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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.
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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 contributed 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 arrangements 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. 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). 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). 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. 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 equality 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 struggles 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 (Sotiopoulos 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). “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 their gendered consequences.

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 Kebe 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 provision 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 intrinsically 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
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comprise complex webs of institutions, actors, 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.
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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

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).


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).
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