

PREFACE

The Slavic-Eurasian Research Center (SRC) of Hokkaido University held an international symposium titled “25 Years After: Post-Communism’s Vibrant Diversity” in Sapporo, Japan on December 8–9, 2016. This symposium was part of our comparative research project relating to border studies, comparative linguistics, comparison of major regional powers, and comparative economic and welfare policies, and 18 papers were presented at this symposium. Among these papers, this volume presents six revised and edited papers from two sessions concerning comparative economic and welfare policies of the symposium.

In Part I of this volume, three authors analyze and compare various aspects of changes and differences in the welfare systems of post-Communist countries. Aidukaite examines the social security systems in the three Baltic States as they have developed to the present by highlighting emerging differences and similarities in social security arrangements. Sengoku compares the family support systems in the eight East European countries with Japan and concludes that the fertility rate seems to be higher in countries that have promoted de-familializing policies than in countries that have not endorsed such policies. Finally, Igarashi analyzes elderly care systems in post-Soviet Russia, and concludes that family members and relatives typically try to manage care for elderly people at present in Russia under a situation in which there are no laws regarding elderly nursing care.

In Part II, three authors discuss the economic transformations and the influence of so-called neoliberalism. Rutland examines the transition to capitalism in Russia, and concludes that the government’s overall role in the economy is roughly on a par with other upper-middle-income countries, and that Russia remains well integrated into the global economic system. Yoshii analyzes the neo-liberalism movement in the Central and East European countries, and indicates that the accession negotiation compelled these countries to assume social market economic thinking as well as neo-liberal ideas. Lastly, Baboš compares the macro-economic policy development of the Czech Republic and Slovakia, and concludes that the Czech Republic and Slovakia did not have many options when deciding about their macro-economic policies.

I would like to express my deep appreciation to all of the participants of the symposium, especially Mie Nakachi and Akira Uegaki who served as discussants of these two sessions. I would also like to thank Mika Osuga of the SRC for her excellent editing work. Lastly, the publication of this proceeding was supported by JSPS KAKENHI (Grant Number JP 16H03575).

SENGOKU Manabu
Editor
Sapporo, December 2017