

BOOK REVIEWS

**Paul Stubbs / Christopher Solioz (eds.),
Towards Open Regionalism in South
East Europe**, Baden Baden: Nomos 2012,
220 pp., ISBN 978-3-8329-6597-6, € 34.00

Though this volume may be read as a free standing work, it is actually a follow-up to an earlier (2008) collection entitled "Regional Cooperation in South East Europe and Beyond. Challenges and Prospects", edited by Christopher Solioz and Wolfgang Petritsch. For those readers interested in not only region-building but also the broader processes of recovery, reconstruction and integration in South East Europe, this book also in fact links well with the 2010 collection "Conflict and Memory. Bridging Past and Future in (South East) Europe", also edited by Solioz and Petritsch.

The focus of the volume under review here veers away from the politically-oriented, state-centric approach of the 2008 volume and concentrates upon the multifaceted, multi-level and, indeed, multi-layered processes of region-building. Thus the notion of "open" regionalism represents a flexible definition of regionalism that encompasses various actors and, as the editors put it, a diverse range of themes which reflect the increasingly complex and dense fabric of cross-border interactions in the region of Southeastern Europe (itself a somewhat contested space). Thus a diverse set of themes is represented in the volume, showing that region-building is evolving, that new (or rediscovered, re-emerging) expressions of *regionness* are evident and, as a result, that conceptions and understanding of regionalism need to be increasingly

flexible. A further important message of the volume is that regional cooperation, despite the various guises and degrees of effectiveness, is becoming genuinely embedded and unlikely to unravel.

There are nine chapters including the introduction by Solioz and Stubbs. Contributions by Dimitar Bechev, Claudia Rose as well as Francesco Strazzari and Fabrizio Cottichia deal with the more familiar facets of regionalism in the specific Southeast European context. Bechev focuses on the state of play in the main externally driven programmes, concentrating on progress in three key sectors: trade, energy as well as Justice and Home Affairs (JHA). Bechev affirms that regional cooperation remains very much intertwined with the EU integration process and highlights the distinction between sectors where cooperation is most advanced and showing best results (trade, energy) and, on the other hand, the slower development of the JHA sector. This yields an interesting proposition that EU-sponsored regional cooperation in Southeastern Europe is stronger in fields where the EU has supranational governance and exclusive competence than in fields where EU operates inter-governmentally and coordinates with other international actors.

Claudia Rose tackles the vexed question of regional economic integration. Somewhat echoing Bechev, she argues that the EU is the main driver of regional integration and that a strategy of simultaneous EU (North-South) and intra-regional (South-South) integration will prove to be the most fruitful way forward. Yet despite certain promising preconditions, it is instructive to consider the influence of cultural factors,

especially “social capital” and in particular the issue of trust. Or to be exact, mistrust as a war legacy needs to be considered. In this respect, Rose notes the need to go beyond the standard EU sponsored market-opening provisions. She recommends more specific externally promoted cross-border initiatives, and cites a few successful examples such as cluster building projects involving enterprises from several states.

Francesco Strazzari and Fabrizio Cottichia tackle an equally if not more daunting and complex, and certainly not less significant, facet of regional cooperation – the fight against the “phantom menace” of transnational organised crime. This issue has a high priority on the regional cooperation agenda and constitutes another example of a largely externally coordinated exercise. Despite the raised local awareness that successful strategies necessitate cross-border responses, the approach remains essentially state-centric and top-down. Far greater effort is needed to involve a much wider range of stakeholders including involvement of local police, businesses, NGOs, community groups and so on.

The other contributions are rather more free-standing case studies of regionalism in the non-standard sense, emphasising the diverse notions of regionness and transnational phenomena. Bojan Bilić focuses on antiwar activist circles in the Yugoslav and post-Yugoslav contexts and highlights the neglect of this “trans-republic, pan-Yugoslav or supra-national peaceful civic engagement”. Examples include the 1968 student protest, the Yugoslav feminist movement and environmentalist activism, all of which acted as precursors for post-Yugoslav antiwar engagement. Gordy’s contribution focuses on how borderlands fit in with current debates and present policies on regional cooperation. Case studies from Kosovo and from Bosnia and Herzegovina show that cross-border interactions

and long-standing regionness have been part of lived experience for centuries. Established traditions and practices of mixing therefore predate ethnicity and nationality as a key organising force for life in the borderlands and necessitate policies and interventions that take into account the fact that it is the borders themselves that are new rather than the regionalism. The Dinaric Arc Initiative is a platform for cooperation between a multitude of actors – governments, IGOs, NGOs – devoted to protecting and nurturing the ecological and cultural heritage of the Dinaric Arc (which covers the whole set of states facing the Eastern Adriatic Sea). Giorgio Andrian’s assessment of this model of cooperation is broadly positive, despite the problems connected to “politicisation” of the initiative, and emphasises the “flexible and non-legally binding regime” that protects effective functioning mechanisms on the ground.

The two remaining chapters cover aspects of cultural cooperation. Nada Švob-Đokić, in her consideration of the idea of an emerging Southeast European cultural space, notes the recent growth and interaction of state-supported nation-focused cultural investment; “independent” culture based on networks supported in part by foreign financing; and globally operating “market culture”. Cultural networks receive particular attention and their role in easing and intensifying cultural communication and affinity is deemed significant. Whether they could lead to a sense of “commonality and belonging to the region” is however far from certain.

In the final chapter, Ana Dević reflects upon fifty years of Yugoslav and post-Yugoslav cinema and argues that film narratives confront the violence of the 1990s in non-ethnonationalist ways. Since around 2000, new films from “all corners of the former Yugoslavia” have sought to undermine the dominant narratives of the

collapse of Yugoslavia, the ensuing deadly conflict and current predicaments. Dević argues that many post-Yugoslav film narratives clearly contest notions that the new (ex-Yugoslav) states and borders are in any way natural, making cinema an important counter-hegemony to the ethnonational “truth regime”.

Overall this is a very interesting, innovative and worthwhile book that merits a place in university libraries. All chapters are rich analyses and without exception very enjoyable to read. Researchers and students interested in Southeastern Europe will find them very useful and informative. There are some important messages for practitioners and policy makers, too. The book is also relevant of course for scholars interested in regional cooperation and regionalism more broadly, along with cognate areas such as conflict resolution and peace-building. One minor disappointment is the absence of detailed studies of some high profile regional cooperation frameworks which have been in operation for a few years and which yet remain to be assessed in terms of their performance. These include the Central European Free Trade Agreement (CEFTA), which is mentioned although only in a small way, and the Regional Cooperation Council (RCC). Given the approach of this book, the choice not to focus on them is understandable. Yet it is notable that this work would have been unable to draw on detailed studies of CEFTA, the RCC and any relevant regional players even if it had wished to do so because there do not seem to be any. Maybe this points to some scope for a third volume in the series?

Martin Dangerfield (Wolverhampton)

Eric GORDY, *Guilt, Responsibility, and Denial. The Past at Stake in Post-Milošević Serbia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013. 272 pp., ISBN 978-0-8122-4535-6, \$ 65.00

If you are interested in transitional justice, but your interest goes beyond the court cases of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY), this book will suit you well. Eric Gordy provides a clear perspective on how Serbian post-2000 society has dealt with its recent past. He analyses those moments that threatened the hegemonic discourse of denial in Serbia as well as the non-moments – that is those instances that contained the potential to do so, but failed. In doing so, he skilfully manoeuvres through the post-Milošević era (2000-2012), highlighting the new governments’ confrontations with the country’s recent past.

Gordy defines his theoretic approach to transitional justice: the concept of *guilt* “refers to a specific status defined by a judicial institution” and *responsibility* to “states of feeling or judgement operating on the level of relationships, perceptions, and individual self-assessment” (18). This distinction leads to his core research questions: How has Serbian society dealt with questions of responsibility for mass atrocities that happened during the wars of Yugoslav dissolution? Has it been prepared to demand answers for crimes that were committed in its name? And if yes, what is the position concerning the consequences such responsibilities should have? To answer these questions, Gordy goes beyond the evidence provided by the work of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY), which determined the guilt of individual perpetrators. Rather, he discusses how Serbian society as a collective has come to terms with both the domestic and international crimes of the Milošević