RECENZIJE I PRIKAZI

nacije, tj. temom odnosa vremena medija i vremena nacije. Tema ima nekoliko zanimljivih aspekata. Prvi se odnosi na (ne)podudarnosti između globalno standardiziranoga vremena i lokalne organizacije vremena, a drugi na različitost ritmova koji obilježuju svakodnevno medijsko izvještavanje i ritmova koji uređuju godišnji ciklus u životu zajednice. Unatoč ujednačenu kalendaru, nacionalni blagdani, svečanosti i svetkovine daju osobit ritam životu svake pojedine nacije i sadrže značajne povijesne narative koji se medijski, ovisno o okolnostima u sadašnjosti, mogu na različite načine vezati uz suvremena zbivanja i pritom dobivati različita značenja za cijelu zajednicu. Autorica ponovno navodi i nekoliko zanimljivih primjera zlouporabe povijesti, koji su preuzeti iz vremena raspada Jugoslavije.

U zadnjem, osmom, poglavlju svoje knjige autorica izlaže sažetak ključnih pojmova. Mihelj smatra da se u nacionalizmu prepleću divergentna svojstva koja je suvišno pokušati razdijeliti - nacionalizam je, naime, obilježen temeljnim dualizmom koji obuhvaća inkluziju i ekskluziju te jednakost i diskriminaciju. Nacionalizam je za autoricu fenomen sa dva nerazdruživa lica. Mihelj stoga, kao i na drugim mjestima u knjizi, inzistira na stavu da u slučaju medijskoga prikaza kulturne raznolikosti nisu moguća propisivanja univerzalnih rješenja, nego uvijek treba uzeti u obzir čimbenike relevantne za konkretnu situaciju. Sličan stav autorica zastupa i u slučaju kozmopolitizma, koji je tek skup vrijednosti i dispozicija koje se selektivno mobiliziraju pa je uvijek potrebna povijesna kontekstualizacija. Put do kozmopolitizma, prema Mihelj, vodi kroz nacionalne države, a nipošto pokraj njih.

Knjiga Sabine Mihelj mogla bi, zbog raznolikosti i relevantnosti obrađenih tema, poslužiti kao zanimljiv i poticajan sugovornik mnogim sudionicima domaćega polja društveno-humanističkih znanosti. Ponajviše zbog pokušaja osvježivanja teorijskih pristupa temama nacije, reprezentacije i tvorbe nacionalnih (i drugih) identiteta stvaranjem elastičnijih metodoloških pomagala i kombiniranih diskurzivno-kontekstualnih pristupa, ali i analitičkim radom na nizu konkretnih primjera iz domaćega, jugoslavenskoga, socijalizma i iz faze raspada Jugoslavije, njezina bi se knjiga mogla priključiti raznovrsnom i živom transdisciplinarnome polju, koje kod nas čine etnografi socijalizma, sociolozi, politolozi, komunikolozi, istraživači koji se oslanjaju na kulturalnostudijsko zaleđe baveći se popularnom (tranzicijskom) kulturom i socijalizmom, književni imagolozi i feminističke kritičarke.

Igor Medić

doi:10.5559/di.20.4.17 EUROPE 2020: TOWARDS A MORE SOCIAL EU?

Edited by Eric Marlier and David Natali with Rudi Van Dam

P.I.E. PETER LANG S.A., Brussels, 2010, 277 pages

The book "Europe 2020: Towards a More Social EU?" was prepared at the request of the EU Belgian Presidency as an independent academic contribution to developing the operational basis for the Europe 2020 Strategy. The objectives were to assess procedural and substantive aspects of the EU coordination in the social policy field and to put forward ideas on the format and role of that coordination in the future in order to reinforce it. The book consists of eleven contributions which generally agree

RECENZIJE I PRIKAZI

that in the past decade social policy was the poor relation of the Lisbon Strategy's policy triangle. Furthermore, contributions agree that social policy at the EU level remained a rather uncoordinated patchwork with insufficient integration between social protection, social inclusion, education, health, justice, housing and other policy areas.

The book opens with an introductory chapter which provides general assessment of the Lisbon and Europe 2020 Strategy in the field of social policy. It underlines the importance of socio-economic governance innovations within the Europe 2020 Strategy such as better legal underpinnings of this strategy due to incorporation of Horizontal Social Clause into the Lisbon Treaty, increased visibility of the new strategy through introduction of the EU flagship initiatives and the overall capacity for a much more integrated and coordinated approach to economic, social, employment and environmental governance. Following this useful overview is an excellent article written by Maurizio Ferrara analyzing capabilities for an effective "nesting" of the national welfare state within the overall spatial architecture of the EU. Ferrara argues that the broad based national insurance schemes need to be updated and modernized in order to respond to a host of endogenous transformations. He welcomes innovative elements of the Europe 2020 Strategy such as launching of the European semester, institutional relocation and procedural refinement of the Social OMC. However, he warns that Europe 2020 will be able to make a difference only if accompanied by a deliberate strategy of both communicative and coordinative discourse on the part of EU institutions.

The third and fourth book chapters focus on the perspectives of the Europe 2020 Strategy in the aftermath of the economic crises. Roger Liddle et al. noted that at present Member States seek to gain competitive advantage against each other through a brand of welfare nationalism which transmutes into a "race to the bottom" in social standards. This unfavorable situation could be changed by a stronger social framework at the EU level which conditions national reforms on the EU economic and social models. The group of authors proposes the creation of an EU carbon tax as well as new taxes for financial activities at the EU level. They also highlight the importance of the EU structural funds which must become more conditional upon promotion of policy synergies between employment policy, welfare provision, education and health. According to David Natali, the EU has not yet developed coherent economic policy institutions that are needed to foster its potential growth. Limits of the Lisbon Strategy are evident in the tensions which existed between budget, economic, employment and welfare reforms in the Member States. In order for Europe 2020 to improve this situation, the author recommends putting more emphasis on the integration of EU and national parliaments and of stakeholders. More active participation of citizens and stakeholders is viewed as necessary for improving visibility of the process and its legitimacy.

The following two articles review the adequacy of the Social OMC within the Lisbon Strategy process. Bart Vanhercke states that due to a lack of transparency of the whole process, public awareness about the Social OMC's institutional visibility is weak. Furthermore, the national reports produced in context of the Social OMC have often been seen as administrative documents rather than planning devices. He concludes that in the future, the OMC in general can only have an impact if it is being "picked up" by actors at the domestic level, who use it as leverage to amplify national reform strategies. This "creative appropriation" calls for greater investment in further strengthening the OMC infrastructure with

RECENZIJE I PRIKAZI

a view to enhancing involvement of stakeholders. The contribution by Mary Daly shows that as a set of social policy ideas the Social OMC was innovative and far-reaching since it contributed to better understanding of poverty and social exclusion as phenomena in their own right and also as approaches to social policy. Daly also analyses the role of the European Platform against Poverty (EPAP) which in her words should be seen as complementary or value added to the Social OMC. EPAP should have more than a single objective and should operate at a number of levels. At the EU level it could identify innovative linkages among social policies and between social, employment and economic policies. At the national level it could raise the visibility of the Social OMC through awareness raising and knowledge diffusing actions around poverty and social exclusion.

In her contribution to the book, Marjorie Jouen states that from a territorial point of view the governance of the EU coordination and cooperation in the social field is currently unsatisfactory. It is too focused on regulation and the design of policies, and not concerned enough with the implementation of these polices. A shift in focus would immediately reveal the important role played by local and regional authorities in delivering and coordination of social provisions. She concludes that institutional arrangements for involving local and regional authorities are a vital step towards enhancing the capacity of EU coordination and cooperation in the social field to promote horizontal and bottom up forms of learning. In practice this could mean involving the Committee of the Regions while from an operational perspective the author suggests taking on board specialized networks or associations.

The chapter written by Martin Kühnemund summarizes the main results of a study commissioned by the European Commission to support mutual learning on social impact assessment within the Social OMC. It states that challenges and shortcomings should not obscure the fact that there are many examples of effective social impact assessments. It is further noted as encouraging that several Member States began to review and revise their impact assessment systems to facilitate a better consideration of social impacts. The chapter suggests that the Commission and Member States can use Social OMC to foster the exchange of experiences and mutual learning on the current social impact assessment practices, by holding regular workshops, training and benchmarking exercises with a view to developing a "learning network" and fostering a wider usage of existing approaches.

Robert Walker in his contribution writes about the potentials of the Euro targets within the Europe 2020 Strategy. He concludes that there are many unknowns and uncertainties as policy targets get transferred from the national to the EU level. These include questions about the degree of political support that exists, the nature, robustness and specificity of the policy logic at both EU and Member State levels, the attainability of the Euro targets already set, the criteria for setting national targets and the linkages between EU, Member State and possible regional and sub regional targets. Walker highlights that targets can neither capture the full complexities of the social and economic issues nor reflect all the subtle processes involved in policy delivery. Therefore, targets are partial and gaming is possible particularly if a culture of competition rather than collaboration is fostered between the Member States. It is important that targets are used to drive policy making rather than to replace it. However, for this to happen, powerful champions must be appointed at the EU and at Member State level to monitor achievements and to encourage various stakeholders to take actions necessary to meet the targets set.

RECENZIJE I PRIKAZI

Assessing strengthening of social inclusion in the Europe 2020 Strategy, Hugh Frazer and Eric Marlier conclude that in order for social inclusion to have a higher political priority at the EU level, the EU's political objectives must emphasize the interdependence and mutually reinforcing nature of economic, employment, social and environmental objectives and policies. The new Europe 2020 Strategy must be built around these four pillars and all must be developed at the same time so that they continuously interact and reinforce each other. Authors emphasize the importance of both building on the positive elements of the Social OMC but also using the increased status accorded to poverty and social inclusion issues in Europe 2020 to address some of the political and institutional weaknesses identified and to strengthen the central element of the Social OMC, the National Strategy Reports on Social Protection and Social Inclusion. Frazer and Marlier make concrete proposals for setting clear EU social objectives with EU and national social outcome targets, improved benchmarking, monitoring and evaluation as well as for taking advantage of the Lisbon Treaty's "Horizontal Social Clause".

The final chapter written by Jonathan Zeitlin assesses ten years of the Lisbon Strategy providing an overview of the three principal phases in its development. Then it looks at the design of the Europe 2020 Strategy which reinforced the social dimension of its predecessor. In Zeitlin's opinion, this was done by broadening of objectives of the new Strategy through calling for "inclusive growth", by adoption of an EU-wide target aimed at lifting at least 20 million people out of the risk of poverty, by the creation of EPAP as one of seven "flagship initiatives" to support delivery of the new strategy, and by incorporation of a guideline on promoting social inclusion and combating poverty. Zeitlin gives very concrete recommendations on strengthening the social dimension of the Europe 2020 Strategy such as: linking the EPAP to Social OMC, benchmarking national performance against the common social indicators and anchoring National Strategy Reports on Social Protection and Social Inclusion into national policy making processes.

The book "Europe 2020: Towards a More Social EU?" represents a very useful collection of contributions analyzing various aspects of the social dimension within the recently initiated Europe 2020 Strategy. This is a collection of high quality works which undertake in-depth analyses that could prove very useful for the policy makers both at the EU level as well as within Member States. The book offers very concrete and well founded solutions and options to a whole range of pending questions related to social governance in a post national setting. The topic itself today proves more important than ever because strengthening the social dimension of the EU represents an inevitable element in re--claiming popular support for the EU project.

Hrvoje Butković

doi:10.5559/di.20.4.18

CONFRONTING OBSTACLES TO INCLUSION International responses to developing inclusive education

Richard Rose (ur.)

Routledge, London & New York, 2010., 295 str.

Knjigu "Confronting Obstacles to Inclusion" ("Suočavanje sa zaprekama za inkluziju") uredio je Richard Rose, ravnatelj Centra za istraživanje i obrazovanje na Sveučili-