

1. **The family pillar argument** (Amy Lang, Matt Vidal)
 - Is the family-system and the problems of its reproduction the same kind of constraint on the state as is the market (or capital)? What are the mechanisms that might translate a "crisis of the family" into a crisis of welfare states?
 - Is it really the case that this is an "equal pillar"? In the end is bottom line the need for the state to assume a more comprehensive role in risk-absorption?
 - GEA seems to collapse the issue of the family's role in welfare provision with the issue of women's dependency. Of course these are historically and empirically linked, but they seem quite distinct conceptually.
2. **de-familialization** (Robyn Autry, Landy Sanchez, Sarah Swider, Matt Vidal)
 - What precisely makes a policy an instance of "defamilialization"? Why are family allowances and paid parental leaves examples of de-familialization? These might be viewed as policies designed to make it easier for families to provide welfare. (EOW)
 - why does GEA believe that in general it would be an improvement if families had less responsibility for welfare-provision (less self-servicing)? It isn't so obvious that this is necessarily a good thing?
 - what "functions" does a defamilialized family serve? Would it completely cease to be a source of risk-reduction?
 - does defamilialization imply commodification? (Landy Sanchez)
 - GEA dismisses the possibility of generating greater gender equality in care providing within families, and seems to believe that the welfare state can do little to change this. Is this right
3. **The welfare state & fertility patterns.** (Shamus Khan, Robyn Autry, Theresa Melgar, Sarah Swider)
 - What precisely is the argument about how welfare regimes impact fertility?
 - why would defamilialization tend to increase fertility – aren't other things more important in fertility decisions?
 - Doesn't fertility decline have more to do with cultural effects of industrialization?
 - Is the argument about the need for fertility-increasing policies in advanced welfare states compelling?
4. **The conservative welfare state regime** (Cesar Rodriguez, Matt Dimmick)
 - there seems to be no logical reason for a correspondence between family-solidarity and corporatism/etatism as a mode of solidarity. In the other two regimes there seems to be a tight correspondence.
 - would the coherence of the typology be enhanced by breaking this type down?
 - Is the explanation of this form of regime as deriving from premodern, religious and absolutist remnants convincing?
5. **Explaining the forms of welfare regime** (Amy Lang, Matt Nichter, Keedon Kwon, Landy Sanchez, James Benson)
 - **Class Alliances.** In TWWC, the argument for variation centers around forms of *class alliance*; this seems much less central in the Social Foundations book. How does the problem of class alliances figure in the account of the *family* dimension of welfare, or in the specific post-industrial dilemmas of the welfare state? What specific role does the middle class play in this?
 - **The path-dependent argument.** Is there a tension between the argument about the path-dependent explanation for variation across countries and the specific account of the mutations and transformations in recent years in the face of post-industrial crisis?
 - Can we reconcile Swenson's explanation of variation between Sweden and the US with EAs?
6. **The typology**
 - Should Japan be treated as a distinct regime-type? a hybrid? (Keedon Kwon)
 - does the idea of "hybrid" have a coherent theoretical meaning?
7. **The relative merits of s-d welfare states and liberal welfare states**
 - in places GEA seems to suggest that liberal welfare states will enhance efficiency more than s-d welfare states and that, as a result (perhaps) s-d welfare states will be less sustainable. Is this part of his argument? (Christine Overdevest)
8. **Risks** (Landy Sanchez, Sarah Swider)
 - how do social problems become "risks"? What determines their boundaries? their representation as risks? (Landy Sanchez)
 - Is the reason why welfare states take on more responsibilities mainly because of a declining capacity for markets and families to absorb risks? Or is it that the level of risks increase? Are these risks really "macro-problems" (like crises of capitalism) or mainly problems concentrated at the micro-level?
9. **Age-structure of welfare state interventions** (Shamus Khan)
 - why does targeting welfare transfers/programs towards youth and young families constitute a win-win strategy?