

se može ostvariti ulaganjem u razvoj nesrodničkog udomiteljstva svih kategorija korisnika što dovodi do unapređenja samog instituta udomiteljstva.

U ostvarivanju boljeg društvenog položaja osoba s invaliditetom važno je razvijati sustavne procese osnaživanja, zagovarati i ostvarivati inkluziju osoba s invaliditetom, prevenirati samoizolacije i senzibilizirati poslodavce za zapošljavanje zaposlenika s invaliditetom.

Potrebno je raditi na senzibilizaciji lokalne zajednice za prepoznavanje i sankcioniranje nasilja nad starijim osobama te promovirati pozitivnu sliku o starijim osobama kroz medije, pružanjem podrške članovima obitelji koji skrbe o starijima doprinosti prevenciji spomenutog nasilja i podizanju kvalitete života starijih osoba.

Prepoznata je potreba mijenjanja patrijarhalnih obrazaca poimanja rodničkih uloga te razvijanja programa kojima će se osnaživati žene koje se iz različitih razloga nalaze u posebno ranjivom položaju.

Društveno partnerstvo istaknuto je kao temelj djelotvorne zaštite ljudskih prava i promicanja socijalne pravde. Centri za socijalnu skrb su tijela koja mogu biti promotori partnerstva u lokalnoj zajednici na način da povezuju djelovanje organizacija civilnog društva i državnih institucija kroz zajedničke projekte. Za razvoj kvalitetnog civilnog društva iznimno je važan volontizam pa je stoga potrebno pronaći načine za njegovo razvijanje i promicanje.

Socijalni rad također ima zadatak pronaći načine za djelovanje u ostalim područjima ljudskog života, poput obrazovanja, palijativne skrbi, radnim organizacijama i poduzećima, zdravstvu, ali i u različitim organizacijama civilnog društva.

Socijalni radnici trebaju biti nositelji promjena u društvu i promicatelji socijalne pravde. Kako bi to ostvarili, potrebno je unaprijediti profesiju na različite načine: promicati samostalnost studija socijalnog

rada, osnivati komore socijalnih radnika, osigurati primjerene uvjete rada i razviti modele zaštite mentalnog zdravlja pomagača. Također, važno je unaprijediti obrazovanje socijalnih radnika kroz razvoj specijaliziranih studijskih programa i angažiranje studenata već tijekom studija i praktičnim područjima socijalnog rada.

Tanja Penava i Maja Nižić

doi: 10.3935/rsp.v18i1.984

BERLIN CONFERENCE 2010: TOWARDS CITIZENS' EUROPE

Berlin, 20 November 2010

The fourth Berlin conference – organised by the *A soul for Europe* civil society initiative (<http://www.asoulforeurope.eu/>) was welcomed by the *Haus der Kulturen der Welt*. The three interlinked ideas behind the initiative are that 1) Europe consists primarily of individuals and not institutions and regulations; 2) culture is the symbolical *glue* that connects Europe and; 3) there is a need for a more direct connection between civil society, culture, business and policy-makers.

The Berlin conference initiative started in the year 2004 and since then it has developed from Berlin-based, civil society initiative into a trans-European decentralised network with offices in Amsterdam, Porto, Tbilisi, Belgrade, Berlin and Brussels. As it currently numbers over 500 participants from civil society organisations, media, business, politics, arts and culture, it can be

said that *A Soul for Europe* initiative has developed into an important EU think-tank. The conference itself was divided into four main topics: 1) The role of the citizen in building Europe, 2) Image of Europe, 3) New forms of co-operation between culture, business and politics, 4) Europe – that's us! Each topic was represented by two keynote speakers and latter discussed between specialised panels of professionals and experts and participants in general.

The first panel had a challenging task of defining relationships between arts, politics and business and offering concrete recommendations for challenging citizens to become more active and pro-European. The first keynote speaker Demester concluded that, even though culture and arts have proved their benefits (for the ideas of unified Europe, inclusion etc.), we cannot expect them to solve all of the problems. She believes that it would be a good idea to organise a Centre (similar to Culture centres in main European cities) that would specialise in promoting values, arts and culture of a unified Europe. De Pauw added that Europe should have unified European political parties instead of today's conglomerates of national parties that share the same political heritage. Horta believes that the goals of unified Europe should be promoted primarily through culture and not arts, because arts can be very self centred. Also, *A soul for Europe* should acknowledge local differences and specific problems that can diminish the potential influence of culture and arts on general public (e.g. there are EU member states where politics perceives artistic and cultural projects as threats). The discussion ended with comments that we should not forget that the individual is the owner of Europe and that projects and initiatives should be focused toward them. In other words, we need to be more local in our actions.

Worldwide dominance of cultural images originating from USA (and mediated through film and video) was the incentive for the second topic. The panel tried to define strategies, models and images that would enhance emotional and cognitive pro-Europe identification of the Europeans. Key speaker Gönczy emphasized that there are more and more people who do not perceive the EU in a positive manner and that is indicative of a communicational crisis within Europe. The crisis is caused by the EU itself, because it promotes itself primarily through images of institutions and regulations. Nobody loves his or her own country because of the bureaucracy or statistical charts. She believes that film and video are the best media to change this image of EU and she has given a few recommendations to the EU: to show their humanity (their human face), to connect with the local people so that members of the European Parliament represent the people and not themselves. Brok has added that we should focus on promoting European narratives or European stories that we can all share and that can develop an emotional bond between Europeans and Europe. Wenders and Gardev gave the participants some insights into the problems of European film: 1) distribution problems (producers in USA have a huge /cash/ advantage); 2) propaganda problem (Europeans are concerned that their film may be seen as a propaganda - at the same time forgetting that every film is propaganda and that can be a legitimate purpose of the film). Apart from problems, Wenders also believes that culture is the *force* that can unite Europe because culture is a communication goods that needs to be in the centre of our interest.

The third discussion was dedicated to the development of dialogue between business and culture sectors that mounts from the usual sponsor-sponsored relation to a common European culture and economy platform. Ad-

ditionally, a part of the discussion was devoted to the conclusions drawn from earlier conferences (the Istanbul Forum 2010 and Berlin conference 2008). The first of the key speakers, Vassiliou, pointed out some of the positive trends and project that have been undertaken by the European Commission: 1) promoting cultural diversity by creating mobility for students and schools, 2) creation of cultural industries alliances, 4) digitalisation programme for small cinemas in Europe, 5) supporting young writers (publishing and translating their works) etc. Oetker, as the other key speaker, emphasized positive sides of the European cultural heritage. Because of that complex heritage, we are more adapt and capable to resolve differences, to be creative. There is no need to lose that capability. He believes that we will never have one European language (and we do not need to have it), all we need are the same rules, dialogue and exchange. In the end, Martel said that, even though it seems that the American culture is overtaking the world, there is no need to despair because arts and entertainment are not orthodox (people can enjoy both American and European films) and we should concentrate on the development of so-called *soft power*.

The last panel was mostly constituted from members of the European Parliament and they discussed the Europe 2020 agenda. During this discussion, Olbrycht pointed out that we can easily fall into a trap of trying to *sculpture* arts in our image. This would eventually destroy arts, because arts have to be free, and European commission has to simply let it be free. In other words, the EU should finance various arts and not only those that will promote the idea of united Europe. Culture and arts are what binds us together and incites us to innovate. It is not something to be used as a tool. The other problem that was pointed out by Pack is that there really is no problem with uni-

fied Europe - if we look amongst the elite, the politicians or the artists. The problem is local and the top-down communication is not good enough to convey the positive idea of united Europe to the local people – and that is what is causing the negative trend and negative emotions that people develop toward the European idea.

Perhaps the most memorable about this conference was that representatives kept repeating that there is no need to despair – which could be indicative of a growing difference between the European elite and the average European citizen. Obviously, popularity of unified Europe is diminishing (enhanced by the economic crisis, problems with Greece etc.). But, even though the support of the public may be diminishing, there are some positive aspects of European reality, as well as some social and cultural aspects that still need to be addressed properly – and that gives hope. Those areas would be: 1) concentration on film (as a media that can convey idea of a unified Europe and even create a emotional bond between Europeans and their continent); 2) government *of* the people *for* the people (and not government of institutions and rules *on* people); 3) using and advocating culture (instead of simply concentrating on politics, economy, bureaucracy etc.) as a tool for creation of European identity and long lasting bonds between people in Europe. In the end, perhaps it would be wise to remind ourselves that the Berlin conference was a productive venue – since it is primarily a forum where different sectors of European social life meet to discuss important issues, create new ideas, strategies, projects and connections. Will any of the proposed ideas and strategies produce some impact on everyday life and politics within Europe is a question for the future. But, if history is something to judge by, it most certainly will.

Ivan Hromatko