: Clarendon Press at Oxford University Press.
- (2007) *The Origins of the Welfare State in England and Germany, 1850–1914. Social Policies Compared*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Herren, Madeleine (1993) *Internationale Sozialpolitik vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg: Die Anfänge europäischer Kooperation aus der Sicht Frankreichs*, Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
- Hertner, Peter (2003) Autarkiepolitik im faschistischen Italien. Zu einigen neueren Forschungsergebnissen, in: Werner Abelshausen, Jan-Otmar Hesse and Werner Plumpe, eds., *Wirtschaftsordnung, Staat und Unternehmen. Neue Forschungen zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Nationalsozialismus. Festschrift für Dietmar Petzina zum 65. Geburtstag*, Essen: Klartext, 139–49.
- Hicks, Alexander M. (1999) *Social Democracy & Welfare Capitalism: A Century of Income Security Politics*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Hills, John (2004) *Inequality and the State*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Julian Le Grand, and David Piachaud, eds. (2002) *Understanding Social Exclusion*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hinrichs, Karl (2001) Elephants on the Move: Patterns of Public Pension Reform in OECD Countries, in: Leibfried 2001a, 77–102 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 583–608].
- (2003) Bounded Solidarity: The Demand for and the Presence of Solidaristic Motivations in the Welfare State, Paper prepared for the Conference 'New Challenges on Welfare State Research', Research Committee 19, International Sociological Association, Toronto, August 21–24.
- Hobsbawm, Eric (1994) *The Age of Extremes: A History of the World. 1914–1991*, New York: Pantheon Books.
- Hort, Sven E.O., and Stein Kuhnle (2000) The Coming of East and South-East Asian Welfare States, *Journal of European Social Policy* 10 (2): 162–84 [*Welfare States*, vol. 2: 136–58].
- Howard, Christopher (1997) *The Hidden Welfare State: Tax Expenditures and Social Policy in the United States*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- (2007) *The Welfare State Nobody Knows: Debunking Myths about U.S. Social Policy*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Huber, Evelynne (2005) Globalization and Social Policy Developments in Latin America, in: Glatzer/Rueschemeyer 2005, 75–105.
- Francois Nielsen, Jenny Pribble, and John Stephens (2006) Politics and Inequality in Latin America and the Caribbean, *American Sociological Review* 71 (6): 943–63.
- Charles Ragin, and John D. Stephens (1993) Social Democracy, Christian Democracy, Constitutional Structure, and the Welfare State, *American Journal of Sociology* 99 (3): 711–49 [*Welfare States*, vol. 1: 544–82].
- and John D. Stephens (2001) *Development and Crisis of the Welfare State. Parties and Policies in Global Markets*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- and John D. Stephens (2004) Welfare States and the Economy, in: Neil J. Smelser and Richard Swedberg, eds., *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*², Princeton, NJ/New York: Princeton University Press/Russell Sage Foundation, 552–74.
- and John D. Stephens (2005) State Economic and Social Policy in Global Capitalism, in: Thomas Janoski, Robert Alford, Alexander M. Hicks, and Mildred Schwartz, eds., *A Handbook of Political Sociology: States, Civil Societies, and Globalization*, New York etc.: Cambridge University Press, 607–29.
- Hurrelmann, Achim, Stephan Leibfried, Kerstin Martens, and Peter Mayer, eds. (2007) *Transforming the Golden Age Nation State?*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan (in press).
- Immergut, Ellen M. (1990) Institutions, Veto Points, and Policy Results: A Comparative Analysis of Health Care, *Journal of Public Policy* 10 (4): 391–416 [*Welfare States*, vol. 1: 583–608].
- (1992) *Health Politics: Interests and Institutions in Western Europe*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Karen M. Anderson, and Isabelle Schulze, eds. (2006) *The Handbook of West European Pension Politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Iversen, Torben (2000) The Causes of Welfare State Expansion: Deindustrialization or globalization? *World Politics* 52 (3, April): 313–49.
- (2005) *Capitalism, Democracy, and Welfare*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- and David Soskice (2001) An Asset Theory of Social Policy Preferences, *American Political Science Review* 95 (4): 875–94.
- and Anne Wren (1998) Equality, Employment, and Budgetary Restraint: The trilemma of the service economy, *World Politics* 50 (4): 507–46 [*Welfare States*, vol. 2: 507–46].
- Jacobs, Jerry A., and Kathleen Gerson (2004) *The Time Divide: Work, Family, and Gender Inequality*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Jacobs, Lawrence R., and Theda Skocpol, eds (2005) *Inequality and American Democracy: What we Know and What we Need to Learn*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Janoski, Thomas, and Alexander M. Hicks (1996) *The Comparative Political Economy of the Welfare State*, Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Janowitz, Morris (1976) *Social Control of the Welfare State*, New York: Elsevier.
- Jensen, Laura (1996) The Early American Origins of Entitlements, *Studies in American Political Development* 10 (2): 360–404.
- (2003) *Patriots, Settlers, and the Origins of American Social Policy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jessop, Bob (2002) *The Future of the Capitalist State*, Cambridge: Polity [Ch. Capitalism and the Capitalist Type of State, 11–54 = *Welfare States*, vol. 1: 298–344].
- Joerges, Christian, and Ernst-Ulrich Petersmann, eds. (2006) *Constitutionalism, Multi-Level Trade Governance, and Social Regulation*, Oxford: Hart.
- Jones Finer, Catherine (1993) The Pacific Challenge, in: id., ed., *New Perspectives on the Welfare State in Europe*, London: Routledge, 198–217.
- ed. (2001) *Comparing the Social Policy Experience of Britain and Taiwan*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- ed. (2002) *Social Policy Reform in China: Views from Home and Abroad*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Judt, Tony (2005) *Postwar: A History of Europe since 1945*, London/New York: Heineman/Penguin.

- Kaase, Max, and Kenneth Newton, eds. (1995ff.) *Series Beliefs in Government*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kahl, Sigrun (2005) The Religious Roots of Modern Poverty Policy: Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed Protestant Traditions Compared, *Archives Européennes de Sociologie* (European Journal of Sociology) XLVI (1): 91–126.
- Kangas, Olli, and Joakim Palme, eds. (2005) *Social Policy and Economic Development in the Nordic Countries*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kapstein, Ethan B. (2006) *Economic Justice in an Unfair World. Toward a Level Playing Field*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Karger, Howard Jacob, and David Stoez (2006⁵) *American Social Welfare Policy: A Pluralist Approach*, Boston, MA etc.: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- Kasza, Gregory J. (2002) The Illusion of Welfare ‘Regimes’, *Journal of Social Policy* 31 (2): 271–87.
- Katz, Michael, and Mark Stern (2006) *One Nation Divisible: What America Was and What It Is Becoming*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Katznelson, Ira (1986) Rethinking the Silences of Social and Economic Policy, *Political Science Quarterly* 101 (2): 307–25 [*Welfare States*, vol. 1: 3–21].
- (1988) The Welfare State as a Contested Institutional Idea, *Politics & Society* 16: 517–31.
- (2005) *When Affirmative Action Was White. An Untold History of Racial Inequality in Twentieth-Century America*, New York: Norton.
- and Martin Shefter, eds. (2002) *Shaped by War and Trade: International Influences on American Political Development*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kaufmann, Franz-Xaver (1998) *Herausforderungen des Sozialstaates*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- (2001a) Social Security, in: Neil S. Smelser and Paul B. Baltes, eds., *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Amsterdam: Elsevier, 14.435–39.
- (2001b) Towards a Theory of the Welfare State, in: Leibfried 2001a, 15–36.
- (2003a) *Varianten des Wohlfahrtsstaats: Der deutsche Sozialstaat im internationalen Vergleich*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- (2003b) *Sozialpolitisches Denken: Die deutsche Tradition*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- (2005) *Schrumpfende Gesellschaft: Vom Bevölkerungsrückgang und seinen Folgen*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- Kautto, Mikko, Johan Fritzell, Bjorn Hvinden, Jon Kvist, and Hannu Vusitalo, eds. (2001) *Nordic Welfare States in the European Context*, London: Routledge.
- Kenworthy, Lane (1999) Do Social-Welfare Policies Reduce Poverty? A Cross-National Assessment, *Social Forces* 77 (3, March): 1119–39 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 94–114].
- (2003) Do Affluent Countries Face An Incomes-Jobs Trade-Off? *Comparative Political Studies* 36 (10): 1180–1209 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 147–76].
- (2004) *Egalitarian Capitalism: Jobs, Incomes, and Equality in Affluent Countries*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- (2006) Germany’s Employment Problem in Comparative Perspective, in: Beckert et al. 2006, 37–59.
- (2007) *Jobs with Equality*, New York etc.: Russell Sage Foundation (forthcoming).
- and Jonas Pontusson (2005) *Rising Inequality and the Politics of Redistribution in Affluent Countries*, Syracuse, NY: Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs (WP Luxembourg Income Study no. 400; <http://www.lisproject.org/publications/liswps/400.pdf>).
- Kersbergen, Kees van (1995) *Social Capitalism – a Study of Christian Democracy and the Welfare State*, London: Routledge.
- and Philip Manow, eds. (2007/08) *Religion and the Western Welfare State*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (under review).
- Kildal, Nanna, and Stein Kuhnle, eds. (2005) *Normative Foundations of the Welfare State: The Nordic Experience*, London: Routledge.
- King, Desmond S. (1987) The States and the Social Structures of Welfare in Advanced Industrial Societies, *Theory and Society* 16 (6): 841–68.
- (1995) *Actively Seeking Work? The Politics of Unemployment and Welfare Policy in the United States and Great Britain*, Chicago etc.: University of Chicago Press.

- (1999) *In the Name of Liberalism: Illiberal Social Policy in the USA and Britain*, Oxford etc.: Oxford University Press.
- Kite, Cynthia (2002) The Globalized, Generous Welfare State: Possibility or oxymoron?, *European Journal of Political Research* 41 (3): 307–43.
- Kitschelt, Herbert (2006a) The Demise of Clientelism in Affluent Capitalist Democracies, in: Herbert Kitschelt and Steven Wilkinson, eds., *Patrons or Policies? Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition*, Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press, 298–321.
- (2006b) Leistungs- und Innovationsprobleme konservativer Sozialstaaten mit koordinierten Marktwirtschaften, in: Beckert et al. 2006, 61–90.
- Klein, Rudolf (1993) O’Goffe’s Tale. Or What Can We Learn from the Success of the Capitalist Welfare States?, in: Catherine Jones, ed., *New Perspectives on the Welfare State in Europe*, London etc.: Routledge, 7–17 [*Foundations* 3: 338–48].
- Kleinman, Mark (2001) *A European Welfare State? European Union Social Policy in Context*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Kohli, Martin (1999) Private and Public Transfers between Generations, *European Societies* 1 (1): 81–104 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 654–77].
- (2004) Intergenerational Transfers and Inheritance: A comparative view, in: Merrill Silverstein, ed., *Intergenerational Relations across Time and Place*, New York: Springer, 266–89 (*Annual Review of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, vol. 24).
- Martin Rein, Anne-Marie Guillemard, and Herman van Gunsteren, eds. (1991) *Time for Retirement: Comparative Studies of Early Exit from the Labor Force*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kornai, János, and Karen Eggleston (2001) *Welfare, Choice and Solidarity in Transition: Reforming the Health Care Sector in Eastern Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kornai, János, Stephan Haggard and Robert R. Kaufmann, eds. (2001) *Reforming the State: Fiscal and Welfare Reform in Post-Socialist Countries*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Korpi, Walter (1983) The ‘Democratic Class Struggle’ and ‘Social Policy’, in: id., *The Democratic Class Struggle*, London etc.: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 7–25, 184–207 [*Welfare States*, vol. 1: 347–98].
- (1985) Economic Growth and the Welfare State: Leaky bucket or irrigation system?, *European Sociological Review* 1 (2): 97–118.
- (2003) Welfare State Regress in Western Europe: Politics, institutions, globalization, and Europeanization, *Annual Review of Sociology* 29: 589–609.
- and Joakim Palme (1998) The Paradox of Redistribution and Strategies of Equality: Welfare State Institutions, Inequality, and Poverty in the Western Countries, *American Sociological Review* 63 (5): 661–87 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 67–93].
- and Joakim Palme (2003) New Politics and Class Politics in the Context of Austerity and Globalization: Welfare state regress in 18 countries, *American Political Science Review* 97 (3): 425–46 [*Welfare States*, vol. 1: 399–420].
- Koven, Seth, and Sonya Michel, eds. (1993) *Mothers of a New World. Maternalist Politics and the Origins of Welfare States*, New York etc.: Routledge.
- Kuhnle, Stein, ed. (2000) *Survival of the European Welfare State*, London: Routledge.
- and Sven E.O. Hort (2004) *The Developmental Welfare State in Scandinavia: Lessons for the Developing World*, Geneva: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.
- and Per Selle, eds. (1992) *Government and Voluntary Organizations: A Relational Perspective*, Aldershot etc.: Avebury (reprinted 1995, 1998).
- Kvist, Jon (1999) Welfare Reforms in Nordic Countries in the 1990s: Using fuzzy-set theory to assess conformity to ideal types, *Journal of European Social Policy* 9 (3): 231–52.
- Ladd-Taylor, Molly (1993) ‘My Work Came out in Agony and Grief’: Mothers and the making of the Sheppard-Towner Act, in: Koven/Michel: 1993, 321–43.
- Lampert, Heinz, and Jörg Althammer (2004⁷) *Lehrbuch der Sozialpolitik*, Berlin etc.: Springer (2007⁸).
- Landes, David S. (1989) *The Wealth and Poverty of Nations: Why Some are so Rich and Some so Poor*, New York: Norton.
- Le Grand, Julian (1982) *Strategy of Equality*, London: Allen & Unwin.
- (1991) Quasi-Markets and Social Policy, *Economic Journal* 101 (408): 1256–67 [*Foundations* 1: 433–44].

- (1993) *Quasi-markets and Social Policy*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- (1997) Knights, Knaves or Pawns? Human Behaviour and Social Policy, *Journal of Social Policy* 26 (2): 126–69 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 285–305].
- (2003) *Motivation, Agency, and Public Policy: Of Knights and Knaves, Pawns and Queens*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2005) Should Citizens of a Welfare State be Transformed into ‘Queens’? A response to [Mathias] Risse, *Economics & Philosophy* 21 (2): 305–8.
- Leibfried, Stephan (2000) National Welfare States, European Integration and Globalization: A Perspective for the Next Century, *Social Policy & Administration* 34 (1): 44–63.
- (2001a) *Welfare State Futures*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2001b) Über die Hinfälligkeit des Staates der Daseinsvorsorge. Thesen zur Zerstörung des äußeren Verteidigungsringes des Sozialstaates, in: Schader-Stiftung, ed., *Die Zukunft der Daseinsvorsorge: Öffentliche Unternehmen im Wettbewerb*, Darmstadt: Schader-Stiftung, 158–66.
- (2001c) Summing up of the Main Points and Arguments of the Expert Meeting, in: Observatory for the Development of Social Services in Europe, ed., *Services of General Interest in Present and Future Europe – The Future of Municipal and Charitable Social Services*, Frankfurt: Deutscher Verein für öffentliche und private Fürsorge, 94–109 (= http://www.soziale-dienste-in-europa.de/Anlage16340/Daseinsvorsorge_in_Europa.pdf).
- (2005) Social Policy: Left to the Judges and the Markets? In: Helen Wallace, William Wallace, and Mark A. Pollack, eds. *Policy-Making in the European Union?*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 243–78.
- and Paul Pierson, eds. (1995) *European Social Policy: Between Fragmentation and Integration*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- and Elmar Rieger (2006) Creating Conditions: Verfassungsrecht, Sozialpolitik und, ‘Democracy Promotion’ in der Außenpolitik der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika, Bremen: TranState (WP Series).
- and Michael Zürn, eds. (2005) *Transformations of the State?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- and Benjamin W. Veghte (2002) Review of BMA and Bundesarchiv (2001ff.), *Journal of Social Policy* 31 (3): 545–7.
- Leimgruber, Matthieu (2005) *Achieving Social Progress without Etatization? A Political Economy of the Swiss Three-Pillar System of Old Age Provisions (1890–1972)*, PhD thesis, University of Lausanne (to be published as *Solidarity without the State*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
- (2006) *Accidental Crossings. Commercial Insurers and the Spread of Workmen’s Compensation in Western Europe and the United States, 1880–1930*, paper presented at the European Social Science History Conference, Amsterdam, 22–25 March, and Insurance and Society Workshop, Harvard Business School, 8 December.
- Leisering, Lutz (2003a) Government and the Life Course, in: Jeylan T. Mortimer and Michael J. Shanahan, eds., *Handbook of the Life Course*, New York etc.: Kluwer: 205–25 (2006^{pb}).
- (2003b) Nation State and Welfare State. An Intellectual and Political History, *Journal of European Social Policy* 13: 175–85.
- and Stephan Leibfried (1999) *Time and Poverty in Western Welfare States. United Germany in Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lessenich, Stephan (2003) *Dynamischer Immobilismus: Kontinuität und Wandel im deutschen Sozialmodell*, Frankfurt a.M.: Campus.
- (2005) ‘Frozen Landscapes’ Revisited: Path Creation in the European Social Model, *Social Policy & Society* 4 (4): 345–56.
- Levin, Martin, and Martin Shapiro, eds. (2004) *Transatlantic Policymaking in an Age of Austerity*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Levy, Jonah D. (1999) Vice into Virtue? Progressive Politics and Welfare Reform in Continental Europe, *Politics and Society* 27 (2): 239–73.
- (2004) Activation through Thick and Thin. Progressive Strategies for Increasing Labor Force Participation, in: Levin/Shapiro 2004, 100–30.
- ed. (2006a) *The State after Statism: New State Activities in the Age of Liberalization*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- (2006b) The State also Rises. The Roots of Contemporary State Activism, in: Levy 2006a, 1–28 (395 endnotes).
- (2006c) The State after Statism. From Market Direction to Market Support, in: Levy 2006a, 367–93 (418 endnotes).
- Lewis, Jane (1992) Gender and the Development of Welfare Regimes, *Journal of European Social Policy* 2: 159–73.
- ed. (1998) *Gender, Social Care and Welfare State Restructuring in Europe*, Aldershot: Ashgate (2003³).
- (2002) Gender and Welfare State Change, *European Societies* 4 (4), 331–57 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 523–49].
- (2006) *Children, Changing Families and Welfare States*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- and Rebecca Surrender, eds. (2004) *Welfare State Change: Towards a Third Way?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lieberman, Robert C. (2002) Political Institutions and the Politics of Race in the Development of the Modern Welfare State, in: Bo Rothstein and Sven Steinmo, eds., *Restructuring the Welfare State: Political Institutions and Policy Change*, New York etc.: Palgrave, 102–28 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 383–409].
- (2005) *Shaping Race Policy: The United States in Comparative Perspective*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Lindbeck, Assar (1988) Consequences of the Advanced Welfare State, *World Economy* 11: 19–38.
- (1993) *The Selected Essays of ...*, vol. 2: *The Welfare State*, Aldershot: Edward Elgar.
- (1997a) ‘The Swedish Experiment’, *Journal of Economic Literature* XXXV (3): 1273–1319 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 201–47].
- (1997b) *The Swedish Experiment*, Stockholm: SNS Förl.
- and Dennis Snower (2001) Insiders versus Outsiders, *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 15 (1): 165–88 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 177–200].
- Lindert, Peter H. (2004) *Growing Public: Social Spending and Economic Growth since the Eighteenth Century*, vol. 1: *The Story*, vol. 2: *Further Evidence*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lødemel, Ivar, and Heather Trickey, eds. (2001) *An Offer you can't Refuse: Workfare in International Perspective*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Loury, Glenn C., Tariq Modood, and Steven Teles, eds. (2005) *Ethnicity, Social Mobility, and Public Policy: Comparing the USA and UK*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Luhmann, Niklas (1990) *Political Theory in the Welfare State*, Berlin etc.: Walter de Gruyter (German 1981).
- Lynch, Julia (2006) *Age in the Welfare State: The Origins of Social Spending on Pensioners, Workers and Children*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Macnicol, John (2006) *Age Discrimination: An Historical and Contemporary Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mahler, Vincent A. (2004) Economic Globalization, Domestic Politics, and Income Inequality: A cross-national study, *Comparative Political Studies* 37 (9): 1025–53.
- Mahoney, James, and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds. (2003) *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maioni, Antonia (1998) *Explaining Differences in Welfare State Development: A Comparative Study of Health Insurance in Canada and the United States*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Majone, Giandomenico, ed. (1996) *Regulating Europe*, London: Routledge.
- (1997) From the Positive to the Regulatory State: Causes and consequences of changes in the mode of governance, *Journal of Public Policy* 17: 139–67.
- (2005) *Dilemmas of European Integration: The Ambiguities and Pitfalls of Integration by Stealth*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Malby, Tony, Bert de Vroom, Maria Luisa Mirabile, and Einar Øverby, eds. (2004) *Ageing and the Transition to Retirement: A Comparative Analysis of European Welfare States*, Aldershot etc.: Ashgate.
- Mangen, Steen (2001) *Spanish Society after Franco: Regime Transition and the Welfare State*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

- Manning, Nick (2004) Diversity and Change in Pre-Accession Central and Eastern Europe Since 1989, *Journal of European Social Policy* 14 (3): 211–32.
- Manow, Philip (2007) *Social Protection and Capitalist Production. The Bismarckian Welfare State and the German Political Economy, 1880–1990*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press (forthcoming).
- Maravall, José María (1995) *Los resultados de la democracia: un estudio del sur y el este de Europa*, Madrid: Alianza.
- Mares, Isabela (2003a) *The Politics of Social Risk. Business and Welfare State Development*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2003b) The Sources of Business Interest in Social Insurance: Sectoral versus National Differences, *World Politics* 55 (2, January): 229–58.
- (2004) Wage Bargaining in the Presence of Social Services and Transfers, *World Politics* 57 (1): 99–142.
- (2005) Social Protection around the World. External Insecurity, State Capacity and Domestic Cleavages, *Comparative Political Studies* 38 (6): 623–51.
- (2006) *Taxation, Wage Bargaining and Unemployment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marmor, Theodore R., Jerry L. Mashaw, and Philip L. Harvey (1990) *America's Misunderstood Welfare State: Persistent Myths, Enduring Realities*, New York: Basic Books.
- Marshall, Thomas H. (1992 [1949]) Citizenship and Social Class, in Id. and Tom Bottomore (1992) *Citizenship and Social Class*, Part I, London and Concord, MA: Pluto Press, 3–51 = Id. (1964) *Class, Citizenship and Social Development*, New York: Doubleday, 65–122 (*Welfare States*, vol. 1: 89–137 = *Foundations* 1: 3–60).
- Mason, Timothy W. (1993) *Social Policy in the Third Reich: The Working Class and the National Community*, transl. by Jim Broadwin; ed. by Jane Caplan; with a general introduction by Ursula Vogel, Providence, RI, Oxford: Berg.
- (1995) *Nazism, Fascism and the Working Class: Essays*, ed. by Jane Caplan, Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press.
- Mau, Steffen (2003) *The Moral Economy of Welfare States. Britain and Germany Compared*, London/New York: Routledge.
- and Benjamin Veghte, eds. (2007) *Social Justice, Legitimacy and the Welfare State*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Mayhew, Alan (1998) *Recreating Europe: The European Union's Policy towards Central and Eastern Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McClure, Margaret (1998) *A Civilised Community: A History of Social Security in New Zealand 1898–1998*, Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- McCormick, Richard L. (1979) The Party Period and Public Policy: An Exploratory Hypothesis, *Journal of American History* 66: 279–98.
- (1986) *The Party Period and Public Policy*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- McEwen, Nicola, and Luis Moreno, eds. (2005) *The Territorial Politics of Welfare*, London: Routledge.
- McGrew, Anthony, and Nana K. Poku, eds. (2006) *Globalization, Development and Human Security*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Mead, Lawrence M. (1986) *Beyond Entitlement. The Social Obligations of Citizenship*, New York: Free Press; London: Collier Macmillan.
- (1997) T.H. Marshall and Poverty, *Social Philosophy and Policy* 14 (2): 197–230 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 248–81].
- (2003) *Government Matters: Welfare Reform in Wisconsin*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- and Christopher Beem, eds. (2005) *Welfare Reform and Political Theory*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Merkel, Wolfgang (2002) Social Justice and the Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism, *Archives Européennes de Sociologie* 43 (1): 59–91.
- Michel, Sonya (1999) *Children's Interests – Mothers' Rights: The Shaping of America's Child Care Policy*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press (pb. 2000).
- and Rianne Mahon, eds. (2002) *Child Care Policy at the Crossroads: Gender and Welfare State Restructuring*, New York: Routledge.

- Miller, David (1999) *Principles of Social Justice*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mingione, Enzo (2001) Il lato scuro del welfare: trasformazione delle biografie, strategie familiari e sistemi di garanzia, *Tecnologia e società, Atti dei Convegni Lincei* 172 (Roma: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei), 147–69.
- Moran, Michael, Martin Rein and Robert E. Goodin, eds. (2006) *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moravcsik, Andrew M. (1998) *The Choice for Europe. Social Purpose and State Power from Messina to Maastricht*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- (2006) Restructuring Europe: Book Review, *West European Politics* 29 (3): 589–90.
- Morgan, Glyn (2005) *The Idea of a European Superstate*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- (2006) The Nation-State, European (Dis)Integration, and Political Development [review of Bartolini 2005] *European Political Science* 5 (4): 340–351.
- Morone, James A., and Lawrence Jacobs (2005) *Wealthy, Healthy, and Fair: The Politics of Health Care for a Good Society*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moynihan, Daniel P., Timothy M. Smeeding, and Lee Rainwater, eds. (2004) *The Future of the Family*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Müller, Katharina (1999) *The Political Economy of Pension Reform in Central-Eastern Europe*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar.
- (2003) *Privatising Old-age Security: Latin America and Eastern Europe Compared*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- (2005) Post-socialist Pension Reform: Contributory and non-contributory, *Public Finance and Management*, 5 (2): 287–306.
- (2006) Perspectives on Pensions in Eastern Europe, in: Pemberton et al. 2006, 223–40.
- Müller, Katharina, Andreas Ryll, and Hans-Jürgen Wagener, eds. (1999) *Transformation of Social Security: Pensions in Central-Eastern Europe* Heidelberg: Physica.
- Müller, Walter, and Markus Gangl, eds. (2003) *Transitions from Education to Work in Europe: The Integration of Youth into EU Labour Markets*, Oxford etc.: Oxford University Press.
- Murray, Charles A. (1984) *Losing Ground: American Social Policy, 1950–1980*, New York: Basic Books (1994²).
- (2006) *In Our Hands: A Plan to Replace the Welfare State*, Washington, DC: AEI [American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research] Press.
- Myles, John (2002a) A New Social Contract for the Elderly?, in: Esping-Andersen et al. 2002, 130–72 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 609–53].
- (2002b) How to Design a Liberal Welfare State: A comparison of Canada and the United States, in: Evelyne Huber, ed., *Models of Capitalism: Lessons for Latin America*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 339–66 (= *Social Policy and Administration*, 32 (Dec. 1998): 341–64).
- (2006) Egalitarian Politics in Hard Times: Can welfare states still promote equality?, *Social Security* 71: 9–30.
- and Paul Pierson (1997) Friedman's Revenge: The Reform of 'Liberal' Welfare States in Canada and the United States, *Politics & Society* 25 (4): 443–72.
- and Jill Quadagno (2000) Envisioning a Third Way: The Welfare State in the Twenty-first Century, *Contemporary Sociology* 29 (1): 156–67.
- and Jill Quadagno (2002) Political Theory of the Welfare State, *Politics & Society* 76 (4): 34–57 [*Welfare States*, vol. 1: 62–85].
- Naumann, Ingela (2005) Child Care and Feminism in West Germany and Sweden in the 1960s and 1970s, *Journal of European Social Policy* 15 (1): 47–63.
- Navarro, Vicente, John Schmitt, and Javier Astudillo (2004) Is Globalization Undermining the Welfare State?, *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 28 (1): 133–52.
- Neckerman, Kathryn, ed. (2004) *Social Inequality*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Nivola, Pietro S. (1997) American Social Regulation Meets the Global Economy, in: Pietro S. Nivola, ed. *Comparative Disadvantage? Social Regulations and the Global Economy*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 16–97.
- Norris, Pippa, and Ronald Inglehart (2004) *Sacred and Secular: Religion and Politics Worldwide*, Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press.

- Novak, William J. (1996) *The People's Welfare: Law and Regulation in Nineteenth Century America*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Nullmeier, Frank (2000) *Politische Theorie des Sozialstaats*, Frankfurt a.M. etc.: Campus.
- and Friedbert W. Rüb (1993) *Die Transformation der Sozialpolitik: Vom Sozialstaat zum Si-che-rungs-staat*, Frankfurt a.M.: Campus.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. (1990) Aristotelian Social Democracy, in: R. Bruce Douglass, Gerald M. Mara and Henry S. Richardson, eds., *Liberalism and the Good*, London: Routledge, 203–52.
- Obinger, Herbert, Stephan Leibfried, Claudia Bogedan, Edith Gindulis, Julia Moser, and Peter Starke (2005) Welfare State Transformation in Small Open Economies, in: Leibfried/Zürn 2005, 161–85.
- Obinger, Herbert, Stephan Leibfried, and Francis G. Castles, eds. (2005a) *Federalism and the Welfare State: New World and European Experiences*, Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press.
- Stephan Leibfried, and Francis G. Castles (2005b) Bypasses to a Social Europe? Lessons from federal experience, *Journal of European Public Policy* 12 (3): 545–71 [*Welfare States*, vol. 2: 599–625].
- and Emmerich Tálos (2006) *Sozialstaat Österreich zwischen Kontinuität und Umbau. Eine Bilanz der ÖVP/FPÖ/BZÖ-Regierung*, Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- and Uwe Wagschal, eds. (2000) *Der gezügelte Wohlfahrtsstaat: Sozialpolitik in reichen Industriena-tionen*, Frankfurt a.M. etc.: Campus.
- and Reimut Zohlnhöfer (2005) *Selling off the 'Family Silver': The Politics of Privatization in the OECD 1990–2000*, Bremen: University, Research Center Transformations of the State (TranState WP 15 = Center for European Studies, Harvard University WP 12).
- O'Connor, James (1973) *The Fiscal Crisis of the State*, New York: St. Martin's Press.
- O'Connor, Julia S., and Gregg M. Olsen, eds. (1998) *Power Resources Theory and the Welfare State: A critical approach. Essays Collected in Honour of Walter Korpi*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ann Shola Orloff, and Sheila Shaver, eds. (1999) *States, Markets, Families: Gender, Liberalism, and Social Policy in Australia, Canada, Great Britain and the United States*, Cambridge: Cambridge Uni-versity Press.
- OECD (2001) *Aging and Income. Financial Resources and Retirement in 9 OECD Countries*, Paris: OECD.
- Offe, Claus (1984a) *Contradictions of the Welfare State*, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- (1984b) Social Policy and the Theory of the State, in: Offe 1984a, [ch. 3] 88–117 [*Welfare States*, vol. 1: 267–97].
- (1996) *Varieties of Transition: The East European and East German Experience*, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- (1997) Towards a New Equilibrium of Citizens' Rights and Economic Resources, in: OECD, ed. *Societal Cohesion and the Globalising Economy. What Does the Future Hold?*, Paris: OECD, 81–108 [*Foundations* 1: 87–114].
- (1998) Demokratie und Wohlfahrtsstaat: Eine europäische Regimeform unter dem Stress der europä-ischen Integration, in: Wolfgang Streeck, ed., *Internationale Wirtschaft, nationale Demokratie. Herausforderung der Demokratietheorie*, Frankfurt a.M.: Campus, 99–136.
- (1999) The German Welfare State: Principles, Performance, Prospects, in: John S. Brady, Beverly Crawford, and Sarah Elise Wiliarty, eds., *The Postwar Transformation of Germany. Democracy, Pros-perity, and Nationhood*, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 202–24.
- (2003) The European Model of 'Social' Capitalism: Can it Survive European Integration?, *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 11 (4): 437–69 [*Welfare States*, vol. 2: 566–98].
- (2005) Armut, Arbeitsmarkt und Autonomie [Afterword], in: Yannick Vanderborgh and Philippe van Parijs, *Ein Grundeinkommen für alle?*, Frankfurt a.M.: Campus, 131–50.
- Oorschot, Wim van (2000) Who Should Get What, and Why? On Deservingness Criteria and the Condi-tionality of Solidarity Among the Public, *Policy and Politics* 28 (1): 33–48 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 353–68].
- Orloff, Ann Shola (1993a) Gender and the Social Rights of Citizenship: The Comparative Analysis of Gender Relations and Welfare States, *American Sociological Review* 58 (3): 303–28 [*Foundations* 1: 61–86].
- (1993b) *The Politics of Pensions: A Comparative Analysis of Britain, Canada and the United States, 1880 – 1940*, Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

- (1996) Gender in the Welfare State, *Annual Review of Sociology* 22: 51–78 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 495–522].
- (2002) *Women's Employment and Welfare Regimes: Globalization, Export Orientation and Social Policy in Europe and North America*, Geneva: UNRISD.
- (2006) From Maternalism to 'Employment for All': State Policies to Promote Women's Employment across the Affluent Democracies, in: Levy 2006a, 230–68.
- and Theda Skocpol (1984) Why Not Equal Protection? Explaining the politics of public social spending in Britain, 1900–1911, and the United States, 1880s–1920s, *American Sociological Review* 49 (6): 726–50 [*Welfare States*, vol. 1: 519–43].
- Osterman, Paul, Thoas A. Kochan, Richard M. Locke, and Michael J. Piore (2001) *Working in America: A Blue Print for the New Labor Market*, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Ostner, Ilona, ed. (2006) *Family Policies in the Context of Family Change: The Nordic Countries in Comparative Perspective*, Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- and Trudie Knijn (2002) Commodification and De-commodification, in: Barbara Hobson, Jane Lewis, and Birte Siim, eds., *Contested Concepts in Gender and Social Politics*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 141–69.
- and Jane Lewis (1995) Gender and the Evolution of European Social Policies, in: Leibfried/Pierson 1995, 159–93.
- Pal, Leslie A., and R. Kent Weaver, eds. (2003) *The Government Taketh Away. The Politics of Pain in the United States and Canada*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Palier, Bruno (2005²) *Gouverner la Sécurité sociale: les réformes du système français de protection sociale depuis 1945*, Paris: Presses Univ. de France (2002¹).
- Palme, Joakim (1990) *Pension Rights in Welfare Capitalism: The Development of Old-age Pensions in 18 OECD Countries 1930–1985*, Stockholm: Stockholm University (1998³).
- Parijs, Philippe Van (1995) *Real Freedom for All: What (if Anything) can Justify Capitalism?*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Pavolini, Emmanuele (2003) *Le nuove politiche sociali: i sistemi di welfare fra istituzioni e società civile?*, Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Pedersen, Susan (1993) *Family, Dependence and the Origins of the Welfare State: Britain and France, 1914–45*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pérez Díaz, Víctor, Elisa Chuliá, and Beta Álvarez-Miranda (1998), *Familia y sistema de bienestar. La experiencia española con el paro, las pensiones, la sanidad y la educación*, Madrid: Fundación Argentaria-Visor.
- Pemberton, Hugh, Pat Thane, and Noël Whiteside, eds. (2006) *Britain's Pensions Crisis. History and Policy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pfau-Effinger, Birgit, and Birgit Geissler, eds. (2005) *Care and Social Integration in European Societies*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Philipps, Richard, Jeffrey Henderson, Laszlo Andor, and David Hulme (2006) Usurping Social Policy: Neoliberalism and Economic Governance in Hungary, *Journal of Social Policy* 35 (4): 485–606.
- Pierson, Christopher (1991) *Beyond the Welfare State. The New Political Economy of Welfare*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- and Francis G. Castles, eds. (2006²) *The Welfare State Reader*, Cambridge: Polity Press (2000¹).
- Pierson, Paul (1993) When Effect Becomes Cause: Policy Feedback and Political Change, *World Politics* 45 (4): 595–628.
- (1994) *Dismantling the Welfare State? Reagan, Thatcher, and the Politics of Retrenchment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1996) The New Politics of the Welfare State, *World Politics*, 48 (2): 143–79 [*Welfare States*, vol. 2: 239–75].
- (1998) Irresistible Forces, Immovable Objects: Post-industrial Welfare States Confront Permanent Austerity, *Journal of European Public Policy* 5 (4): 539–60.
- (2000a) Not Just What, but When: Timing and Sequence in Political Processes, *Studies in American Political Development* 14: 72–92.
- (2000b) Dr. Seuss and Dr. Stinchcombe: A Reply to the Commentaries, *Studies in American Political Development* 14 (1): 113–19.

- (2000c) Three Worlds of Welfare State Research, *Comparative Political Studies* 33 (6/7): 791–821.
- (2001) Coping with Permanent Austerity: Welfare State Restructuring in Affluent Democracies, in: id., ed., *The New Politics of the Welfare State*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2001, 410–56 [*Welfare States*, vol. 2: 276–328].
- (2004) *Politics in Time. History, Institutions and Social Analysis*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- and Stephan Leibfried (1995) Multitiered Institutions and the Making of Social Policy, in: Leibfried/Pierson 1995, 1–40.
- Pinker, Robert A. (1979) *The Idea of Welfare*, London: Heinemann.
- Piori, Michael J., and Sean Stafford (2006) Changing Regimes of Workplace Governance, Shifting Axes of Social Mobilization, and the Challenge to Industrial Relations Theory, *Industrial Relations* 45 (3): 299–325.
- Plante, Rebecca J., ed. (2007) *Maternalism Reconsidered: Motherhood and Method in the 20th century*, Oxford/New York: Berghahn Publ. (forthcoming).
- Pogge, Thomas (2002) *World Poverty and Human Rights: Cosmopolitan Responsibilities and Reforms*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Pontusson, Jonas (2005) *Inequality and Prosperity. Social Europe vs. Liberal America*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- (2006) The American Welfare State in Comparative Perspective: Reflections on Alberto Alesina and Edward L. Glaeser, Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe, *Perspectives on Politics* 4 (2): 315–26.
- Powell, Walter W., and Richard Steinberg, eds. (2006) *The Nonprofit Handbook*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Prasad, Monica (2005) *The Politics of Free Markets: The Rise of Neoliberal Economic Policies in Britain, France, Germany, and the United States*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Quadagno, Jill S. (1994) *The Color of Welfare: How Racism Undermined the War on Poverty*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2004) *One Nation, Uninsured: Why the US has no National Health Insurance*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Quine, Maria Sophia (2002) *Italy's Social Revolution. Charity and Welfare from Liberalism to Fascism*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Ranci, Costanzo (2004) *Politica sociale. Bisogni sociali e politiche di welfare*, Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Rawls, John (1986) Distributive Justice, in: Robert M. Stewart, ed., *Readings in Social and Political Philosophy*, New York etc.: Oxford University Press, 196–211 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 3–18].
- (1971) *A Theory of Justice*, Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Recker, Marie-Luise (1985) *Nationalsozialistische Sozialpolitik im Zweiten Weltkrieg*, München: Oldenbourg.
- Reich, Charles A. (1964) The New Property, *Yale Law Journal* 73 (X): 733–87.
- Rein, Martin, and Lee Rainwater, eds. (1986) *Public/Private Interplay in Social Protection. A Comparative Study*, Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Rein, Martin, and Winfried Schmähl, eds. (2003) *Rethinking the Welfare State – The Political Economy of Pension Reform*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Rieger, Elmar (2004): Welfare for Farmers? The Eastern Enlargement of the EU Common Agricultural Policy, in: *Osteuropa*. Special Edition (Manfred Sapper and Volker Weichsel, eds., Sketches of Europe. Old Lands, New Worlds, Berlin: Berliner Wissenschaftsverlag), 247–78 (first published as: Wohlfahrt für Bauern? Die Osterweiterung der Agrarpolitik, *Osteuropa* 54, 5–6, 2004, 296–315).
- (2005a) The Wonderous Politics of Global Ideas, *Global Social Policy* 5 (1): 8–14.
- (2005b): Die Eigenart der Sozialpolitik in der westlichen Welt. Religiöse Entwicklungsbedingungen des modernen Wohlfahrtsstaates in vergleichender Perspektive, *Jahrbuch für christliche Sozialwissenschaft* 46, 165–205.
- and Stephan Leibfried (1998), Welfare State Limits to Globalization, *Politics and Society* 26 (3): 363–90 [*Welfare States*, vol. 2: 431–58].
- and Stephan Leibfried (2003) *Limits to Globalization. Welfare States and the World Economy*, Cambridge: Polity.

- Rimlinger, Gaston V. (1971) *Welfare Policy and Industrialization in Europe, America, and Russia*, New York etc.: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Ringen, Stein (1997) *Citizens, Families and Reform*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2006²) *The Possibility of Politics: A Study in the Political Economy of the Welfare State*; with a new introduction by the author, New Brunswick, NY etc.: Transaction Publishers (1989 Oxford University Press).
- (2007) *What Democracy Is For: On Freedom and Moral Government*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ringold, Dena (1999) Social Policy in Postcommunist Europe: Legacies and Transition, in: Linda J. Cook, Mitchell A. Orenstein, and Marilyn Rueschemeyer, eds., *Left Parties and Social Policy in Postcommunist Europe*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 11–46.
- Ritter, Gerhard A. (2006) *Der Preis der deutschen Einheit. Die Wiedervereinigung und die Krise des Sozialstaats*, München: C.H. Beck.
- Rodgers, Daniel T. (1998) *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in a Progressive Age*, Cambridge, MA etc.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Rodríguez Cabrero, Gregorio (2004) *El Estado del Bienestar en España: debates, desarrollo y retos*, Madrid: Editorial Fundamentos.
- Rodrik, Dani (1998a) Why Do More Open Economies Have Larger Governments, *Journal of Political Economy* 106 (6): 997–1032.
- (1998b) *Has Globalization Gone too Far?* Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics.
- (2002) *Feasible globalizations*, London: LSE, Centre for Economic Policy Research (DP no. 3524) = *Globalization* (2005), 196–213.
- Rokkan, Stein (1974) Dimensions of State Formation and Nation Building, in: Charles Tilly, ed., *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 562–600.
- Roseman, Mark (1996) National Socialism and Modernisation, in: Richard Bessel, ed., *Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany: Comparisons and Contrasts*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 197–229.
- Rothgang, Heinz, Mirella Cacace, Simone Grimmeisen, and Claus Wendt (2005) The changing role of the state in health care systems, in: Leibfried/Zürm 2005, 187–212.
- Rothgang, Heinz, Herbert Obinger, and Stephan Leibfried (2006) The State and its Welfare State: How do Welfare State Changes Affect the Make-Up of the Nation State?, *Social Policy & Administration* 40 (3): 250–66.
- Rothstein, Bo (1998) *Just Institutions Matter. The Moral and Political Logic of the Universal Welfare State*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [Ch. 6: The Political and Moral Logic of the Universal Welfare State, pp. 144–70 = *Welfare States*, vol. 1: 660–88].
- (2005) *Social Traps and the Problem of Trust*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- and Sven Steinmo, eds. (2002) *Restructuring the Welfare State: Political Institutions and Policy Change*, New York: Palgrave/Macmillan.
- Rueschemeyer, Dietrich, and Theda Skocpol, eds. (1996) *States, Social Knowledge, and the Origins of Modern Social Policies*, New York and Princeton, NJ: Russell Sage Foundation and Princeton University Press.
- Rys, Vladimir (2001) Transition Countries of Central Europe entering the European Union: Some social protection issues, *International Social Security Review* 54 (2–3): 177–89.
- Sainsbury, Diane, ed. (1994) *Gendering Welfare States*, London: Sage.
- (1996) *Gender, Equality and Welfare States*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ed. (1999) *Gender and Welfare State Regimes*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Salamon, Lester M., Helmut K. Anheier, Regina List, Stefan Toepfler, S. Wojciech Sokolowski, and Associates, eds. (1999) *Global Civil Society: Dimensions of the Nonprofit Sector*, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.
- Saraceno, Chiara (2003) *Mutamenti della famiglia e politiche sociali in Italia*, Bologna: Il Mulino.
- ed. (2000) *Social Assistance Dynamics in Europe. National and Local Poverty Regimes*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Sarasa, Sebastià & Luis Moreno, eds. (1995) *El Estado del Bienestar en la Europa del Sur*, Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Sociales Avanzados (CSIC).

- Sarfati, Hedva, and Giuliano Bonoli, eds. (2002) *Labour Market and Social Protection Reforms in International Perspective. Parallel or Converging Tracks?*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Sawhill, Isabel V., and Sara McLanahan (2006) Opportunity in America, Special Issue of *The Future of Children* 16 (2, Fall).
- Scharpf, Fritz W. (1997) Economic Integration, Democracy and the Welfare State, *Journal of European Public Policy* 4 (1): 239–62.
- (1999) *Governing in Europe. Effective and Democratic?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2002) The European Social Model: Coping with the challenges of diversity, *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40 (2): 645–70.
- (2006) *Problem Solving Effectiveness and Democratic Accountability in the EU*, Wien: Institut für Höhere Studien (HIS, Series Political Science, no. 107).
- and Vivien Schmidt, eds. (2000) *Welfare and Work in the Open Economy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2 vols.
- Scheve, Ken, and David Stasavage (2006a) Religion and Preferences for Social Insurance, *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 1 (3): 255–86.
- (2006b) The Political Economy of Religion and Social Insurance, 1910–1939, *Studies in American Political Development* 20 (2): 132–59.
- Schierup, Carl-Ulrik, Peo Hansen, and Stephan Castles, eds. (2006) *Migration, Citizenship and the European Welfare State: A European Dilemma*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schmähl, Winfried, and Sabine Horstmann, eds. (2002) *Transformation of Pension Systems in Central and Eastern Europe*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Schmid, Günther, and Bernard Gazier, eds. (2002) *The Dynamics of Full Employment: Social Integration through Transitional Labour Markets*, Cheltenham etc.: Edward Elgar.
- Schmidt, Manfred G. (1996) When Parties Matter: A review of the possibilities and limits of partisan influence on public policy, *European Journal of Political Research* 30 (2): 155–83.
- (2004) *Sozialpolitik in der DDR*, Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- (2005³) *Sozialpolitik in Deutschland. Historische Entwicklung und internationaler Vergleich*, Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften (1988¹, 1998² – Opladen: Leske + Budrich).
- Schmidt, Vivien A. (2002) Does Discourse Matter in the Politics of Welfare State Adjustment? *Comparative Political Studies* 35 (2): 168–93 [*Welfare States*, vol. 2: 361–86].
- (2006) *Democracy in Europe: Institutions, Ideas, Discourse*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schneider, Volker, Simon Fink, and Marc Tenbrücken (2005) Buying out the State: A Comparative Perspective on the Privatization of Infrastructures, *Comparative Political Studies* 38 (6): 704–27.
- Schwartz, Herman M. (2000) Internationalization and Two Liberal Welfare States: Australia and New Zealand, in: Scharpf/V.A. Schmidt 2000, vol. 2, 69–130.
- (2001) The Danish ‘Miracle’: Luck, Pluck or Stuck? *Comparative Political Studies* 34 (2, March): 131–55.
- (2003) Globalisation/Welfare: What’s the Preposition? And, Or, Versus, With? *Social Policy Review* 15: 71–90.
- Seeleib-Kaiser, Martin (2001) *Globalisierung und Sozialpolitik. Ein Vergleich der Diskurse und Wohlfahrtssysteme in Deutschland, Japan und den USA*, Frankfurt a.M. etc.: Campus.
- Silke van Dyk, and Martin Roggenkamp (2006) *Party Politics and Social Welfare: Comparing Christian and Social Democracy in Austria, Germany and the Netherlands*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar (in press).
- Shalev, Michael, ed. (2003) *The Privatization of Social Policy? Occupational Welfare and the Welfare State in America, Scandinavia and Japan*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Siegel, Nico A. (2002) *Baustelle Sozialpolitik. Konsolidierung und Rückbau im internationalen Vergleich*, Frankfurt a.M. etc.: Campus.
- Simmons, Beth A., and Zachary Elkins (2004) The Globalization of Liberalization: Policy Diffusion in the International Political Economy, *American Political Science Review* 98 (1): 171–89.
- Skocpol, Theda (1996⁴) *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press (1992¹).
- (1995) Introduction, in: id., ed., *Social Policy in the United States: Future Possibilities in Historical Perspective*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 3–10.

- (2000) *The Missing Middle: Working Families and the Future of American Social Policy*, New York: Norton.
- (2003a) *Diminished Democracy: From Membership to Management in American Civic Life*, Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- (2003b) Doubly Engaged Social Science: The Promise of Comparative Historical Analysis, in: Mahoney/Rueschemeyer 2003, 407–28.
- and Edwin Amenta (1986) States and Social Policies, *Annual Review of Sociology* 12: 131–57.
- and Morris P. Fiorina (1999) Making Sense of the Civic Engagement Debate, in: id., eds., *Civic Engagement in American Democracy*, Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press: 1–23.
- and Gretchen Ritter (1991) Gender and the Origins of Modern Social Policies in Britain and the United States, *Studies in American Political Development* 5 (Spring): 36–83.
- Skowronek, Stephen (1982) *Building a New American State: The Expansion of National Administrative Capacities, 1877–1920*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smeeding, Timothy M. (2005) Public Policy, Income Inequality, and Poverty. The United States in Comparative Perspective, *Social Science Quarterly* 86 (5, December): 955–83 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 115–43].
- (2006a) Government Programs and Social Outcomes: Comparison of the United States with Other Rich Nations, in: Auerbach/Card/Quigley 2006, 149–218.
- (2006b) Poor People in Rich Nations: The United States in Comparative Perspective, *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 20 (1): 69–90.
- Smith, Timothy B. (2003) *Creating the Welfare State in France, 1880–1940*, Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- (2004) *France in Crisis: The Welfare State, Inequality and Globalization since 1980*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Soysal, Yasemin Nuhoglu (1995) *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Spence, Michael (2002), Signaling in Retrospect and the Informational Structure of Markets, *American Economic Review* 92 (3, June): 434–59.
- Standing, Guy (2002) *Beyond the New Paternalism: Basic Security as Equality*, London/New York: Verso/St. Martin's.
- (2003) Globalisation: The eight crises of social protection, in: Loudes Beneria and Savitri Bisnath, eds., *Global Tensions: Challenges and Opportunities in the World Economy*, New York: Routledge, 111–33.
- ed. (2005^{2 rev.}) *Promoting Income Security as a Right: Europe and North America*, London: Anthem (2004¹).
- Starke, Peter (2007) *Radical Welfare State Retrenchment: A Comparative Analysis*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Steinmo, Sven (2002) Taxation and Globalization: Challenges to the Swedish Welfare State, *Comparative Political Studies* 35 (7): 839–62 [*Welfare States*, vol. 2: 459–82].
- (2003) Bucking the Trend? The welfare state and the global economy: the Swedish case up close, *New political economy* 8 (1): 31–48.
- and Jon Watts (1995) It's the Institutions Stupid! Why Comprehensive National Health Insurance Always Fails in America, *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* 20 (2): 329–72.
- Stevens, Beth (1990) Labor Unions, Employee Benefits, and the Privatization of the American Welfare State, *Journal of Policy History* 2 (3): 233–60 (also in Shalev 2003, 73–103).
- Stier, Haya, Noah Lewin-Epstein, and Michael Braun (2001) Welfare Regimes, Family-Supportive Policies, and Womens Employment along the Life-Course, *American Journal of Sociology* 106 (6, May): 1731–60 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 550–80].
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. (2002) Information and the Change in the Paradigm in Economics, *American Economic Review* 92 (3, June): 460–501.
- Stolleis, Michael (2003) *Geschichte des Sozialrechts in Deutschland: ein Grundriß*, Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius.
- Stone, Deborah A. (1985) *The Disabled State*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.

- (1999/2000) Beyond Moral Hazard: Insurance as Moral Opportunity, *Connecticut Insurance Law Journal* 6 (1): 11–46.
- Streeck, Wolfgang (1995) From Market Making to State Building? Reflections on the Political Economy of European Social Policy, in: Stephan Leibfried and Paul Pierson, eds., *European Social Policy*, Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 389–431.
- (1999) On the Institutional Conditions of Diversified Quality Production, in: Egon Matzner and Wolfgang Streeck, eds., *Beyond Keynesianism*, Aldershot, Hants: Edward Elgar, 21–61.
- (2000) Competitive Solidarity: Rethinking the ‘European Social Model’, in: Karl Hinrichs, Herbert Kitschelt, and Helmuth Wiesenthal, eds., *Kontingenz und Krise: Institutionenpolitik in kapitalistischen und postsozialistischen Gesellschaften*. Frankfurt a.M.: Campus, 245–61 [*Welfare States*, vol. 2: 549–65].
- (2003) The Crumbling Pillars of Social Partnership, *West European Politics* 26 (4, October): 101–24 (Special Issue *Germany: Beyond the stable state*).
- and Kathleen A. Thelen, eds. (2005) *Institutional Change in Advanced Political Economies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sunstein, Cass R. (1997) Paradoxes of the Regulatory State, in: id., ed., *Free Markets and Social Justice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 271–97.
- (2004) *The Second Bill of Rights: Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s Unfinished Revolution and Why We Need It More Than Ever*, New York: Basic Books.
- (2005) Why Does the American Constitution Lack Social and Economic Guarantees?, in: Michael Ignatieff, ed., *American Exceptionalism and Human Rights*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 90–143.
- Sutton, John (2006) Globalization: A European Perspective, in: Giddens et al. 2006, 37–51.
- Svallfors, Stefan (1997) Worlds of Welfare and Attitudes to Redistribution: A Comparison of Eight Western Nations, *European Sociological Review* 13 (3): 283–304 [*Welfare States*, vol. 3: 331–52].
- ed. (2005) *Analyzing Inequality: Life Chances and Social Mobility in Comparative Perspective*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- (2006) *The Moral Economy of Class: Class and Attitudes in Comparative Perspective*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- and Peter Taylor-Gooby, eds. (1999) *The End of the Welfare State? Responses to State Retrenchment*, London etc.: Routledge (repr. 2002).
- Swank, Duane H. (2002a) *Global Capital, Political Institutions, and Policy Change in Developed Welfare States*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2002b) European Welfare States: Regionalization, globalization, and policy change, in: Thomas L. Brewer, Paul A. Brenton, and Gavin Boyd, eds., *Globalizing Europe: Deepening Integration, Alliance Capitalism and Structural Statecraft*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 159–85.
- (2003) Withering Welfare? Globalisation, political economic institutions, and contemporary welfare states, in: Linda Weiss, ed. *States in the Global Economy: Bringing Domestic Institutions Back in*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 58–82.
- Sykes, Robert, Bruno Palier, and Pauline M. Prior, eds. (2001) *Globalization and European Welfare States: Challenges and Change*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001.
- Tanzi, Victor, and Ludger Schuknecht (2000) *Public Spending in the 20th Century: A Global Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor-Gooby, Peter (1998) Choice and the New Paradigm in Policy, in: id., ed., *Choice and Public Policy. The Limits to Welfare Markets*, London: Macmillan, 201–22.
- (2002) The Silver Age of the Welfare State: Perspectives on Resilience, *Journal of Social Policy* 31 (3): 507–621.
- ed. (2004a) *New Risks, New Welfare: The Transformation of the European Welfare State*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ed. (2004b) *Making a European Welfare State? Convergences and Conflicts over European Social Policy*, Malden, MA: Blackwell 2004.
- ed. (2005a) *Ideas and Welfare State Reform in Western Europe*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- (2005b) Is the Future American? Or, Can Left Politics Preserve European Welfare States from Erosion through Growing ‘Racial’ Diversity?, *Journal of Social Policy* 34 (4): 661–72.

- (2006) Working with the Grain of Human Nature: Reciprocity vs. Self-Regarding Individualism, unpubl. ms.
- and Stefan Svallfors, eds. (2002) *The End of the Welfare State? Responses to State Retrenchment*, London, New York: Routledge.
- Tennstedt, Florian (1976) Zur Ökonomisierung und Verrechtlichung in der Sozialpolitik, in: Axel Murswieck, ed., *Staatliche Politik im Sozialsektor München*: Piper, 139–65.
- (1981) *Sozialgeschichte der Sozialpolitik in Deutschland: vom 18. Jahrhundert bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- (2003) Geschichte des Sozialrechts, in: Bernd Baron von Maydell and Franz Ruland, eds., *Sozialrechtshandbuch*, Baden-Baden: Nomos³, 24–80.
- (2004) Sozialwissenschaft – Sozialrecht – Sozialgeschichte: Kooperation und Konvergenz am Beispiel der Sozialpolitik, in: Günther Schulz with Christoph Buchheim, Gerhard Fouquet, Rainer Gömmel, Friedrich-Wilhelm Henning, Karl Heinrich Kaufhold and Hans Pohl, eds., *Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte: Arbeitsgebiete, Probleme, Perspektiven; 100 Jahre Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Stuttgart: Steiner, 551–75 (= *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Beiheft 169).
- Thane, Pat (1991) Visions of Gender in the Making of the British Welfare State: Women in the Labour Party and social policy, 1906–45, in: Bock/Thane 1991: 93–118.
- (1993) Women in the British Labour Party and the Construction of State Welfare, 1906–1939, in: Koven/Michel 1993, 343–77.
- (1996²) *Foundations of the Welfare State*, London: Longman (1982¹).
- (2000) *Old Age in English History: Past Experiences, Present Issues*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2001) What Difference Did the Vote Make?, in: Amanda Vickery, ed., *Women, Privilege and Power: British Politics 1750 to the Present*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 253–87.
- ed. (2005) *The Long History of Old Age*, London: Thames & Hudson.
- Thelen, Kathleen A. (2000) Timing and Temporality in the Analysis of Institutional Evolution and Change. *Studies in American Political Development* 14 (1): 101–8.
- (2003) How Institutions Evolve: Insights from Comparative Historical Analysis, in: Mahoney/Rueschemeyer, 208–40.
- Therborn, Göran (2004) *Between Sex and Power: Family in the World, 1900–2000*, London etc.: Routledge.
- ed. (2006) *Inequalities of the World. New Theoretical Frameworks. Multiple Empirical Approaches*, London: Verso.
- Titmuss, Richard M. (1974) What is Social Policy?, in: id., *Social Policy. An Introduction*, London: Allen and Unwin, 23–32 (ch. 2; the chapter dates from a recurring introductory lecture series at the LSE last held in 1973) [*Welfare States*, vol. 1: 138–47].
- (1976³) The Social Division of Welfare: Some Reflections on the Search for Equity, in: id., *Essays on 'The Welfare State'*, London: George Allen & Unwin, 34–55 (1958¹; lecture in 1955, first printed separately in 1956).
- Toninelli, Pier Angelo (2000) The Rise and Fall of Public Enterprise. The Framework, in: id., ed., *The Rise and Fall of State-owned Enterprise in the Western World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3–24.
- Traxler, Franz, Sabine Blaschke, and Bernhard Kittel (2001) *National Labor Relations in Internationalized Markets: A Comparative Study of Institutions, Change, and Performance*, Oxford etc.: Oxford University Press.
- Tsebelis, George (2002) *Veto Players: How Political Institutions Work*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Tsoukalis, Loukas (2005^{pb.}, 2nd upd., exp.) *What kind of Europe?*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ullrich, Carsten (2000) *Solidarität im Sozialversicherungsstaat: Die Akzeptanz des Solidarprinzips in der gesetzlichen Krankenversicherung*, Frankfurt a.M. etc.: Campus Verlag.
- (2002) Reciprocity, Justice and Statutory Health Insurance in Germany, *Journal of European Social Policy* 12 (2): 123–36.

- Veghte, Benjamin W. (2004) *Why Did the Working and Lower Classes in the United States Not Successfully Mobilize for a Redistributive Welfare State? An Exploratory Study of Constraints on Political Mobilization*, Bremen: University of Bremen, Graduate School of Social Sciences (GSSS Working Paper No. 1).
- Robert Y. Shapiro, and Greg M. Shaw (2007) Social Policy Preferences, National Defense and Political Polarization in the United States, in: Steffen Mau and Benjamin W. Veghte, eds., *Social Justice, Legitimacy and the Welfare State*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 145–68.
- Visser, Jelle (2006) The Five Pillars of the European Social Model of Labor Relations, in: Beckert et al. 2006, 315–35.
- Wade, Robert (2005) Is Globalization Reducing Poverty and Inequality?, in: John Ravenhill, ed., *Global Political Economy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 291–316 (see also: id., Is Globalization Reducing Poverty and Inequality? *World Development* 2004, 32 (4): 567–89).
- and Martin Wolf (2002) Are global poverty and inequality getting worse?, *Prospect*, March: 16–21.
- Walzer, Michael (1983) *Spheres of Justice. A Defence of Pluralism and Equality*, Oxford: Martin Robertson.
- Weaver, R. Kent (1986) The Politics of Blame Avoidance, *Journal of Public Policy* 6 (Oct-Dec): 371–98.
- (2004) Public Pension Regimes in an Age of Austerity, in: Levin/Shapiro 2004, 64–99.
- (2007a) *Reforming Social Security: Lessons from Abroad*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- (2007b) *Gaining Ground? Implementing the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Program*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Weir, Margaret (1992) *Politics and Jobs: The Boundaries of Employment Policy in the United States*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- ed. (1998) *The Social Divide: Political Parties and the Future of Activist Government*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Ann Shola Orloff, and Theda Skocpol, eds. (1988) *The Politics of Social Policy in the United States*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Western, Bruce (1997) *Between Class and Market: Postwar Unionization in the Capitalist Democracies*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- (2006) *Punishment and Inequality in America*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- White, Stuart, ed. (2001) *New Labour: The Progressive Future?* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- (2003) *The Civic Minimum: On the Rights and Obligations of Economic Citizenship*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilensky, Harold L. (1975) *The Welfare State and Equality. Structural and Ideological Roots of Public Expenditures*, Berkeley, CA etc.: University of California Press [chap. 1: The Welfare State as a Research Problem and chap. 2: Economic Level, Ideology and Social Structure, i.e. pp. 1–49 = *Welfare States*, vol. 1: 211–65; chap. 2 only: 15–49 = *Foundations* 3: 87–124].
- (2002) *Rich Democracies: Political Economy, Public Policy, and Performance*, Berkeley, CA etc.: University of California Press.
- (2003) *Postindustrialism and Postmaterialism? A critical view of the 'new economy', the 'information age', the 'high tech society' and all that*, Berlin: WZB, Abt. Ungleichheit und soziale Integration (SP I 2003–201).
- Wolf, Martin (2004) *Why Globalization Works: The Case for the Global Market Economy*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Wood, Geof, and Ian Gough (2004) [Conclusion:] Rethinking Social Policy in Development Contexts, in: Ian Gough, Geof Wood, Armjando Barrientos, Philippa Bevan, Peter Davis, and Graham Room, eds., *Insecurity and Welfare Regimes in Asia, Africa, and Latin America: Social Policy in Development Contexts*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 312–26 [*Welfare States*, vol. 2: 658–73].
- Wuthnow, Robert, ed. (1991) *Between States and Markets: The Voluntary Sector in Comparative Perspective*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Zürn, Michael, and Stephan Leibfried (2005) Reconfiguring the National Constellation, in: Leibfried/Zürn 2005, 1–36.