

Changing Welfare States Towards the century of Social Investment?

1st Term, Academic Year 2021-2022

Thursdays, 09:00-11:00

First Seminar Session: 7 Oct 2021

Last Seminar Session: 9 Dec 2021

Instructors: Prof. Anton Hemerijck in collaboration with Dr. Johannes Karremans

Contact: Maureen Lechleitner (Maureen.Lechleitner@EUI.eu)
(Administrative Assistant)

Location: please check the Events calendar regularly for exact weekly locations
This will be an in-class seminar, unless developments in the Covid pandemic prevent it - in which case, the class will take place via Zoom or in hybrid.

Please register online in Osiris: Course Code SPS-RESHE-WEL-21

[Registration](#)

Aims

The course offers a comparative analysis of modern welfare state development and social reform against the background of changing nature of economics, politics and society. The aim is to introduce researchers to the state of the art in comparative welfare state research literature, with a special emphasis on recent changes in economy and society, such as the feminization of the labour market, demographic aging, economic internationalization and the impact of the global financial, on variegated national welfare states. The Seminar aims to provide researchers with advanced knowledge in the basic institutions underlying modern welfare states and their variation over time, pressed by structural change. The Seminar also provides skills in comparative cross-national and European welfare analysis, with special attention given to the variety of competing theories in the field and related methodological approaches.

Content

The welfare state, in the shape and form in which it developed in Western Europe in the second half of the twentieth century, represents a key institution in Europe's advanced political economies. Since the turn to the 21st century, five sets of challenges confront policy makers with the imperative to redirect the welfare effort, to redesign institutions and to elaborate on new principles of social justice, and all this, against the background of intensified European regional integration.

From without, in the first place, international competition is challenging the re-distributive scope and de-commodifying power of the national welfare state, its capacity to shield people in need against the hard laws of the marketplace. Many academic observers believed that the increase in cross-border competition in the markets for money, goods and services has substantially reduced the room for manoeuvre of national welfare states. In addition, there is the danger that tax competition results in an under-provision of public goods.

Second, *from within*, ageing populations, as a result of rising life expectancy and rapidly falling birth rates, changing family structures, the feminisation of the labour market, changes in work organization, and skill-biased technological change tend to challenge the institutions of work and welfare inherited from the industrial age. Low or falling employment levels of many social groups, new and rising inequalities, skill-biased patterns of social exclusion, and new sources of immigration and segregation, also in the housing market in metropolitan areas, pose a threat to social cohesion.

Third, while policy makers must find new ways to manage the adverse consequences of economic internationalisation and post-industrial differentiation, their attempts to recast the welfare state are constrained by long-standing social policy commitments in the areas of unemployment and pensions, which have ushered in a period of *permanent austerity*. The maturation of post-war welfare commitments seems to crowd-out effective policy responses favouring a successful transition towards the post-industrial and knowledge-based economy of the 21st century.

Then there is the challenge of *Europeanisation*. Issues of work and welfare have since the mid-1980s become intertwined with the Single Market and the European Monetary Union (EMU). In the European Union (EU) we have entered an era of *semi-sovereign welfare states*. National welfare states can no longer behave as if they were autonomous and in control. European (economic) integration has fundamentally recast the boundaries of national systems of social protection, constraining the autonomy for domestic policy options but also opening opportunities for EU-led multi-level policy coordination.

Last but not least, there are the social, economic and political shocks and aftershocks of the crises that have hit Europe over the last fifteen years, starting with the global financial crisis of 2008 and ending with the Covid-19 crisis, with the Eurozone (2009-2015) and the refugee (2015-16) crises in-between. In the process of mounting pressures and crisis-related contingencies, recently there has been considerable re-appreciation of the welfare state, particularly in high social-spending countries that have seemingly ‘buffered’ the crises well, under the heading of social investment, exemplified in terms of three core welfare policy functions relating to: raising and maintaining human capital “stock” throughout the life course; easing the “flow” of contemporary labour market transitions; and upkeeping strong minimum-income universal safety nets as social protection and economic stabilization “buffers”. Slowly but surely, the neoliberal imperative of ‘making work pay’ by social retrenchment and market deregulation is replaced by a ‘capacitating’ approach, whereby activating poverty relief, family and gender policy, education, training and employment services, and public health, are

understood to ‘crowd in’, rather than ‘crowd out’, private economic initiative, productivity, employment, and growth, while containing inequality.

As a result of intrusive structural change, the academic debate about 21st century welfare provision is very different in comparison to two decades ago. Attempts to explain welfare state diversity and political stalemates in retrenchment endeavours, strongly influenced by the work of Gøsta Esping-Andersen on ‘the three worlds of welfare capitalism and Paul Pierson’s conjecture of the ‘new politics’ of the welfare state’ of the 1990s, are giving to new understandings of transformative welfare policy change over the past decade. Social investment reforms in Denmark, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, and Spain in the 1990s and 2000s, before the onset of the Great Depression required a fuller and more nuanced understanding of the interaction between domains that are often treated separately in comparative welfare analysis, like macroeconomic, fiscal, industrial relations, labour market policy and regulation, and work-life balance policies, beyond the traditional confines of decommodifying social security, against the dynamic background of globalisation, European integration, demographic shifts, changing family patterns and gendered labour market behaviour. The comprehensive — political economy — view of the politics of the ‘new welfare state’ encouraged scholars to transcend narrowly conceived preoccupations with decommodifying social security and to engage in comparative research that also integrates ‘capacitating’ social service provision at decentralized levels of governance and EU-level single market, fiscal and monetary policy coordination.

Objectives

Researchers who have successfully completed this course should be able to:

- Produce well-structured academic response papers, employing the analytical tools of comparative political economic and welfare regime studies in conjunction with important theoretical understanding of EU social and economic policy coordination, drawing on a broad range of sources;
- Make clear and concise oral presentations based on the basis of serious reading exercises, collection of relevant data on the changing nature of social risks and associated political conflict and compromise national over reform, including at the level of EU socioeconomic policy-making;
- Design and write brief synopses on the multidimensional politics of welfare – particularly on social investment – reform in selected countries (of their own choosing) in the wake of the global financial crisis and the shadow of intensified European (economic) policy coordination.

The course will provide researchers with the conceptual and empirical background information to enable them to write focused Phd-theses, and to answer questions like:

- How variegated welfare regimes across Europe have been seeking to reconcile the alleged trade-off equity and efficiency in economically hard times?

-
- What drives reform, which institutions, ideas and power resources help their enactment, and – vice versa – which institutional conditions stall transformative policy change?
- What motivates political actors to pursue structural reform or, vice versa, decline to ponder intrusive policy change?
- How the political boundaries of EU and domestic social and economic policy are being challenged on the backdrop of what new conflict lines, especially across the post-crisis Eurozone?
- Whether social investment (still) is the more appropriate answer to the exigencies of the 21st century competitive knowledge-based economy?
- Will the EU be given the time and energy to develop a European social (investment) union, or will the aftermath of the economic crisis, and its associated nationalist backlashes, entrap the EU and its member welfare states in secular stagnation, unleashing domestic political spillovers which may break Europe and national welfare states apart?
- What are the consequences of Covid-19 for the welfare state and European (economic) integration.

Participation and examination

Attendance at seminars is compulsory for those who register for this course. EVERY member of the seminar is liable to be called upon to discuss ANY of the core readings in any week, as active participation in the discussion is vital to the success of the course. Other members of the EUI may be welcome to attend but should consult the course provider in advance of the first meeting of the class.

All researchers registering for the course will be expected to produce three response papers. The first two response papers (500 words) should engage with the literature of the class. The third response paper (1000 words) should be more empirical, and take a specific case of social policy initiative and link it to the literature of the class. The response papers should be circulated 24 hours in advance of the seminars, and students will be asked to give 10 minute presentations of their papers. In the first session, we will make a plan for how the response papers are going to be distributed throughout the course. The idea is that each student writes a response paper for one of the sessions 2-4, one of the sessions 5-7, and the empirical response papers for the sessions 8-10.

For researcher wishing to write a term paper for this seminar/workshop, please send a copy by email to the seminar's professor, with a cc. to Maureen Lechleitner.

Schedule

The full list of seminar sessions is the following:

- Session 1: Thursday 07 October – 09.00 Refectory
- Session 2: Thursday 14 October – 09.00 Emeroteca
- Session 3: Thursday 21 October – 09.00 Refectory
- Session 4: Thursday 28 October – 09.00 Emeroteca
- Session 5: Thursday 04 November 09.00 Sala del Capitolo
- Session 6: Thursday 11 November 09.00 Sala del Capitolo
- Session 7: Thursday 18 November 09.00 Emeroteca
- Session 8: Thursday 25 November 09.00 Sala del Capitolo
- Session 9: Thursday 02 December 09.00 Sala del Capitolo
- Session 10: Thursday 09 December 09.00 TBA

Literature

The course largely builds on the themes of the volume ‘Changing Welfare States’ by Anton Hemerijck (Oxford University Press 2013). The seminar brings this volume in discussion with the broader welfare state literature, including also contributions to the edited volume *The Uses of Social Investment* by Anton Hemerijck (Oxford University Press, 2017). For the full list of readings, please see below.

Session 1: Welfare state regimes: between industrial and post-industrial economies

Classification of countries into distinct welfare regimes is a common approach in comparative social policy research, most notably since Esping-Andersen’s seminal book *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism* (1990). Countries belonging to different welfare regimes are expected to react differently to similar challenges due to persisting differences in the relative balance between the state, the market, and the family. Thus, the principal expectation of the regime theory is that of persistent diversity across welfare regimes. In this session, we get acquainted to Esping-Andersen’s typology of welfare ‘regimes’ and discuss how to account for regime temporality, path-dependency and transformation. We then look at contributions from other scholars who have sought to further develop these overarching configurations, and their application in current comparative social policy research. We will also discuss Chapter 1 and 3 from the “Changing Welfare States” volume (Hemerijck 2013), which will also allow us to give an overview of the themes of the course.

Readings:

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press. Chapters 1 and 9

Esping-Andersen, G. (1999). *Social Foundations of Post-industrial Economies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Chapter 5: ‘Comparative Welfare Regimes Re-examined’.

Arts, W., & Gelissen, J. (2002). Three worlds of welfare capitalism or more? A state-of-the-art report. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 12(2), 137–158.

Hemerijck, A. (2013), *Changing Welfare States*, Oxford University Press, chapters 1 and 3.

Session 2: The Core Contention: between welfare state inertia and (gradual) transformative change

The first session confronts the core theoretical issue at stake, concerning the adjustment or (non-)reform capacity of contemporary welfare states to endogenous and external challenges. Two positions can be found in the literature. On the one hand, there is the conjecture that welfare state change is close to impossible. On the other hand, there is the alternative observation that welfare reform is difficult, but that it happens notwithstanding.

Readings:

Pierson, P. (2011). ‘The Welfare State over the Very Long Run’, *ZeArbeitspapier*, No. 02/2011, <http://hdl.handle.net/10419/46215>.

Pierson, P. (1996), ‘The New Politics of the Welfare State’, *World Politics*, 48(2): 143-179. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/25053959.pdf?acceptTC=true>.

Hemerijck, A. (2013), *Changing Welfare States* (2013), Oxford University Press, chapter 2.

Vis, B. (2009). ‘Governments and Unpopular Social Policy Reform: Biting the Bullet or Steering Clear?’, *European Journal of Political Research*, 48(1): 31-57. Direct link: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1475-6765.2008.00783.x/abstract>.

Bonoli, G. (2012). ‘Blame Avoidance and Credit Claiming Revisited’. In Bonoli, G. & Natali, D. (eds.). *The Politics of the New Welfare State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Session 3: Transformative welfare state change – The era of recalibration

While the retrenchment-literature focuses on cutbacks or continuity in social policy in times of persistent austerity, other authors point at the emergence of welfare state reform influenced by policy objectives unrelated to austerity and ‘blame avoidance’. These include economic competitiveness, social equality, fiscal responsibility, and intergenerational solidarity. New ideas and norms are being formed both among national actors and international organizations such as the United Nations and the European Union, affecting ideational change and redrawing of welfare boundaries. This session highlights the need to take a long-term perspective when analyzing social policy continuity and change, and to consider the causes and consequences of

ideational change for social policy transformation.

Readings:

Hemerijck, A. (2013). *Changing welfare states*. Oxford University Press. Chapters 5, 6 and 7

Van Kersbergen, K., & Hemerijck, A. (2012). Two decades of change in Europe: the emergence of the social investment state. *Journal of Social Policy*, 41(3), 475-492.

Seeleib-Kaiser, M. (2016). The End of the Conservative German Welfare State Model. *Social Policy & Administration*, 50(2), 219–240.

Bonoli G. ‘Time Matters: Postindustrialization, New Social Risks, and Welfare State Adaptation in Advanced Industrial Democracies’. *Comparative Political Studies*. 2007;40(5):495-520.

Session 4: Social Investment Paradigm Change?

Session 4 is about taking social investment seriously. Before the crisis struck, social investment recalibration had become the *fil rouge* in welfare reform among Europe’s mature welfare states. Policymakers in these countries recognized that in the face of intensified demographic ageing and disruptive technological change, future economic growth will rely heavily on high levels of employment and improvements in productivity.

Today, there is ample proof that social investments in child-care, long-term care, education and training, active labour market policy, lifelong learning and active ageing, paid parental leave, family services and benefits, in a complementary fashion, significantly contribute to employment, productivity, demographic balance, improved fertility, increased tax revenue, reduced long-term reliance on compensatory social protection policies, and lower levels of poverty.

The session is built around a discussion of a foundational text that G. Esping-Andersen wrote for the *Why We Need a New Welfare State* volume for OUP and more recent endorsement of the social investment perspective on the score of its promise of high levels of employment at subdued levels of inequality. In addition, specific attention will be given to some of the more recent critiques of the social investment paradigm in comparative social policy analysis. A fair number of political scientists are therefore quite sceptical about an effective social investment reform in the aftermath of the Great Recession. Any kind of politics of investment suggests an explicit political exchange on the part of reformers to deliberately sacrifice or forego short-term consumption in order to reap long-term gains that make everybody better off in the future. In times of austerity, as we know, for Paul Pierson social investments provide rather few short-term electoral rewards for politicians facing negatively biased electorates.

Esping-Andersen, G., D. Gallie, A. Hemerijck and J. Myles (2002), *Why We Need a New Welfare State*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, chapter 1.

Hemerijck, A. (ed.) (2017), *The Uses of Social Investment*, Oxford; Oxford University Press, Chapter 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 16

Jacobs, A.M. (2011). 'Theorizing Intertemporal Policy Choice', in: *Governing for the Long Term. Democracy and the Politics of Investment*, Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press, chap. 2, pp. 28-71

Session 5: Varieties of welfare state change – institutional and ideational explanations

Comparative welfare state scholars have over the past decade been increasingly grappling with the theoretical predicament to try and make sense of reform dynamics. In doing so, a fair number of political scientists have come to nuance the conjecture of 'blame avoidance' in the politics of the 'new' welfare state. It has been accepted that, however defined, 'institutions matter' for political behaviour, social interaction, and welfare performance. Although institutions cannot be changed at will, the 'lock in' effects of policy and strategy continuity should also not be exaggerated. In order for institutions to survive under conditions of structural social and economic change, decision-makers invoke strategies of institutional adaptation which are often accompanied by processes of social learning, characterized by a dialectic intermediating between the 'contest of power', the 'the play of ideas' and prevailing 'policy legacies' and the 'rules of the game' of politics and administration.

Hemerijck, A. (2013). Changing welfare states. Oxford University Press. Chapter 4

Béland, D. (2009). Ideas, institutions, and policy change. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 16 (5), 701–718.

Streeck, W., and K. Thelen (2005) *Beyond Continuity: Institutional Change in Advanced Political Economies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, chap. 1.

Crouch, C. (2010), 'Complementarity', in: G. Morgan, J.L. Campbell, C. Crouch, O.K. Pedersen and R. Whitley (eds), *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Institutional Analysis*, pp. 117-137.

Seeleib-Kaiser, M., and T. Fleckenstein (2007) 'Discourse, Learning and Welfare State Change: The Case of German Labour Market Reforms', *Social Policy and Administration*, 41(5): 427–48.

Vis, B., & Van Kersbergen, K. (2013). Towards an open functional approach to welfare state change: Pressures, ideas, and blame avoidance. *Public Administration*, 91(4), 840-854.

Session 6: The electoral turn: welfare state change as a response to electoral preferences?

An important shift in the recent literature on the welfare state has been the so-called ‘electoral turn’ in explaining (non-)reform. Scholars advocating an ‘electoral turn’ have shifted attention to bottom-up electoral behaviour and partisanship mobilization, steeped in quantitative public opinion survey research (and experiments) on welfare-and-work related issues, to the input side of the political process. There is a distinct departure from the core institutional insight that ‘policy shapes social politics’, as scholars under the ‘electoral turn’ assume parties respond in a synchronic short-term fashion, congruent to electoral preferences, harking back to the pre-institutional presumption that ‘politics creates policy’.

Beramendi, P. S. Hausermann, H. Kitchelt, and H. Kriesi (2015), ‘Introduction: The Politics of Advanced Capitalism’, in: Beramendi, P. (et al.), *The Politics of Advanced Capitalism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gingrich, J., & Häusermann, S. (2015). The decline of the working-class vote, the reconfiguration of the welfare support coalition and consequences for the welfare state. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 25(1), 50-75.

Abou-Chadi T., E. Immergut, Recalibrating social protection: Electoral competition and the new partisan politics of the welfare state, First published: 15 October 2018
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12308>
<https://ejpr.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/1475-6765.12308?af=R>

T. Iversen and D. Soskice (2019), *Democracy and Prosperity. Reinventing Capitalism through a Turbulent Century*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, ‘Introduction’ pp.1-52.

Session 7: The Onslaught of the Great Recession – a *snap-shot* overview

Although the debate on the impact of the Great Recession on the welfare state is still ongoing, a number of articles and collections have delved into how the 2008 global credit crunch has affected national welfare state and EU social policy change. Most contributions emphasize fiscal consolidation and increased EU surveillance. Very few writings have addressed the great importance of automatic stabilization and fiscal discretion to buffer the blow. At face value, the more inclusive, high-spending, wide-coverage welfare states of north and western Europe, with deep fiscal pockets, including Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland, cushioned people during the economic downturn admirably, both at the levels of risk groups and demographic cohorts and in terms of macro-economic stabilization in the aggregate. The more segmented welfare states of southern Europe, especially Greece, were less proficient, not only in fairly distributing the crisis burden across risk groups and age cohorts, but also because of their limited stabilization capacity.

Pontusson, J., & Raess, D. (2012). How (and why) is this time different? The politics of economic crisis in Western Europe and the United States. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 15, 13-33.

Armingeon, K., and L. Baccaro (2012), ‘Political economy of the sovereign debt crisis: The Limits of Internal Devaluation’, in: *Industrial Law Review*, 41(3), pp. 254-75.

Armingeon, K., K. Gutman, and D. Weisstanner (2016), 'Choosing the Path of Austerity:

How parties and policy coalitions influence welfare state retrenchment in periods of fiscal consolidation', in: *West European Politics* 39 (4): 628-647. *First published online: December 23 2015 DOI: 10.1080/01402382.2015.1111072.*

Olafson, S. and K. Stefansson (2019), 'Welfare Consequences of the Crisis in Europe', in: Olafson, S., M. Daly, O. Kangas, and J. Palme (eds.), *Welfare and the Great Recession. A Comparative Study*, Oxford: Oxford University Press (2019), pp. 15- 42.

Helgason, A. F., 'Government Responses to the Great Recession. A Comparative Perspective', in: Olafson, S., M. Daly, O. Kangas, and J. Palme (eds.), *Welfare and the Great Recession. A Comparative Study*, Oxford: Oxford University Press (2019), pp. 59-79.

Session 8: Varieties of national responses

Over the past decades European welfare states have made considerable efforts to redirect labour market policy, employment regulation, social security benefits, pensions, family services and education and training programs, contingent on internal and external pressures, political mobilization and support, existing policy legacies and the institutional make-up of different welfare regimes. The result has been a highly *dynamic* era of reform, marked by considerable retrenchments, on the one hand, but also profound processes of 'welfare recalibration', conjuring up to a fundamental recasting of the functional, normative, distributive, and institutional underpinnings upon which European welfare states were historically based. It has been accepted that, however defined, 'institutions matter' for political behaviour, social interaction, and welfare performance. Although institutions cannot be changed at will, the 'lock in' effects of policy and strategy continuity should also not be exaggerated. In order for institutions to survive under conditions of structural social and economic change, decision-makers invoke strategies of institutional adaptation which are often accompanied by processes of social learning, characterized by a dialectic intermediating between the 'contest of power', the 'the play of ideas' and prevailing 'policy legacies' and the 'rules of the game' of politics and administration. Is this still true of deep crisis times?

Ronchi, S. (2018). Which roads (if any) to social investment? The recalibration of EU welfare states at the crisis crossroads (2000–2014). *Journal of Social Policy*, 47(3), 459–478.

M. Matsaganis (2019), 'Greece: The Crisis, Austerity, and the Transformation of Welfare', in: Olafson, S., M. Daly, O. Kangas, and J. Palme (eds.), *Welfare and the Great Recession. A Comparative Study*, Oxford: Oxford University Press (2019), pp. 83-96.

J. Palme (2019), 'Sweden: In Times of Two Crises', in: Olafson, S., M. Daly, O. Kangas, and J. Palme (eds.), *Welfare and the Great Recession. A Comparative Study*, Oxford: Oxford University Press (2019), pp. 228-45.

S. Sacchi (2016), 'Conditionality by Other Means: European Union Involvement in

Italy's Structural Reforms in the Sovereign Debt Crisis', in: C. de la Porte and E. Heins

(eds.), *The Sovereign Debt Crisis, the EU and Welfare State Reform*, London; Palgrave MacMillan (2016), pp. 159-79.

Hemerijck, A., J. Karremans, and M. van der Meer (2019), 'Minority Government Constructive Opposition, and Social Concertation in the Netherlands (2012 – 2019)', EUI (unpublished manuscript)

Hall, P.A. (2014) Varieties of Capitalism and the Euro Crisis, *West European Politics*, 37(6): 1223-1243. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2014.929352>

Session 9: The EU and the Welfare state: friends or foes?

The European Union (EU), a path-breaking post-war institutional innovation, just like the modern welfare state, has over-developed as a critical intervening variable in domestic processes of welfare state change. It is fair to say that in the EU we have entered an era of semi-sovereign welfare states. Important works have been written on how European integration has contributed to the loss of boundary control of national political economies, 'globalization' breaking down the borders of economic competition while contributing little to new welfare institution building. The establishment of the internal market and the introduction of the EMU and the Stability and Growth Pact have added a new economic supranational layer to domestic social and economic policy repertoires of individual Member States. How does this impact upon member states' spending decisions in the sphere of social policy?

Hemerijck, A. (2016) *New EMU Governance: Not (yet) ready for social investment?*, Working Paper No. 01/2016, Institute for European Integration Research, Vienna (I have a PDF).

Scharpf, F.W. (2009) 'Legitimacy in the multilevel European polity', *European Political Science Review*, 1(2): 173-204.

C. de la Porte and E. Heins (2016), 'A New Era of European Integration? Governance of Labour Market and Social Policy since the Sovereign Debt Crisis', in: C. de la Porte and E. Heins (eds.), *The Sovereign Debt Crisis, the EU and Welfare State Reform*, London; Palgrave MacMillan (2016), pp. 15-41.

Haas, J. S., D'Erman, V. J., Schulz, D. F., & Verdun, A. (2020). Economic and fiscal policy coordination after the crisis: is the European Semester promoting more or less state intervention? *Journal of European Integration*, 42(3), 327-344.

Karremans, J. (2021). Political alternatives under European economic governance: Evidence from German budget speeches (2009–2019). *Journal of European Public Policy*, 28(4), 510-531.

Zeitlin, J., & Vanhercke, B. (2018). Socializing the European Semester: EU social and economic policy co-ordination in crisis and beyond. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 25(2), 149-174.

Session 10: The welfare state in the post-Covid-19 world: towards the century of social investment?

Final roundtable discussion based on draft chapters from “Who’s afraid of the welfare state now? Lessons from the Great Recession for a post-Covid-19 social contract”. (in times of the Covid-19 Pandemic) by Anton Hemerijck and Manos Matsaganis.