

Social Cohesion and Development

Vol 2, No 1 (2007)

Labor Relations



Th. Sakellariopoulos & J. Berghman (eds) ,
Connecting Welfare Diversity within the European
Social Model, Intersentia, Antwerpen-Oxford-New
York, 2004

Marina Angelaki

doi: [10.12681/scad.9042](https://doi.org/10.12681/scad.9042)

Copyright © 2016, Marina Aggelaki



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

To cite this article:

Angelaki, M. (2016). Th. Sakellariopoulos & J. Berghman (eds) , Connecting Welfare Diversity within the European Social Model, Intersentia, Antwerpen-Oxford-New York, 2004. *Social Cohesion and Development*, 2(1), 93–95.
<https://doi.org/10.12681/scad.9042>

Th. Sakellariopoulos & J. Berghman (eds), *Connecting Welfare Diversity within the European Social Model*, Intersentia, Antwerpen-Oxford-New York, 2004

The official launch of the Open Method of Coordination (OMC) during the Lisbon European Council in 2000 has given new impetus to the debate on European governance which started in the mid-1990s with the publication of the Commission's White Paper on European Governance. This has also signaled a shift of the research focus from analyzing the European integration process to analyzing the EU as a system of governance. Against this background, the book edited by Th. Sakellariopoulos and J. Berghman constitutes an insightful contribution to the growing literature on new modes of governance in social policy and its application in specific policy sectors by providing information about the gradual development and implementation of the OMC and its prospects.

The book is the revised Report prepared by an international team of experts in the context of the Greek Presidency of the EU (2003) and presented during the International Conference "The Modernization of the European Social Model. EU Policies and Practices", held at Ioannina, Greece. The principal aim of the book is to examine and determine the interrelations between the instruments of European social policy and the development of the European Social Model by focusing on the potential of the Open Method of Coordination. It therefore provides a much needed, in-depth and comprehensive analysis of the Open Method of Coordination and its interrelations with the European Social Model.

The approaches adopted vary, depending on the scientific background of the authors, yet there is consensus about the fact that the launch of the OMC as a tool supporting the modernization of welfare states has presented member states with the opportunity to clarify their social options.

The introductory chapter by A. Hemerijck and J. Berghman provides an overview of the various definitions of the European Social Model, highlighting not only the shared patrimony of social Europe, but also the diversity among the various welfare regimes. Within this framework, the adoption of the OMC provides significant potential to the common challenges faced by European welfare states. The second chapter, elaborated by Th. Sakellariopoulos, examines the potential of the OMC by focusing on the learning and participation elements of this new policy tool and highlighting the conditions under which it can contribute to the convergence of social protection systems (necessity for a streamlined approach, incorporation of OMC in the Constitution, clarification of the theoretical context of its implementation). The potential of the OMC as an instrument promoting policy learning has attracted the attention of other scholars as well [Trubek D. & Mosher J., (2003), "Alternative Approaches to Governance in the EU: EU Social Policy and the European Employment Strategy", *JCMS*, vol. 41, no 1, p.p. 63-88; Casey B. & Gold M., (2005), "Peer review of labor market programs in the European Union: what can countries really learn from one another", *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 12, no 1, p.p. 23-43; Eckhardt M., (2005), "The open method of coordination on pensions: an economic analysis of its effect on pension reforms", *Journal of European Social Policy*, vol. 15, no 3, p.p. 247-267; Kerber W. & Eckhardt M., (2007), "Policy learning in Europe: the Open Method of Coordination and Laboratory Federalism", *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 12, no 2, p.p. 227-247]. The weakness of the participatory element, on the other hand, has also been highlighted in the work of –among others– Chalmers

D. & Lodge M., (2003), *The Open Method of Coordination and the European Welfare State*, ESRC Centre for Analysis and Risk Regulation, DP 11, LSE; De la Porte C. & Nanz P., (2004), "The OMC- a deliberative-democratic mode of governance? The cases of employment and pensions", *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 11, no 2, p.p. 267-88; Jacobsson K. & Vifell A., (2004), "New governance structures in employment policy-making? Taking stock of the European Employment Strategy" in: W. Linsenmann, W. Meyer and W. Wessels (eds) *Economic Governance in the EU*, Basingstoke, Palgrave, Macmillan; De la Porte C. & Pochet P., (2005), "Participation in the Open Method of Coordination", in: J. Zeitlin and P. Pochet (eds) *The Open Method of Coordination in Action*, Brussels/Bern: Peter Lang, p.p. 351-89.

In terms of the future prospects of the OMC, Sakellaropoulos makes reference to the scenarios developed by De la Porte and Pochet (*Building Social Europe through the Open Method of Coordination*, PIE-Peter Lang, Brussels, 2002), yet, at the same time, he expresses some reservations relating to the application of the OMC (possible violation of the principle of subsidiarity, substitution of legislation, OMC seen as simply supporting the Community method, danger of multiple split of the European sphere in separate fields of welfare). However, as pointed out by Trubek D. and Trubek L., ("Hard and Soft Law in the Construction of Social Europe: the Role of the Open Method of Co-ordination", *European Law Journal*, vol. 11, no 3, 2005, p.p. 343-364), the application of hard law should not preclude the use of soft law, or vice versa. On the contrary –as they point out– we should focus on the capacities of different modes and their possible combination as evidenced in the framework of the European Employment Strategy.

The following two chapters analyze the application of the OMC in two specific policy fields; pensions and social inclusion. Given the cautious stance of member states towards the application of the OMC in the field of pensions and the weakness of the participatory element in the process of elaborating the National Strategy Reports, the third chapter by Y. Stevens focuses firstly on the interpretation of the integrated approach on pensions adopted by the European Commission and, secondly, proceeds to an examination of that pillar within the European Social Model and the development of the second pillar within the OMC. The novel element in this chapter is that, whereas studies on the OMC in the field of pensions have thus far focused on the first pillar, Stevens moves a step forward by incorporating in his analysis the second pillar through ideas on how to strengthen an instrumental approach of the OMC on occupational pensions. The fourth chapter, written by G. Amitsis, is based on the first round of the application of the OMC in social inclusion and aims at identifying the best practices and weaknesses that could be taken into account during the second round of NAPs/incl. The elaboration of new ideas and perspectives related to the development of the EU in the social agenda is also examined through two different scenarios, based on the hard and soft intervention of the European bodies concerned.

The fifth chapter, elaborated by A. Stergiou, discusses the legal aspects involved in the search for the necessary institutional remedies for the so-called "social deficit" of the EU by examining the role of social rights and social citizenship as normative machinery for the development of social policies. The final chapter concludes by pointing out a number of issues that merit further research, i.e., the overall efficiency of the OMC and the need for streamlining the process, questions of political legitimacy and support and the ways to enhance it and, finally, the way OMC is ultimately viewed; either as a new and challenging policy making procedure or as a tool that will give a more precise meaning to the –so far vague– notion of the European Social Model.

The events that followed the book's publication have only partly addressed some of the points mentioned above. The Commission proposed in 2003 the streamlining of the social

dimension of the Lisbon strategy, so as to strengthen and complement the Treaty-based processes of employment and macroeconomic policies through the creation of an integrated framework (*Communication. Strengthening the Social Dimension of the Lisbon Strategy: Streamlining the Open Method of Coordination in the field of Social Protection*, COM (2003) 261 final). This involved the establishment of a single set of common objectives, comprising three pillars (social inclusion, pensions and health and long-term care) fully consistent and interconnected with the employment guidelines and the broad economic policy guidelines, adopted in 2006. Even though this new streamlined approach seemed as a positive step towards the strengthening of the social dimension, the renewed Lisbon strategy launched in 2005 has downplayed the social aspects and has ultimately subordinated the OMC in the field of social protection and inclusion to the goals of economic policy. As stated by the Commission: "Satellite OMC and other sectoral processes can feed into the national Lisbon programs to the extent that they directly relate to growth and jobs" (*Delivering on growth and jobs: a new and integrated economic and employment coordination cycle in the EU*, SEC(2005) 193 final). In terms of the EU Constitution, the OMC is only mentioned indirectly, thus failing to acquire the constitutional status some had hoped for.

Overall, the book contributes to the growing debate concerning the potential of "soft" regulatory mechanisms such as the OMC and its application in specific policy fields. In this respect, it could be considered as the continuation of the book edited by Pochet P. and De la Porte C. (eds) (2002), *Building Social Europe through the Open Method of Coordination*, PIE-Peter Lang, Brussels. At the same time, it could be a good starting point for those wishing to read the book by Zeitlin J. and Pochet P. with L. Magnuson (2005), *The Open Method of Coordination in Action: The European Employment and Social Inclusion Strategies*, PIE-Peter Lang, Brussels, providing also national case studies on the application of the OMC. Whereas all these studies have contributed to a more in depth understanding of the OMC, research needs to be complemented by national case studies on the implementation of the OMC in specific policy fields, as the latter are still scarce.

Marina Aggelaki
Panteion University, Athens

Σοφία Βιδάλη

Έλεγχος του Εγκλήματος και Δημόσια Αστυνομία - Τομές και Συνέχειες στην Αντεγκληματική Πολιτική Εκδόσεις Αντ. Ν. Σάκκουλα, Αθήνα-Κομοτηνή, 2007

Το δίτομο έργο της επίκουρης καθηγήτριας Εγκληματολογίας στο Δημοκρίτειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θράκης, κ. Σοφίας Βιδάλη, «Έλεγχος του Εγκλήματος και Δημόσια Αστυνομία - Τομές και Συνέχειες στην Αντεγκληματική Πολιτική», αποτελεί αφενός μια περιγραφή της ιστορικής πορείας της δημόσιας Αστυνομίας και αφετέρου μια προσέγγιση της αστυνόμευσης ως μορφής κοινωνικού ελέγχου στην Ελλάδα. Η συγγραφέας τοποθετείται επίσης ερμηνευτικά απέναντι σε μια μακρά πορεία εξελίξεων των λεγόμενων δυτικών κοινωνιών καπιταλιστικού τύπου, οι οποίες αφορούν στα κορυφαία ζητήματα που απασχολούν την Εγκληματολογία, δηλαδή εκείνα του κοινωνικού ελέγχου, της ασφάλειας, του κοινωνικού αποκλεισμού, των λόγων και των πρακτικών των εξουσιαστικών μηχανισμών, στη διαλεκτική τους με τις οικονομικές, κοινωνικές και ιστορικές εξελίξεις που παρουσιάζονται, εννοιολο-