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***† Not just summarize, but focus on the points:***

*1) What is the main question of this piece?*

*2) Why is this piece selected as distinctive one in terms of welfare state research?*

*3) What are the mechanisms the author looking for?*

Esping-Anderson (1990) takes a broader approach to understand the welfare state. It means that he does not focus on particular social policy *per se*, but on how different nations arrive at their peculiar public-private sector mix (p. 2).

Key concepts

1. Welfare state: In Esping-Anderson (1990), he criticizes the definition welfare states of Titmuss (1955) and Therbon (1983) as they are ahistorical and do not focus on the process.
2. De-commodification

* Decommodificationof the status of individuals vis-à-vis the market; A state can provide with *compensation* for a lost labor-input (commodity) through state intervention; compensation for *potential* loss of job, income or general welfare because of sickness, injuries, unemployments.
* With regards to non-democracies, whether and under which conditions the authoritarian regimes have incentives to compensate to their constituencies?
* Individual & family-oriented / Market-oriented / State-oriented: Are appropriate concepts to capture the diversities (varying levels) of the welfare in authoritarian regimes?

1. Stratification: One’s status as a citizen defined based on one’s class position

* When it comes to the varied class stratification through state intervention, Esping-Anderson (1990) argues that income discrepancies as an indicator of the degree of social tensions, conflicts, and rivalry between classes.
* It means that the fewer income discrepancies, the fewer class tensions, and that in the more stratified society, it shows the higher class tensions and disharmony.

Mechanisms

The causes of the WSRs in Esping-Anderson (1990) are three.

1. First, he argues that the structure of trade unions and coalition with left-oriented parties.

* It seems that the coalition will not threat ruling power if it compensates the coalition enough.
* Can link this part with the co-optation strategy of autocrats?

1. Second, an agrarian class coalition with the conservative forces or with left parties let a state go toward more generous WSR.

* The quality? the attribute? the interests of the inner circle, which leads to the successful settlement of an authoritarian regime can matter.
* The economic condition whether they have enough resources to provide certain social policies of the regime would matter too.

1. Lastly, the political leaning of the new middle class leads to a higher level of welfare states.

* In sum, according to Esping-Anderson (1990), it is essential for which classes go to make a coalition and whether the coalition successfully takes the ruling initiative of the state.
* It seems to assume the new middle in terms of industrial societies in democracies, then how can we define the similar power, who has swaying power to determine the levels of the welfare or specification of the social policies in the authoritarian states?
  + Can we describe the co-opted constituencies as the ‘new middle’?
  + In democracies, the new middle can: democratic institutions guarantee the right to vote, and freedom of association (necessary for transfer power-resources to political pressure)
  + Do they have the initiative to change or shift the levels of resources using in authoritarian regimes?