

been described many times in political science literature in the Czech Republic.

Another important term that may confuse readers is 'civil society'. Skalnik writes that for ODS, civil society smacked of direct democracy and populism. In the Czech Republic, after 1989 a big debate was initiated over the term 'civil society'. ODS (Klaus and his supporters) have taken the liberal view of civil society. Liberals locate many associations in a civil society (interest groups, churches, trade unions, political parties, trade companies) and perceive them as equal, while corporatists, social liberals and certain influential intellectuals, have a narrower scope of the associations within it (they exclude trade companies and even political parties) and perceive some of them as privileged in governmental relations (and especially privileged over political parties). While liberals, according to the Czech constitution, agree that the "political system is based on the free and voluntary creation and free competition of political parties ..." (article no. 5), their opponents label this stance as a rejection of civil society. Those who defend the corporatist approach to civil society maintain that the election results should be corrected (by the president) and that the influence of the parties in the public sphere should be minimised (by 'independent' organisations and intellectuals). Peter Skalnik probably shares the non-liberal view of civil society. In this respect readers will find interesting the short reference to civil society in Coetzee's article. He writes that governmental, state, semi-state and parastatal organisations (i.e. privileged organisations of corporatist civil society) represent a substantial source of growing apathy in society.

In the editorial chapter we find the incorrect usage of the above-mentioned terms and many simplifications of complex problems. In short, I think it is dubious to simply describe, for example, pre-war Czechoslovakia as 'one of the exemplary democracies', privatisation as a 'Marxist experiment', the division of the Czechoslovak federation as the arrogant decision of the victorious parties in the Czech and Slovak parts of the republic and the result of ignoring calls for a ref-

erendum, the position of Slovakia in access to the EU as a motive for Klaus' politics, and citizenship laws containing the condition of criminal probity as the cause behind Czech xenophobia. The comparison of virtually similar processes in two different countries is indeed a challenging but difficult task, and the prerequisite for doing so is broader knowledge of the compared societies and more analytical access. This book, though it presents a great deal of interesting information, has not completely satisfied this task.

Klára Vlachová

Georg Vobruba: *Integration + Erweiterung. Europa in Globalisierungsdilemma*
Wien, Passagen Verlag 2000, 195 p.

Georg Vobruba, currently Professor and Dean of the Social Science Faculty of the University of Leipzig, is well known through his writings about the labour market and social policy. For many years he has been concentrating on European integration issues viewed from a comprehensive socio-political perspective. In a series of books, he has presented insightful observations and often also revelatory optics, featured mostly in terms of dialectics, dilemmas and conflicts. This is also the prevailing vocabulary of the book reviewed here, which is devoted to the 'dilemma of globalisation'.

The main thesis of the study is that it is because of globalisation that the European welfare state - which is a precondition of the successful development of Europe - is falling into trouble. More concretely, a 'viscious circle' is produced when increasing social-political problems lead to higher labour costs, which aggravate competition abilities and, consequently, bring about even more unemployment (p. 97). However, not only social policy based on employment status, but also universal systems are vulnerable, albeit somewhat less. In any case, the European welfare state is being seriously challenged by the globalisation process.

The book is divided into two grand sections. The first is about the self-accomplishment

of politics in the globalisation dilemma and the second is about the dialectics of European integration and enlargement. In conclusion, the author assesses the perspectives of the eastern enlargement of the European Union.

In the first section, Vobruba presents a basically optimistic view regarding the interplay between globalisation and the European style of welfare state. He is convinced that social policy is a precondition of successfully coping with globalisation. The development of the welfare state within globalisation is even desirable in the sense of the *self-accomplishment* of politics. The globalisation dilemma can be solved if globalisation is supported by social policy. Because globalisation pushes economic growth, it leads to higher state revenue. The author rejects the arguments that globalisation requires tax reductions and that it involves additional social costs.

One very important observation is that social change in modern times becomes reflexive and thus politics itself arranges advantageous conditions for social change. Politics is obliged to create opportunity structures and appropriate situational contexts that enable individuals to cope with social change and adapt to it. Social policy is necessary in the process of globalisation and its accomplishment is a condition of the self-accomplishment of politics as such. The only alternative to this is the self-destruction of politics. In brief, this is how Vobruba's message may be understood.

In the last part of the first section, the author compares the US and European social system. In a stylised form, the first is presented as short-term oriented, clearly separated from the labour market, with distributional conflicts solved as a zero-sum game. The low level of social protection is *displayed* in low labour costs and, eventually, in low hourly productivity. In contrast, the second is observed as long-term oriented, with strong and even increasing (during European integration) links between social protection and the labour market, with corporatist arrangements enabling the solution of distributional conflicts as a positive-sum game.

Contrasting pictures of the US and European social systems continue in the author's distin-

guishing of two types of flexibility: the first is only adaptive, imposed on individuals, with the dominance of numerical flexibility; the second is innovative, initiated, with the dominance of the functional flexibility. In the latter case, social protection enables people to adapt, involving their participation and not endangering their quality of life. Instead of liberty *from* the welfare state, the aim is to reach the liberty *through* the welfare state, which makes economic and life-quality possible in parallel, but in a wider horizon. Not only is the globalisation challenge more relevant for Europe than for the US, Europe is also more ready to cope with it in the long term.

The second section is focused on the 'dialectics of integration and expansion'. By integrating the formerly poor periphery of countries step by step into an affluent centre, the welfare gap shifts outwards. The outer regions are able to protect the centre only if they have no serious political and economic problems themselves. Consequently the progressing integration of the EU is an important reason for its expansion. The author calls this 'expansion by extended integration'. Calculated inclusion operates according to the logic of 'self-interested aid', which is based on the concern for solving problems at their origin in order to prevent negative spill-over effects. Taken as a forerunner of the EU eastern enlargement, German unification provides a good example of the mode of operation of 'expansion by extended integration'.

Moreover, there is also 'expansion by deepened integration', which in concrete terms is outlined by borderless territory (Schengen-countries) and by the common currency (Euro-countries). On the one hand, deepened integration led to the shared interest of the richest EU members in maintaining high standards of control at the outer EU border, triggering attempts to intervene in the practices of control of those members with the outer borders. On the other hand, ongoing European integration led to the interest of the rich centre in improving the economy and stabilising the political situation in the EU neighbour regions.

The enlargement has important limits: first external, i.e. territorial limits, and second inner,

distributional limits, which are again twofold – the institutional problems of the organisation of consensus-building and the material problem consisting in raising and distributing EU finances. The fact that eastern enlargement will include relatively poor and small new members goes beyond the financial capacities of the EU. The Convent, launched in 2001 as a forum for solving inner obstacles to further integration and enlargement, is in fact dominated by the political representatives of individual states, and thus offers political room for defending national interests rather than overcoming them.

Eastern enlargement also unleashes the problem of legitimacy, which includes two arguments: pacification (no wars) and prosperity (positive sum game). Both arguments are weak, argues Vobruba – the pacification argument is too inclusive (it holds true for everybody) while the prosperity argument is not inclusive enough (costs and gains are unequally distributed across time as well as between different social groups). The integration of Europe is actually a project of the elites. However much people agree with further integration in general terms, with regard to their living circumstances, scepticism prevails. The result is thus an entanglement of interests.

In such a constellation the risk arises that attitudes towards eastern enlargement in both the member and candidate states will lead to diverging and mutually incompatible elite strategies. As long as the candidates are willing to join, there is not enough inclusion capacity in the West; and as soon as the necessary inclusion capacity arrives, the willingness to join vanishes. This is the scenario of the greatest possible misfortune, which will probably not come true. However, the lengthy process of enlargement tends to jeopardise the possibilities of an encompassing deepening of the integration.

Georg Vobruba's oeuvre is very condensed and thus often not easy to read. He does not work with simple numbers and shop-floor arguments, but considers problems on a higher level and in their complexity. He does not introduce concrete political recipes either. As a true researcher, he mostly works with stylised facts and reflects on possible scenarios. Only one thing is

certain: actual economic integration should also be politically framed. The question remains open as to whether the EU of tomorrow will be the Europe of today, and whether its institutions and habits are strong enough to include the communist legacy of the East.

Jiří Večerník

Mitchell A. Orenstein: *Out of the Red. Building Capitalism and Democracy in the Postcommunist Europe*

Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press
2001, 166 p.

The transition economies of Central and Eastern Europe seem for many to represent great political and economical laboratories for studying exceptional social development and for testing different theoretical models of transformation from the state-owned economy to the capitalist one, and from the near-totalitarian state to democratic society. For this reason literature on the post-communist transition is not too rare, although it is usually only concerned with clarifying the different theoretical models of economic and policy development, and on evaluating radical strategies of market reform. Unfortunately, the applicability of such theories, models, and advice to Central European reality is obviously poor; at best these are good-will-without-knowledge tips. Orenstein's *Out of the Red* seems to be another case. The author has deeply immersed himself in the history of the transformation and the struggle to build capitalism and democracy in two post-communist countries, Poland and the Czech Republic, and has made some general assertions about the relationship between capitalism and democracy in the present world.

Orenstein starts with an evaluative description of the different (by the West) recommended strategies of post-communist transformation, mainly neo-classical (which he calls 'neo-liberal', see below) and social-democratic. He chronicles the central conflict between those who feared that democracy would pose obstacles to radical economic reform – belonging to the former view – and those who feared that rapid eco-