

Introduction: Social security and care after socialism: Reconfigurations of public and private

Rosie Read and Tatjana Thelen

Abstract: State frameworks for welfare and social security have been subject to processes of privatization, decentralization, and neoliberal reform in many parts of the world. This article explores how these developments might be theorized using anthropological understandings of social security in combination with feminist perspectives on care. In its application to post-1989 socioeconomic transformation in the former socialist region, this perspective overcomes the conceptual inadequacies of the “state withdrawal” model. It also illuminates the nuanced ways in which public and private (as spaces, subjectivities, institutions, moralities, and practices) re-emerge and change in the socialist era as well as today, continually shaping the trajectories and outcomes of reforms to care and social security.

Keywords: care and social security, emotions, postsocialism, public/private

The collapse of socialist states reinforced global neoliberal trends that surfaced in the early 1980s, particularly in English-speaking countries. The loss of a socialist alternative, an idea that first emerged with the beginning of industrialization in the nineteenth century, strengthened the seemingly inevitable spread of marketization and accelerated globalization. Throughout the Cold War, the Soviet Union represented an alternative interpretation of society and the economy, and its disappearance further undermined the previous historical acceptance of a welfare state (Mishra 1999: 1ff.; see also Ryner 2000). Demographic transformations and technological innovations that led to changes in employment structures further con-

tributed to a perception of the postwar welfare state as under pressure or even in crisis (Ascoli and Ranci 2002; Döring 1999; Esping-Andersen 1996; Mingione 1991; Pierson and Castles 2000). While the development of state-organized social security nets was once seen as the basis of modern society, they have been increasingly interpreted as hindering economic growth (F. v. Benda-Beckmann 2005). This is linked to the worldwide pressure to privatize many state forms of social security. Nevertheless, specific local histories and welfare regimes influence the degree and nature of state restructuring as well as the ability of national governments to impose neoliberal agendas. Some authors have pointed to the resilience of national wel-

fare arrangements or argued that privatization is not uniform, nor does it always imply a reduction in public expenditure (Mishra 1990; Pierson 1994; Ranci 2002). The notion of state “withdrawal,” however, continues to be a widespread assumption (Ryner 2002). These policy debates tend to frame what is public and private primarily in terms of a distinction between the state administration and the market economy (Weintraub 1997: 7).

These developments are closely linked to discourses on deserving need, dependency, and the quality of institutionalized care which criticize the welfare state as too controlling, paternalistic, and interventionist, thereby inhibiting not only individual independence, but also gender equality (Ganesh 2005; Mingione 1991: 199; Orme 1998). Care provision “at home” or “in the community” is considered preferable to institutional care, which is seen as diminishing personal autonomy and individuality. Judgments of this kind are based on the liberal ideal of the autonomous individual, for whom dependency is perceived as essentially negative (Knijn 2000; Ungerson 2000). Various civil movements have fought to uphold an independent life, for the disabled and the elderly for example, sometimes calling for the marketization and privatization of social services, and the right of welfare customers to make “choices” about services (Ungerson 1999). These critical debates concerning state social security and care are invariably embedded within a range of established ways of thinking about public and private, some of which depart from the classic liberal understanding of these categories. Republican thought, for instance, construes public in terms of civic engagement and participation, whereas for many feminist critics, who highlight the significance of the private as kinship and domesticity, the public is a more general, residual category consisting of the market, the state, and civil society (Weintraub 1997).

In line with the overall dominance of these discourses, recent welfare reforms in numerous countries have profoundly altered relationships between states and citizens and caused significant shifts in individual social security arrange-

ments and caring practices. In this section we investigate how notions of social security and care are reconfigured at various levels and how everyday practices shape the outcomes of reform. We provide an innovative analysis of these developments using anthropological concepts of social security in combination with feminist approaches to care, thereby contributing fresh insights on the consequences of neoliberal reforms to welfare and social security in an increasingly globalized world.

The ethnographic articles collected here are drawn from studies of different parts of former socialist states, ranging from the special case of eastern Germany to remote areas of Russia. In many ways, the reorganization of social security provided by the state in this region mirrors the reform of the welfare state in Western democracies and much of the postcolonial world, although it was more intense and took place over a shorter period of time (Moghadan 1993). Nevertheless, these neoliberal reforms reconfigured pre-existing divisions between public and private that were characteristic of state socialism. This process of social change has tended to be thought about in terms of “state withdrawal,” a perception that, we argue, has significant implications for understanding care and social security. The perspective developed here seeks to question and complicate the “state withdrawal” representation of social change. The case studies in this section empirically analyze state involvement in social security arrangements, and explore the complex web of interaction involved in post-1989 transformations. In so doing they show how old and new notions of public and private overlap and emerge within struggles over new policies and reforms. Before exploring transformation in the former socialist states, we will outline the theoretical background to concepts of social security and care.

Social security in anthropological theory

Anthropological research on social security emerged mainly in the context of scholarly de-

bates on Third World development in the 1970s and 1980s (Ahmad et al. 1991; v. Benda-Beckmann et al. 1988; Leliveld 1994; Midgley 1984; Partsch 1983). In the course of these discussions, the Western concept of social security (as tied to health, old age, and unemployment insurance in industrialized countries) was criticized as ethnocentric and not applicable to developing countries, in which state-led provisions reached only small portions of the population, and social security was provided through personal or community relationships (F. v. Benda-Beckmann 2005). At the same time, scholars began to recognize the multilayered nature of social security in Western welfare states, as evident in the theory of welfare pluralism or welfare mix (Johnson 1987; Zacher 1988). As a result, the hitherto limited perspective of social security was broadened to embrace other institutions such as kinship or neighborhood, that is, institutions central to the provision of social security even though this was not their primary “purpose.” Anthropological research has also increasingly questioned homogenized notions of the state, as evidenced in the singular division between public/private, understood here as state/nonstate, formal/informal, or even modern/traditional types of provision.¹ These dichotomies obscure the multifaceted and contradictory nature of state bureaucracies and “conflate different levels of the social organization of social security: the (source of) regulation and the (source of) provision of goods and services” (F. and K. v. Benda-Beckmann 1994: 13). For example, parental care is rarely seen as formal social security, yet in many cases it is legally required. Moreover, although state social security frameworks are viewed in everyday discourse as a positive achievement, research has revealed their ambivalent nature, often demonstrating their tendency to reallocate resources from poor to rich, rather than reduce poverty (K. v. Benda-Beckmann 1994; Midgley 1984).² More recent studies have emphasized the “fragmentation” of welfare, as well as its limits and even its role in producing insecurity (Carter 1998; DeJong and Roth 2005; v. Euwijk 2004; see also the various chapters in

Leutloff-Grandits, Peleikis and Thelen 2008; Nettleton and Burrows 1998; Rohregger 2006). As a result the analytical conceptualization of social security differs from its common, everyday meanings insofar as it emerges through diverse practices, relations, ideologies, policies, and institutions. Further, it is the interrelation among various institutions, actors, and their respective interests that is increasingly the focus of this literature.

Analyzing these interrelations, Franz and Keebet von Benda-Beckmann (1994) differentiate between the various layers of social security. Most importantly, they distinguish between the preconditions for social security (i.e., the availability of resources in the form of people, labor, money, and means of production), on the one hand, and, on the other, the social-distribution mechanisms that comprise moral and legal principles of need and obligation and their institutional implementation, as well as their concrete outcomes in terms of everyday practice. Institutional provision (frequently based on legal rights and obligations) is typically more restricted than general principles might suggest. Constructions of need vary historically between societies as well as between the members of the society (K. v. Benda-Beckmann 1994; Haney 2002). Dominant ideologies can also influence future expectations of support in individual life scripts (Hashimoto 1996). The hegemony of certain social constructions or practices does not imply their universal acceptance, or their ability to alleviate poverty. On the contrary, sociohistorical and ethnographic studies have shown how needs are negotiated within the family (Finch 1994; Finch and Mason 1993) or in civil servant–client interaction (de Konig 1988; Haney 2002; Howe 1990), and how they serve particular political or institutional interests (Katz 1989; Lipsky 1980; Marcus 2006). Ideas and practices of social security are also adapted to changing notions of risk and responsibility (Standing 1996; also Thelen 2005, 2006b).

Hence, in addition to exploring access to (material and immaterial) help, analyzing social security involves considering actors’ expecta-

tions about the future and the actions of others. Often it is not simply access to material resources that makes people feel secure, but a network of social relations to which they can appeal in times of crisis and need (see also Caldwell, this volume). Thus, in principle, anthropological approaches to social security encompass emotional as well as material support. In practice, however, research in this area has tended to be concerned with challenging assumptions about state/nonstate boundaries by focusing on the structural and material conditions of social security, rather than its emotional dimensions.

Feminist approaches to care

While theories of social security emerged within discussions of development in Third World countries, analyses of care have emerged mainly in the context of feminist critique, most often (but not exclusively) in Western capitalist contexts. Whereas social security discussions sought to go beyond public/private as a distinction between state and nonstate, feminist debates on care approached the private as an explicitly gendered category, incorporating notions of kinship, household, domesticity, and reproduction. Broadly speaking, feminist approaches to care have emphasized the socially constructed nature of all caring arrangements, which both reflect and reproduce unequal social relations. Among the broad range of themes explored, the significance and negotiation of care as a gendered activity has received special emphasis with regard to households and families (DeVault 1991; Feder and Kittay 2002; Finch and Mason 1993), as well as in the contexts of formal employment (Bolton and Boyd 2003; James 1989, 1992; Pierce 1997), and care migration (Anderson 2000; Constable 1997; Hochschild 2000; Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001).

Much feminist work has highlighted the significance of the emotional nature of care and how these emotions affect the interplay between capitalist economic relations and gender inequalities (Adkins 2002; Adkins and Lury 1999;

Hochschild [1983] 2003; Wouters 1989). Care relations and practices have been explored from a number of different perspectives, but no clear consensus on the precise meaning of “care” as a concept has emerged (Thomas 1993). Strikingly consistent in this array of literature, nevertheless, is the constant concern with questions of authenticity and exploitation, and how the two are linked. The pioneering work of Arlie Hochschild ([1983] 2003) on emotional labor, for example, set much of the agenda for feminist thinking on care and emotions in public workspaces. Hochschild’s key contribution was to theorize how the study of emotions (or more specifically, emotionally inflected caring behavior) could be built into an understanding of political economy by connecting a “theory of feelings with a theory of labor” (Colley 2006: 2). She examined the management of emotion among American flight attendants as an aspect of their commodified labor, a process that generated customer satisfaction, and hence company profits. Hochschild argued that the emotional expression dictated by airline management and governed by profit, resulted in alienating flight attendants from their own authentic emotions. She has been criticized for her insistence on a clear divide between authentic and inauthentic feelings, which is mapped onto a naturalized division between public and private (see, e.g., Bolton and Boyd 2003; Wouters 1989; see also Haukanes, this volume).

Yet, the question of the relative authenticity or inauthenticity of commercialized emotion and caring practices continues to be explored and debated in feminist research (Adkins 2002; Adkins and Lury 1999; Bolton and Boyd 2003; Colley 2006; Kiely 2005). Conversely, feminist discussions on women’s caring practices in kinship relations and domestic environments have outlined the opposite problem; feminized relations of care are not so much inauthentic as too authentic, that is, too naturalized, sentimentalized, unquestioned, and taken for granted by family members or (in some cases) welfare structures. The gendered invisibility of these forms of care is precisely what makes them unrewarded and therefore exploitative. Thus,

feminist debates are frequently divided on the question of how much recognition of women's caring role in the family should be incorporated into welfare structures, and what effect this might have on women's citizenship (see, e.g., Feder and Kittay 2002; Fraser 1997; Knijn and Kremer 1997; Lister 1997; Pateman 1988; Thomas 1993; Ungerson 1999). Recently, the role of men in care provision has received more detailed attention (Ungerson 1999: 7; see also Kay, this volume).

Social security and care: A combined approach

In this section, we aim to combine these two distinct perspectives of social security and care in our ethnographic exploration of social realities after socialism. We take the holistic view of social security as linked to general ideas about risk and need, and consider how these are institutionally implemented and negotiated in daily practice. Care is approached as a dimension of social security, which consists of practices that address socially constructed needs that have a giving and a receiving side. In analyzing the giving and receiving of care as part of the broader scheme of social security arrangements, we connect shifts in ideologies and policies to everyday practices. In other words, the personal and emotional dimensions of caring identities and relationships can be seen as embedded in broader historical and socioeconomic developments. Viewing care as part of social security draws attention to the complex web of social relations involved, including new caring actors, organizations, and ideologies, for example, as well as state institutions and international influences. Even more significantly, combining the two perspectives in this field is particularly promising because it enables us to bring different versions of the public/private distinction into a common analytical frame, one that makes clear the ways in which different notions merge, for instance, how public relations are made private and vice versa.³

This perspective offers a fresh insight into the workings of change in the postsocialist region where the role of state social security has often been privileged and overemphasized (a point we explore below). The ethnographic articles in this section describe the way that social security arrangements depend on a shifting mix of actors, agencies, and intimate social relationships. Our approach helps to reveal how everyday social security arrangements and actual caring relations shape the outcome of socioeconomic reforms after socialism. Placing special emphasis on emotional dimensions of care is vital, as individual decisions about social security are often influenced by emotional needs. The feminist emphasis on emotions and intimate care relations can add to our understanding of the fluid and ambivalent nature of social security relations and the processes by which they are continually (re)produced. This in turn helps to reveal how everyday arrangements and practices influence social change. Next we focus on the broader transformations in social security and care in former socialist countries.

Socialism and the “withdrawal” of the caring state

The establishment of socialist states entailed key shifts in systems of redistribution. The socialist version of modern welfare had historical antecedents in the moral assumptions regarding entitlement and assistance for workers found within “paternalistic” industrial family businesses. Socialist states enlarged these entitlements to more universal, comprehensive, and centralized systems of social security provision. Entitlement to support was linked to employment more so than in the welfare regimes of Western liberal democracies. In contrast to the developing world, where anthropological debates on social security emerged, in socialist societies state institutions were a key (if not dominating) presence in numerous aspects of social life. Waged work and state-regulated pensions were guaranteed as a major source of income and subsidized cheap consumer goods

were almost universally available. Besides this, state services (often distributed through the workplace) included education, transportation, childcare, and cultural facilities (Adam 1991; Gal and Kligman 2000a, 2000b; Haney 2002; Kornai 1990; Nash 2003; Pine 2002; Standing 1996). On the one hand, universal frameworks for welfare dramatically reduced socioeconomic inequalities, thereby contributing to the legitimacy of the socialist state (Verdery 1996). On the other hand, socialist welfare was criticized for producing “low quality” services. Additional resources were distributed to broad categories of people, such as “the women” or “the youth,” who were defined as having particular needs (Haney 1999; see also Kay in this volume).⁴ Excluded from or at least neglected in this system of redistribution were those who did not want or were unable to work. Economic shortages contributed to the persistent importance of other institutions (kinship, ethnic and religious communities, patronage networks) in individual social security arrangements. As has been frequently commented in the literature of the region, it was commonplace to rely on a range of personal networks to gain access to goods and services that were in short supply (Ledeneva 1998; Nash 2003; Verdery 1996; Wedel 1986; for an overview, see Sampson 1985–86). These personal relations came to be seen as the paradigmatic private during socialism, not least because the private spheres of liberal and republican thought (e.g., market and civic engagement) were heavily restricted.

Kinship, domestic domains, and circles of personalized relationships became even more important during the economy of shortage that characterized the later socialist period.⁵ As Pine and Haukanes note, “kin and friends came to represent a site of trust, associated with a rare kind of safety” (2005: 7). Although arrangements for the provision of care within the family and the household, and the gendered forms they took, varied significantly across the socialist region, some broad features of what Gal and Kligman call “socialist gender orders” have been recognized (2000b: 5). Socialist states shared a commitment to the emancipation of women

from their subordinate position in peasant and bourgeois family structures. Significantly, this was to be achieved through women’s legal equity and full-time participation in official employment. As in other regions with strong state support for gender equality, such as Scandinavian countries, socialist labor markets remained gendered with women overrepresented in lower positions, frequently in the realm of professionalized care, like education and health services. At the same time, the significance of women’s role in reproduction and as caregivers within the family was frequently reiterated in state and popular discourses (Einhorn 1993; Gal 1994; Gal and Kligman 2000a, 2000b; Haney 1999; Haukanes 2001; Huseby-Darvas 1996; Lapidus 1978; Pine 2002; Read 2005, 2007).

Everyday social security and care arrangements in socialist societies thus relied on a series of conditions that were to be radically altered by transformations after 1989. With regard to state-sponsored welfare, neoliberal discourses on economic reform in the region echoed those of Western welfare countries in viewing socialist states as too paternalistic and controlling, and assumed that attempts to redistribute wealth and resources inhibited individual autonomy and self-help strategies. Consequently, reformers and policy makers from within and outside the region promoted the “withdrawal” of the state from many areas of social life and the “contraction” of welfare (e.g., Aslund; 1992; Klaus 1992; Kornai 1990; Kornai and Eggleston 2001). In the minds of the reformers, the state needed to be peeled back to make way for the private—seen here as the market—and a reinvigorated civil society.

The narrative of a widespread state retreat, so clearly taken for granted among policy makers and politicians, has also persisted in social science research on the former socialist region. Although extensive debates have taken place over whether such a retreat was desirable or what its concrete effects might be, the notion that the state was indeed withdrawing frequently remained in place through these discussions. As evidenced by the anthropological book titles of the early 1990s, strong emphasis was

placed on “surviving” or “coping” with post-socialism (e.g., Bridger and Pine 1998; Kideckel 1995). There has been a consistent focus on the ways in which political and economic restructuring has generated new forms of social and economic exclusion, hardship, and insecurity, albeit often concentrated in particular regions or among certain social, cultural, ethnic, or gender groups. As a result, a picture has emerged of the “loss” of the paternalistic state; of people being thrown back on their own resources and personal networks; of “survival strategies,” “torn safety nets,” and new forms of socioeconomic vulnerability (Field and Twigg 2000; Hivon 1998; Sampson 1995; Shreeves 2002; Sneath 2002; Standing 1996; Walker 1998).

Yet while post-1989 socioeconomic transformations have undoubtedly produced severe forms of hardship for many communities in the region, which may well have been experienced as a loss of the state or as state abandonment (Karjanen 2005; Kideckel 2002; Nazpary 2001; Pine 2002), the notion of state withdrawal is problematic when used in an analytical sense. There are two (interrelated) reasons for this. First, it implies a rather one-dimensional view of “the state” as a singular entity with clearly defined boundaries. This view of the state makes it difficult to grasp the complex and contradictory nature of reforms in former socialist countries, particularly the ways in which a range of state bodies, actors, and institutions, far from being in retreat, continue to shape social life in the region, albeit in altered form. Second, the state-withdrawal model provides little analytical purchase on the dynamic post-1989 reconfigurations of public and private spaces, institutions, moralities, and subjectivities.

In relation to the first point, it is increasingly recognized that the post-1989 goal of creating a liberal, residual welfare state based on a mix of social insurance, social assistance, and private services was rarely implemented in a straightforward manner (Standing 1996). Influenced by specific local economic histories and socialist government policies, processes of restructuring and waves of reform were the outcome of strug-

gles among different interest groups, often with contradictory results. Levels of unemployment and poverty diversified within the region after 1989 (Kalb, Svašek and Tak 1999; Stark and Bruszt 1998). Nevertheless, the social dislocation produced by market reforms placed strong pressures on governments to maintain or even enlarge individual welfare entitlements, or risk losing mass public support. As a result, areas such as health care, education, maternity, and family benefits were subjected to less radical reform than others (Haggard and Kaufman 2001: 4; Sotiropoulos 2005: 296). The closing of large socialist enterprises (previously central to frameworks for state-provided social security), and the creation of large numbers of unemployed workers led governments to assume responsibility for designing special state-support programs (Sotiropoulos 2005: 269). Elsewhere, responsibility for social security was transferred from centralized institutions to local state bodies. At the individual level, for example, among the unemployed, this has sometimes led to an increasing reliance on state frameworks and provision. However, the rationale underpinning new regimes of welfare has altered, with the shift from universal to more targeted systems of provision. As Kalb (1997: 205) has argued, systems of social redistribution are “culturally formative precisely because their managers and protagonists generally undertake action in order to shape their recipients in the light of their own moral motivations.” Although means testing in certain areas of state support was introduced in some countries prior to the demise of socialism, since 1989 various forms of social assistance are no longer defined as a legal right, and have become increasingly stigmatized (Haney 1999; Nash 2003).⁶ “Deserving need” (especially in relation to men) might still be measured according to individual “willingness” to work, but diminishing opportunities for employment (particularly among low-skilled workers) often mean that fewer and fewer people are able to meet this moral requirement, and are therefore increasingly socially excluded. The decentralization of welfare regimes also led to changes in who delivers

social security, with churches, charities, and other nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) taking on more significant and proactive roles (Caldwell 2004; Read 2005, 2007). Yet, even in these cases, the state continues to regulate, mediate, and/or finance these services in full or in part, although the priority and rationale for doing so has shifted.

Second, the narrative of state withdrawal does not capture (in either conceptual or ethnographic terms) the variability of “privatization” processes in post-1989 reforms. As elsewhere in the world, privatization entails different things, such as the introduction of market principles of exchange, the selling off of state enterprises and properties to private businesses or individuals, the decentralization of hitherto centrally administered frameworks for social security, or the (re)authentication of kinship or community-based care as against that of state institutions, and so on. Yet, the question of the impact of such privatization processes in the former socialist region is a particularly fascinating one to consider, because of the ways in which the ideologies of public and private underpinning the drive toward liberal economic restructuring and marketization became entangled (in a range of different ways) with the divisions between public and private that were shaped in the socialist era. As a result, private spaces, practices, and subjectivities (some of which had previously been part of conscious strategies for keeping state authorities and procedures at a distance) were incorporated into new socioeconomic realities. In the process they acquired new or additional meanings and were made to work in different ways. For example, as Wedel (1998) demonstrates, previously private networks and “cliques” were able to reposition themselves as the emerging civil society after 1989 in order to access resources from international donors, while at the same time pursuing rather narrow, self-interested goals (see also Kay, this volume). Elsewhere, however, actors have drawn on apparently private, “nonstate” networks and resources to preserve and even recreate forms of care and provision that previously were clearly identified with public, state

socialist institutions (see Thelen, this volume; Haukanes, this volume). The (re)emergence of conservative gender discourses alongside the rhetoric of liberal economic transition constructed home and kinship as the most authentic domain for care provision (typically with women repositioned as carers, not workers), whereas public care institutions were supposed to become more “family-friendly.” The varied and multiple ways in which this discourse was negotiated has often reshaped the gendered boundaries of public and private characteristic of the socialist era (see for example, Goven 2000; Haney 1999; Haukanes 2001; Nash 2003; Pine 2002; Read 2007; Thelen 2005, 2006a, 2006c).

This special section explores these nuanced and complicated social processes and effects. Anthropological concepts of social security, combined with feminist perspectives on care, provide useful analytical tools in this endeavor, because they allow us to investigate in a holistic way the changing alignments between families, state institutions, NGOs, and the market, and their gendered consequences.

Rethinking private/public and emotional needs after socialism

All the articles in this section explore how public and private categories are generated in daily life in a multifaceted and often contradictory fashion. Through detailed examination of specific ethnographic cases, authors investigate the changing ways in which social security is governed, provided, and experienced, and in particular, how the reconfiguration of state/nonstate boundaries is experienced and negotiated via notions of emotional care and need. The articles therefore demonstrate how articulations of authentic care are linked to alternative and competing notions of public and private, which emerged in the postsocialist era. All four concentrate on practices of care giving and receiving that take place outside of kin relations, either through organizations (Thelen, Haukanes, and Kay) or social networks (Caldwell).

Nevertheless, caring practices in all four cases invoke notions of “privateness” and intimacy, which are conventionally associated with kinship in the feminist literature on care (Feder and Kittay 2003; Haukanes 2001; Read 2005, 2007).

The contributions of Tatjana Thelen and Haldis Haukanes focus on care in former socialist enterprises. Thelen explores significant shifts in the organization and provision of care services for the retired employees of what was an East German enterprise. She examines how the transfer and implementation of West German norms and regulations surrounding such matters as union activity and membership, pensions, housing provision, and the relationship of former employees to the enterprise affected the provision of care for retirees (or “veterans” in socialist terminology) in a myriad of ways. Her analysis confirms the blurred nature of public/private distinctions, as well as those between state/nonstate and formal/informal care. Thelen argues that state-provided care, far from being “cold” or impersonal, actually delivers vital emotional support to pensioners and current employees in times of accelerated change. Moreover, the economic success of new forms of social security does not inhere in the delivery of “better quality” services (as in certain neoliberal discourses of welfare reform), but in their ability to imitate socialist forms of provision for retired workers. Similarly, Haukanes explores how notions of public and private infuse the daily practices of cooking, feeding, and eating in an agricultural cooperative canteen in the rural south of the Czech Republic. Despite the relative decline of the cooperative’s agricultural business, its canteen continues to function and is run by an energetic woman called Katja. As in the eastern German case, economic success in the Czech setting is based on or supported by emotional needs and care. In her discussion, Haukanes shows how food is prepared, distributed, and received in a familiar and affectionate atmosphere. She relates these practices to reconfigurations of private–public boundaries in wider Czech society and to discourses on “marketization”, arguing that the emotional work

performed in the canteen cannot simply be seen as a response to new “market forces.” The privateness generated through social relations in the canteen is more appropriately interpreted in the light of socialist ideals that stress the centrality and importance of the workplace in the community than as the commodification of feminized labor for profit. In their respective ethnographic case studies, Thelen and Haukanes demonstrate how the organization and provision of social security (in the form of food or senior care) is delivered in a socioeconomic context greatly altered since socialism. Both studies reveal, however, that expectations and constructions of need, as well as the mechanisms of distribution, closely resemble those of the socialist period. According to Franz and Keebet v. Benda-Beckmann (1994: 14), the regulatory and legal apparatus through which these forms of social security are made available has not altered the cultural and ideological expectations of the providers and recipients to any great extent. Analyzing these contexts in terms of the “presence” or “absence” of the state (as in the state withdrawal narrative) would not capture the multilayered ways in which public and private worlds are actively generated, experienced, and reformulated at a range of levels (moral, ideological, and institutional).

Rebecca Kay’s contribution explores the care services offered by a Men’s Crisis Center in the Altai region of Western Siberia. The psychological support and practical advice provided to local men by this Center is a new approach to supporting men developed by particular actors across a range of local state institutions and structures, sometimes in collaboration with international donors. Resisting the imposition of a conventional state/nonstate binary on her material, Kay suggests that the care provided to local men by the center must be seen as a “hybrid” form of social security, which is both connected to *and* disassociated from local and regional state actors, policies, and welfare regimes. Indeed, Kay maintains that the fluid nature of the boundaries between state and nonstate is precisely what makes new and innovative approaches to men’s problems possible.

She also draws attention to men as givers, and particularly receivers, of care within welfare institutions, and in this way sheds some light on a rather neglected area in a discussion that has tended to focus on women's experiences. Kay demonstrates vividly the difficulties faced by the Crisis Center in authenticating men's needs for care, particularly emotional care. The conservative gender discourses that have re-emerged in recent years promote positive images of masculinity as autonomous, self-sufficient, and self-reliant, a process that obscures or trivializes men's needs at a time of increasing material hardship for many. In a context in which state frameworks for social security and welfare have long focused on the needs of women and "vulnerable" groups, Kay shows how the Men's Crisis Center struggles to define and attend to forms of need not previously acknowledged or recognized.

Melissa Caldwell examines the complexity of social security for elderly Muscovites, including access to public transportation, health care, and shopping facilities. She demonstrates how a range of transformations, including housing and migration patterns, has fractured the authenticity of care provided in and through kinship. In addition, cutbacks in public spending placed many elderly in severe difficulty. Interestingly, however, Caldwell's research participants did not so much mourn the loss of the state as the failure of their own kin to look after them. In her analysis she focuses on the ways in which her elderly research participants negotiate and secure both material and emotional support for themselves via increasingly transnational welfare networks. The give-and-take of relationships between elderly Russians and their foreign caregivers retains the qualities of respect, honor, and trust that are more generally associated with familial relationships. Not only does the creation of fictive kin relations with strangers offer practical substitutes for the absence of actual kin support, it also challenges those cultural models that presume the necessity of kin for such support. Her approach complements others in this section by demonstrating how ostensibly public forms of provi-

sion are made "private" (i.e., intimate, compassionate, and emotional) and how international actors shape individual social security and care arrangements.

The emphasis on emotions and the (re)creation of emotional, caring relations in all four case studies highlights the processual nature of social security. Social security relations do not exist merely as a consequence of institutional prescriptions or static assumptions about need and obligation, but are actively (re)created on a daily basis. In this way, supposedly private feelings and personalized arrangements for care are always intricately and dynamically connected to public frameworks for welfare and security, and vice versa. Moreover, the cases demonstrate how emotional experiences are linked to wider, sometimes international discourses and developments. For example, far from longing for an autonomous, independent life, elderly Muscovites establish new caring networks of mutual obligation, including relations with strangers. The opportunities for elderly Muscovites to establish such new caring relations are enabled by new regulations requiring foreign religious communities to engage in welfare delivery. In the case of the Men's Crisis Center in Siberia, the creation of a friendly supportive environment is the basis for additional material or instrumental kinds of social security delivery. Different state actors (central state ministries, local state bodies, educational and medical institutions) are involved in the provision. However, the ability of the Men's Crisis Center in Siberia to deliver emotional support is challenged by presumptions among international donors on appropriate boundaries between state and nonstate organizations. The emotional style of Katja, the protagonist in the Czech case study, is a large part of what guarantees the economic success of the canteen, thereby safeguarding a key form of security for the elderly in the community. Although German unification eliminated some material needs, it simultaneously created fundamental emotional insecurity. Yet, the incorporation of socialist enterprise-centered care for pensioners creates familiarity in new institutional settings

and supports community building. In sum, the perspectives developed here allow us to understand the local production of social security in a globalizing world. By adapting and incorporating world wide discourses and blueprints for economic and political reform into daily practice, local actors also shape the nature of neoliberalisms and globalization.

Tatjana Thelen is a Senior Researcher at the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology in Halle/Saale, Germany. She has taught courses in Social Anthropology at universities in Berlin, Halle and Szeged, Hungary. She is author of the book *Privatisierung und soziale Ungleichheit in der osteuropäischen Landwirtschaft. Zwei Fallstudien in Ungarn und Rumänien* (Privatisation and social inequality in eastern European agriculture. Two case studies from Hungary and Romania; 2003). Her current research focuses on changing social security relations in eastern Germany.

E-mail: thelen@eth.mpg.de.

Rosie Read is a Senior Lecturer at the Institute of Health and Community Studies, Bournemouth University. She gained her PhD in Social Anthropology from Manchester University in 2002. Her doctoral study explored gender, work, and changing ideologies of nursing care in the context of postsocialist reforms in the Czech Republic. Her current research, also based in the Czech Republic, examines volunteering and gender in social care contexts. She is the author of several articles and has co-edited *Changes in the Heart of Europe: Recent Ethnographies of Czechs, Slovaks, Roma, and Sorbs*, with Timothy Hall (2006).

E-mail: rread@bournemouth.ac.uk.

Notes

1. For some time now anthropology and its related disciplines have acknowledged that states cannot be conceived as undifferentiated, organic entities acting in a wholly rational fashion. Instead, states comprise complex webs of institutions, actors, policies, and initiatives, all of which emerge and converge at different local, regional, and centralized or national levels (Bierschenk 1999; Ferguson and Gupta 2002; Lipsky 1980; Migdal 1994; Mitchell 1991; Scott 1998). Yet, parallel to this acknowledgment of the complex nature of states-as-institutions, it should be understood that states are also constructed in everyday discourse and practice, where they are frequently homogenized and essentialized, and thus rendered culturally knowable (Herzfeld 1997).
2. Similarly, many welfare state allocative activities (tax exemptions and reductions, state-subsidized credits, etc.) in Western industrialized countries are most advantageous to middle-income groups (Mingione 1991: 210).
3. Our understanding of public and private draws on that of Gal and Kligman (2000a: 41), who state that “the public/private dichotomy is best understood as a discursive distinction that, once established, can be used to characterize, categorize, organize and contrast virtually any kind of social fact; spaces, institutions, groups, people’s identities, discourses, activities, interaction, relations. Public and private are indexical signs, or shifters, always dependent for part of their referential meaning on the interactional contexts in which they are used.” In this sense, public and private are “flexible cultural resources that enable new imaginings of social action” (Gal and Kligman, 2000a: 42).
4. Haney (1999, 2002) throws light on the historical development of socialist welfare principles and differentiates among the various socialist welfare regimes in the case of Hungary.
5. Interestingly, other authors have advanced a contrasting view on the phenomenon of personal relations. They see the private sphere as shrinking, rather than gaining in importance in socialist societies (Garcelon 1997; Kharkhordin 1997). On this basis, some have argued that the public/private distinction developed in Western countries cannot be applied to socialist societies. This difference results in part from the stronger emphasis placed by these authors on an encompassing state control in all realms of social life, and in part on their equation of the private sphere with more emotional, authentic feelings.
6. In contrast to allocative state activities, such as tax policies, productive interventions that involve

direct redistribution often entail social stigma (Mingione 1991: 210; see also Johnson 1987: 12).

References

- Adam, Jan. 1991. Social contract. In *Economic reforms and welfare systems in the USSR, Poland and Hungary: Social contract in transformation*, ed. Jan Adam, 1–26, Houndmills, UK: Macmillan.
- Adkins, Lisa. 2002. *Revisions: Gender and sexuality in late modernity*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Adkins, Lisa, and C. Lury. 1999. The labour of identity: Performing identities, performing economies. *Economy and Society* 28 (4): 598–614.
- Ahmad, Ehtisham, Hean Dréze, John Hills, and Amartya Sen, eds. 1991. *Social security in developing countries*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Anderson, Bridget. 2000. *Doing the dirty work? The global politics of domestic labour*. London: Zed Books.
- Ascoli, Ugo, and Constanzo Ranci. 2002. The context of new social policies in Europe. In *Dilemmas of the welfare mix: The new structure of welfare in an era privatization*, ed. Ugo Ascoli and Constanzo Ranci, 1–24. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Aslund, Anders. 1992. *Post-Communist economic revolutions: How big a bang?* Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies.
- Benda-Beckmann, Franz von. 2005. ‘Nicht mehr’ und ‘noch nicht’: Umkehrungen von Tradition und Modernität auf der Suche nach der passenden Solidarität für soziale Sicherung. *Rechtsgeschichte* 6: 29–40.
- Benda-Beckmann, Franz von, and Keebet von Benda-Beckmann. 1994. Introduction. In *Coping with insecurity: An ‘underall’ perspective on social security in the Third World*, ed. Franz von Benda-Beckmann, Keebet von Benda-Beckmann, and Hans Marks. *Focaal* 22/23: 7–34.
- Benda-Beckmann, Franz von, Keebet von Benda-Beckmann, Eric Casino, Frank Hirtz, Gordon Woodman, and Hans Zacher, eds. 1988. *Between kinship and the state: Social security and law in developing countries*. Dordrecht: Foris, Walter de Gruyter.
- Benda-Beckmann, Keebet von. 1994. Social security in developing countries; A mixed blessing. In *Social (in)security and poverty a global issues*, ed. M.T.W. Meereboer, 10–24. The Hague: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Development Information Department.
- Bierschenk, Thomas. 1999. Dezentralisierung und lokale Demokratie: Macht und Politik im ländlichen Benin in den 80er Jahren. In *Dezentralisierung, Demokratisierung und die lokale Repräsentation des Staates: theoretische Kontroversen und empirische Forschungen*, ed. Thomas Bierschenk and Jeapierre de Olivier, 37–68. Köln: Köppe.
- Bolton, Sharon C., and Carol Boyd. 2003. Trolley dolly or skilled emotion manager? Moving on from Hochschild’s managed heart. *Work Employment and Society* 17 (2): 289–308.
- Bridger Sue, and Frances Pine, eds. 1998. *Surviving post-socialism: Local strategies and regional responses in eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union*. London: Routledge.
- Caldwell, Melissa. 2004. *Not by bread alone: Social support in the new Russia*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Carter, John. 1998. *Postmodernity and the fragmentation of welfare*. London: Routledge.
- Colley, Helen. 2006. Learning to labor with feeling: Class, gender and emotion in childcare education and training. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood* 7 (1): 15–29.
- Constable, Nicole. 1997. *Maid to order in Hong Kong: Stories of Filipina workers*. London: Cornell University Press.
- de Konig, Peter. 1988. Bureaucrat-client interaction: Normative pluralism in the implementation of social security disability laws. In *Between kinship and the state: Social security and law in developing countries*, ed. Franz v. Benda-Beckmann et al., 376–98. Dordrecht: Foris.
- DeJong, Willemin, and Claudia Roth. 2005. *Ageing in insecurity: Case studies on social security and gender in India and Burkina Faso*. Münster: Germany: Lit.
- DeVault, Marjorie L. 1991. *Feeding the family: The social organization of caring as gendered work*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Döring, Dieter, ed. 1999. *Sozialstaat in der Globalisierung*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.
- Einhorn, Barbara. 1993. *Cinderella goes to market: Citizenship, gender and women’s movements in East Central Europe*. London: Verso.

- Esping-Andersen, Gøsta, ed. 1996. *Welfare states in transition: National adaptations in global economies*. London: Sage.
- Euwijk, Peter van. 2004. When social security reaches its limits: Long-term care of elderly people in urban Indonesia. In *Exploring social (in)-securities in Asia*, ed. Romana Büchel, 74–90. Bern: Institut für Sozialanthropologie.
- Feder, Ellen K., and Eva Feder Kittay. 2003. Introduction. In *The subject of care: Feminist perspectives on dependency*, ed. Eva Feder Kittay and Ellen K. Feder, 1–12. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Ferguson, James, and Akhil Gupta. 2002. Spatializing states: Toward an ethnography of neoliberal governmentality. *American Ethnologist* 29 (2): 981–1002.
- Field, Mark, and Judyth Twigg, eds. 2000. *Russia's torn safety nets: Health and social welfare during the transition*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.
- Finch, Janet. 1994. *Family obligations and social change*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Finch, Janet, and Jennifer Mason. 1993. *Negotiating family responsibilities*. London: Routledge.
- Fraser, Nancy. 1997. *Justice interruptus: Critical reflections on the 'post-socialist' condition*. New York: Routledge.
- Gal, Susan. 1994. Gender in the post-socialist transition: The abortion debate in Hungary. *East European Politics and Societies* 8 (2): 256–86.
- Gal, Susan, and Gail Kligman. 2000a. *The politics of gender after socialism: A comparative historical essay*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 2000b. Introduction. In *Reproducing gender: Politics, publics and everyday life after socialism*, ed. Susan Gal and Gail Kligman, 3–19. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ganesh, Kamala. 2005. 'Made to measure': Dutch elder care at the intersections of policy and culture. In *Care, culture and citizenship: Revising the Dutch welfare state*, ed. Carla Risseuw, Rajni Palriwala and Kamala Ganesh, 116–58. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Garcelon, Marc. 1997. The shadow of the Leviathan: Public and private in Communist and Post-Communist society. In *Public and private in thought and practice: Perspectives on a grand dichotomy*, ed. Jeff Weintraub and Krishan Kumar, 303–32. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Goven, Joanna. 2000. New parliament, old discourse? The parental leave debate in Hungary. In *Reproducing gender: Politics, publics and everyday life after socialism*, ed. Susan Gal and Gail Kligman, 286–306. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Haggard, Stephan, and Robert R. Kaufman. 2001. Introduction. In *Reforming the state: Fiscal and welfare reform in post-socialist countries*, ed. Janos Kornai, Stephan Haggard and Robert Kaufman, 1–24. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haney, Lynne. 1999. 'But we are still mothers': Gender, the state, and the construction of need in post-socialist Hungary. In *Uncertain transition: Ethnographies of change in the post-socialist world*, ed. Michael Burawoy and Katherine Verdery, 151–87. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- . 2002. *Inventing the needy: Gender and the politics of welfare in Hungary*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hashimoto, Akiko. 1996. *The gift of generations: Japanese and American perspectives on aging and the social contract*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haukanes, Haldis. 2001. Women as nurturers: Food, risk and ideals of care in the Czech Republic. In *Women after Communism: Ideal images and real lives*, ed. Haldis Haukanes, 67–79. Bergen: Centre for Women's Studies and Gender Relations, University of Bergen.
- Herzfeld, Michael. 1997. *Cultural intimacy: Social poetics and the nation state*. London: Routledge.
- Hivon, Myriam. 1998. The bullied farmer: Social pressure as survival strategy? In *Surviving post-socialism: Local strategies and regional responses in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union*, ed. Sue Bridger and Frances Pine, 33–51. London: Routledge.
- Hochschild, Arlie Russel. 2000. Global care chains and emotional surplus value. In *On the edge: Living with global capitalism*, ed. Will Hutton and Anthony Giddens, 130–46. London: Jonathan Cape.
- . [1983] 2003. *The managed heart: Commercialisation of human feeling*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. 2001. *Doméstica: Immigrant workers cleaning and caring in the shadows of affluence*. London: University of California Press.

- Howe, Leo. 1990. *Being unemployed in Northern Ireland: An ethnographic study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huseby-Darvas, Éva V. 1996. 'Feminism, the murderer of mothers': The rise and fall of neo-nationalist reconstruction of gender in Hungary. In *Women out of place: The gender of agency and the race of nationality*, ed. Brackette F. Williams, 161–85. London: Routledge.
- James, Nicky. 1989. Emotional labour: Skill and work in the social regulation of feeling. *Sociological Review* 37: 15–42.
- James, Nicky. 1992. Care = Organisation + Physical labour + Emotional labour. *Sociology of Health and Illness* 14 (4): 488–509.
- Johnson, Norman. 1987. *The welfare state in transition: The theory and practice of welfare pluralism*. Brighton, UK: Wheatsheaf Books.
- Kalb, Don, Maruška Svašek, and Herman Tak. 1999. Approaching the 'new' past in East-Central Europe. *Focaal* 33: 9–23.
- Kalb, Don. 1997. *Expanding class: Power and everyday politics in industrial communities in the Netherlands, 1850–1950*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Karjanen, David. 2005. Social atomization and structural violence in the transition from socialism. *Anthropology of East Europe Review*, Special Issue on Czech, Slovaks, and Sorbs, guest editors: Timothy M. Hall and Rosie Read, 17 (1): 30–37.
- Katz, Michael B. 1989. *The undeserving poor: From the war on poverty to the war on welfare*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Kharkhordin, Oleg. 1997. Reveal and dissimulate: A genealogy of private life in Soviet Russia. In *Public and private in thought and practice: Perspectives on a grand dichotomy*, ed. Jeff Weintraub and Krishan Kumar, 333–64. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kideckel, David A. 1995. Communities in the East European transition. In *East European communities: The struggle for balance in turbulent times*, ed. David A. Kideckel, 1–6. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Kideckel, David A. 2002. The unmaking of an East-Central European working class. In *Post-socialism: Ideals, ideologies and practices in Eurasia*, ed. Chris M. Hann, 114–32. London: Routledge.
- Kiely, Julia A. 2005. Emotions in business-to-business service relationships. *Service Industries Journal* 25 (3): 373–90.
- Klaus, Vaclav. 1992. *Dismantling socialism: A preliminary report*. Prague: Top Agency.
- Knijn, Trudie. 2000. The rationalized marginalization of care: Time is money, isn't it? In *Gender and citizenship in transition*, ed. Barbara Hobson, 201–19. New York: Routledge.
- Knijn, Trudie, and Monique Kremer. 1997. Gender and the caring dimension of welfare states: Towards inclusive citizenship. *Social Politics* (Fall): 328–61.
- Kornai, János. 1990. *The road to a free economy. Shifting from a socialist system: The example of Hungary*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Kornai János, and Karen Eggleston. 2001. *Welfare, choice and solidarity in transition: Reforming the health care sector in Eastern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lapidus, Gail W. 1978. *Women in Soviet society: Equality, development, and social change*. Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- Ledeneva, Alena V. 1998. *Russia's economy of favors: Blat, networking and informal exchange*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leliveld, André. 1994. *Social security in developing countries: Operation and dynamics of social security mechanisms in rural Swaziland*. Tinbergen Institute Research Series: Thesis Publishers.
- Leutloff-Grandits, Carolin, Anja Peleikis, and Tatjana Thelen. 2008. *Creating social (in-) security through religious networks: Ethnographic approaches*. New York: Berghahn.
- Lipsky, Michael. 1980. *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Lister, Ruth. 1997. *Citizenship: Feminist perspectives*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.
- Marcus, Anthony. 2006. *Where have all the homeless gone? The making and unmaking of a crisis*. New York: Berghahn.
- Midgley, James. 1984. *Social security, inequality and the third world*. Chichester: UK John Wiley.
- Migdal, Joel S. 1994. The state in society: An approach to struggles for domination. In *State power and social forces: Domination and transformation in the third world*, ed. Joel S. Migdal, Atul Kohli, and Vivienne Shue, 7–36. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mingione, Enzo. 1991. *Fragmented societies: A sociology of economic life beyond the market paradigm*. Cambridge, UK: Basil Blackwell.

- Mishra, Ramesh. 1990. *The welfare state in capitalist society*. Hemel Hempstead, UK: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- . 1999. *Globalization and the welfare state*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Mitchell, Timothy. 1991. The limits of the state: Beyond statist approaches and their critics. *American Political Science Review* 85 (1): 77–96.
- Moghadan, Valentine M. 1993. Bringing the third world in a comparative analysis of gender and restructuring. In *Democratic reform and the position of women in transitional economies*, ed. Moghadan, Valentine M., 327–52. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nash, Rebecca. 2003. Re-stating the family: Kinship and care in the Czech Republic. Unpublished PhD dissertation: University of Virginia.
- Nazpary, Joma. 2001. *Post-Soviet chaos: Violence and dispossession in Kazakhstan*. London: Pluto Press.
- Nettleton, Sarah, and Roger Burrows. 1998. Insecurity, reflexivity and risk in the restructuring of contemporary British health and housing policies. In *Postmodernity and the fragmentation of welfare*, ed. John Carter, 153–67. London: Routledge.
- Orme, Joan. 1998. Community care: Gender issues. *British Journal of Social Work* 28: 615–22.
- Partsch, Manfred. 1983. *Prinzipien und Formen sozialer Sicherung in nicht-industriellen Gesellschaften*. Sozialpolitische Schriften, Heft 48. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
- Pateman, Carole. 1988. *The sexual contract*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Pierce, Jennifer. 1997. *Gender trials*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Pierson, Christopher, and Francis G. Castles, eds. 2000. *The welfare state: A reader*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Pierson, Paul. 1994. *Dismantling the welfare state?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pine, Frances. 2002. Retreat to the household? Gendered domains in post-socialist Poland. In *Post-socialism: Ideals, ideologies and practices in Eurasia*, ed. Chris Hann, 95–113. London: Routledge.
- Pine, Frances, and Haldis Haukanes. 2005. Introduction. In *Generations, kinship and care: Gendered provisions of social security in Central Eastern Europe*, ed. Frances Pine and Haldis Haukanes, 1–22. Bergen: University of Bergen.
- Ranci, Constanzo. 2002. The mixed economy of social care in Europe. In *Dilemmas of the welfare mix: The new structure of welfare in an era of privatization*, ed. Ugo Ascoli and Constanzo Ranci, 25–46. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Read, Rosie. 2005. Altering care: Gifts and emotion in nursing practice within a Czech nursing home. In *Generations, kinship and care: Gendered provisions of social security in Central Eastern Europe*, ed. Haldis Haukanes and Frances Pine, 137–62. Vol. 17. Bergen: University of Bergen, Centre for Women's and Gender Research.
- Read, Rosie. 2007. Labour and love: Competing constructions of 'care' in a Czech nursing home. *Critique of Anthropology* 27 (2): 203–22.
- Rohregger, Barbara. 2006. *Shifting boundaries: Social security in the urban fringe of Lingowe City, Malawi*. Aachen, Germany: Shaker.
- Ryner, Magnus J. 2000. European welfare state transformation and migration. In *Immigration and welfare: Challenging the borders of the welfare state*, ed. Michael Bommes and Andrew Geddes, 51–71. London: Routledge.
- Ryner, Magnus J. 2002. *Capitalist restructuring, globalisation and the third way: Lessons from the Swedish model*. London: Routledge.
- Sampson, Steven. 1985–86. The informal sector in Eastern Europe. *Telos* 66: 278–300.
- Sampson, Steven. 1995. All is possible, nothing is certain: The horizons of transition in a Romanian village. In *East European communities: The struggle for balance in turbulent times*, ed. David A. Kideckel, 159–75. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Scott, James C. 1998. *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition failed*. Newhaven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Shreeves, Rosamund. 2002. Broadening the concept of privatization: Gender and development in rural Kazakhstan. In *Markets and moralities: Ethnographies of post-socialism*, ed. Ruth Mandel and Caroline Humphries, 211–35. Oxford: Berg.
- Sneath, David. 2002. Mongolia in the 'age of the market': Pastoral land-use and the development discourse. In *Markets and moralities: Ethnographies of post-socialism*, ed. Ruth Mandel and Caroline Humphries, 191–210. Oxford: Berg.
- Sotiropoulos, Dimitri A. 2005. Poverty and safety net in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe in the

- post-communist era. In *Welfare state reform in Southern Europe: Fighting poverty and social exclusion in Italy, Spain, Portugal and Greece*, ed. Maurizio Ferrera, 266–96. London: Routledge.
- Standing, Guy. 1996. Social protection in Central and Eastern Europe: A tale of slipping anchors and torn safety nets. In *Welfare states in transition: National adaptations in global economies*, ed. Gosta Esping-Andersen, 225–55. London: Sage.
- Stark, David, and L. Bruszt. 1998. *Postsocialist pathways: transforming politics and property in East Central Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thelen, Tatjana. 2005. Caring grandfathers: Changes in support between generations in East Germany. In *Generations, kinship and care: Gendered provisions of social security in Central Eastern Europe*, ed. Haldis Haukanes and Frances Pine, 163–88. Vol. 17. Bergen: University of Bergen, Centre for Women's and Gender Research.
- . 2006a. Lunch in an East German enterprise: Difference in eating habits as symbols of collective identities. *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 1 (131): 51–70.
- . 2006b. *The loss of trust: Changing social relations in the workplace in Eastern Germany*. Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle/Saale, Working Paper No. 78.
- . 2006c. Law and mutual assistance in families: A comparison of socialist legacies in Hungary and eastern Germany. *Journal of Legal Pluralism* (Fall, 53–54): 177–207.
- Thomas, Carol. 1993. Deconstructing concepts of care. *Sociology* 27 (4): 649–69.
- Ungerson, Clare. 1999. *The production and consumption of long-term care: Does gender matter?* European University Institute, Florence, Working Paper EUF No. 99/19.
- Ungerson, Clare. 2000. The commodification of care: Current policies and future politics. In *Gender and citizenship in transition*, ed. Barbara Hobson, 173–200. New York: Routledge.
- Verdery, Katherine. 1996. *What was socialism and what comes next?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Walker, Michael. 1998. Survival strategies in an industrial town in east Ukraine. In *Surviving post-socialism: Local strategies and regional responses in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union*, ed. Sue Bridger and Frances Pine, 188–202. London: Routledge.
- Wedel, Janine. 1986. *The private Poland: An anthropologist's look at everyday life*. New York: Facts on File.
- . 1998. *Collision and collusion: The strange case of Western aid to eastern Europe*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Weintraub, Jeff. 1997. The theory and politics of the public/private distinction. In *Public and private in thought and practice: Perspectives on a grand dichotomy*, ed. Jeff Weintraub and Krishan Kumar, 1–43. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wouters, Cas. 1989. The sociology of emotions and flight attendants: Hochschild's managed heart. *Theory, Culture and Society* 6: 95–123.
- Zacher, Hans F. 1988. Traditional solidarity and modern social security: Harmony or conflict? In *Between kinship and the state: Social security and law in developing countries*, ed. Franz von Benda-Beckmann et al., 21–38. Dordrecht: Foris.