



# EU CENTER OF EXCELLENCE

## *First Semiannual Newsletter*

February 2009

1. Directors' Note
2. EUCE Inauguration Lecture: Women and Global Security. Margot Wallstrom, Vice President of the European Commission
3. A Plan for Democracy and Debate. Christine Landfried, EUCE Scholar-in-Residence.
4. Challenges to Sovereignty From Within the Nation-State: Legitimacy and Politics in French Immigration Administration. Summary of grant research by Graham Hill, Department of Sociology at UC Berkeley.
5. EUCE Faculty and Student 2008-09 Grant Awards
6. Fall 2008 Events
7. EUCE Guest Interviews: Conversations with History

### **Directors' Note**

Dear EU Studies Community,

Welcome to the inaugural issue of the bi-annual newsletter of the European Union Center of Excellence at the University of California, Berkeley. This new EU Center is a joint effort of the Institute of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies and the Institute of European Studies and is being underwritten by a three-year, €300,000 grant from the European Commission as part of the Network of European Union Centers of Excellence in the United States. We are proud to be one of only eleven such Centers currently funded by the Delegation of the European Commission in Washington, DC. Together with the aforementioned Institutes, our Center is working in close cooperation with the School of Public Health Program in Green Chemistry and Chemicals Policy, the Institute of Governmental Studies, the Berkeley Roundtable on the International Economy, and the Boalt Hall School of Law Warren Institute. With the creation of this EU Center of Excellence, UC Berkeley will play a vital role in promoting a deeper understanding of the European Union and raise the level of dialogue and discourse on transatlantic relations throughout the State of California.

Over the next three years, the EU Center will support a number of activities related to the better understanding of and teaching about the European Union. Academic opportunities will include faculty research grants, curriculum development grants, pre-dissertation/dissertation fellowships for graduate students, support of the annual Claremont – UC Undergraduate Research Conference on the European Union, and an EU Center Working Papers Series. In addition, the EU Center will support a visiting speaker series and a series of conferences and workshops on the following themes: Transatlantic Relations in a Post-Transatlantic World; the Euro, the European Union, and the World; Facing New Challenges: EU-U.S. Collaboration and “Best Practices” to Solve Global Health, Energy, and Environmental Problems; and Immigration, Integration, and Cultural Change in the European Union.

We invite you to visit our website at <http://eucenter.berkeley.edu/> for the latest up-to-date information about EU Center activities and research and funding opportunities. If you have any additional questions, please feel free to contact the EU Center directly by e-mail at [eucenter@berkeley.edu](mailto:eucenter@berkeley.edu) or by phone on (510) 643-5777. We look forward to seeing you at our next upcoming events!

Beverly Crawford  
Co-director

Jeffrey Pennington  
Co-director

## **EU Center of UC Berkeley Inauguration Lecture by Margot Wallstrom, Vice President of the European Commission.**

### **Women and Global Security.**

*“Enhanced global security is a goal that we all share, whether as men or women, Americans or Europeans. Where we sometimes differ is over what we mean by “security” and how it is best enhanced.”*

Margot Wallstrom

On September 30<sup>th</sup>, 2009, the European Union Center of Excellence at UC Berkeley was inaugurated with a public lecture by Vice President of the European Commission, Margot Wallstrom. Ms. Wallstrom began her talk with an overview of the EU’s role on the world stage, noting that although the “soft power” approach it takes to pressing international issues attracts fewer headlines than those of other more forceful world actors, its contributions to global change are significant nonetheless. These include providing approximately one fifth of the world’s trade in goods, a quarter of the world’s trade in services, one third of the world’s GDP, and one half of worldwide development aid. After calling for active collaboration between the U.S. and the EU to work toward their shared

objectives of a stable, peaceful, and prosperous world in which democracy prevails and human rights are respected, Ms. Wallstrom's lecture turned to the global challenge of security, and in particular, to the role women might play in enhancing global security. She argued that because security concerns women in particular ways, women consequently tend to perceive security as a matter of individual and social well-being; in terms of such problems as earning enough money to feed one's children, gaining access to education and healthcare, and living in freedom not only from violence but also from the poverty and social injustices that are often the root causes of violence. She thus proposed a redefinition of the term 'security' – expanding it from its standard association with defense and military issues into the daily mass destruction of people's lives through poverty, disease, hunger, injustice and oppression. She maintained that the key to enhanced global security is sustainable development but also cautioned that economic development will be sustainable only if it is equitable and socially just, and stressed furthermore that social justice must address contemporary gender inequality.

In order to confront gender inequality head-on Wallstrom proposed attending to three issues that are central to the goal of equitability:

1. Universal access to education: In spite of the empowerment provided by education, sixty to seventy percent of the 100 million children world wide who receive no education are girls. On the other hand, women have comprised historically the majority of the world's educators within the small or extended family circle, at the village school, and in many other places where boys and girls are educated and trained for adult life. Educators need support in the form of training, decent pay, social recognition, facilities and equipment, all of which cost taxpayers money but must be seen by political leaders as crucial long-term investments.

2. Access to clean water and sufficient food: Although water and food are indispensable to life, the soaring cost of food is threatening the lives of millions of the world's poorest populations and is beginning to also impact the developed world. In the poorest communities women spend a substantial part of their lives fetching water from sources miles away from their villages, which in turn are already suffering food shortages due to unsustainable development and climate change. In addition, access to water for agriculture, industry and population growth is still denied to millions of people world wide, while water-borne diseases are a major cause of illness and death in the developing world.

3. Mitigation of climate change. Climate change dramatically affects global security and must be fought in order to ensure a viable future for the world's children and successive generations. On this issue Wallstrom noted, the EU is taking a lead, having committed itself without qualification to making a 20% cut in its members' greenhouse gas emissions by 2020.

Wallstrom pointed out that although women make up the majority of the people leading insecure lives today (70% of the world's poorest people living on less than one dollar a day, are women, and 340 million women world-wide are not expected to live past 40,

largely because of gender-based violence and poverty-related illness ) women are significantly underrepresented in public life. The voices expressing concern for the connection between poverty, disease, education, injustice and violence are often those of women, who understand that real peace and security depend on social justice, participatory democracy and non-violent dialogue, but all too often they are not at the table when security policy is being discussed. Wallstrom explained this imbalance as the tendency of many men to “choose other men” for positions of power and influence. Invoking the shocked reactions to photos of Spain’s new minister of Defense Carme Chacon, a young mother of pacifist tendencies inspecting the troops while eight months pregnant, she also called into question the pervasive assumption that the position of Defense Minister requires stereotypical ‘male’ attributes such as strength and war expertise. She wondered instead whether we might not consider the maternal instinct to defend the family and keep the peace among its members as an equally great asset when it comes to shaping national and international security policies, and noted that in a number of countries women have been and still are actively helping to make peace by rebuilding relationships, bridging traditional divides, and focusing on the practicalities of daily life and family needs.

Wallstrom concluded her talk by reminding the audience that on March of this year, the European Commissioner for External Relations organized a conference for women political leaders to discuss among other things how to give fresh impetus to implementing Resolution 1325 of 2000, which stresses women’s participation in peace negotiations, conflict resolution and preventative diplomacy. The European Union intends to support multi-country projects promoting the implementation of Resolution 1325, and is inviting the organizers of such projects to present them for selection for EU financing. As chair of the World Council of Women Leaders’ Ministerial Initiative, she promised to continue using all her influence to ensure that more women are appointed to senior political and advisory positions in governments around the world, and called on all women in positions of influence world-wide to do likewise.

\*

### **A Plan for Democracy and Debate?**

Christine Landfried, EUCE Scholar-in-Residence; Professor, Universität Hamburg, Institut für Politische Wissenschaft

The political elites of the European Union do have a problem with the citizens in Member States. Or do the citizens have a problem with the political elites? It is a fact that citizens are not as enthusiastic about European integration as political elites think they should be. The negative results of the referenda in France and in the Netherlands in 2005 on the Constitutional Treaty and of the referendum in Ireland on the Treaty of Lisbon in 2008 are demonstrating very clearly that there are communication shortcomings between political elites and citizens.

A lively public debate about political questions with the intention to be a critical counterpart towards politics is central for every democracy. From a normative point of view public spheres in democracies should be structured in such a way that there is a diversity of information and opinions within the public sphere, and that the public sphere is independent from the political system. It is not easy to realize such a demanding public sphere with debates having the potential to criticize politics on the level of the Nation State. And in the European Union it is of course even more difficult to succeed in having public debates in which problems are discussed on the basis of an “enlightened understanding” (Robert A.Dahl). Such a public debate about European topics is a challenge for elites and citizens as well as a necessity for the democracy in the European Union. This is why scientists and politicians become more and more interested in the conditions that have to be fulfilled in order that a European public sphere can emerge.

It is my hypothesis, that one of the major deficits of the present public debate between political elites and citizens on the future of Europe is the way in which elites neglect the difference of ideas and interests combined with a paternalistic approach. Not only do elites interpret European integration as being predominantly a process of homogenization but also do they not take seriously the criticism of the peoples and the growing difference between the elite and the public support for the European Union.<sup>1</sup>

Let us take for example, the European Commission’s “Plan-D for Democracy, Dialogue and Debate”.<sup>2</sup> This plan, developed after the referenda in France and in the Netherlands on the Constitutional Treaty, seeks to “organize” a European public debate. It was the aim of “Plan D” to contribute to an intense public debate on European constitutional politics during the so-called “reflection period.” However, can a public debate be “organized”? Can a democracy be “planned”? Analyzing the text of the Commission, it soon becomes clear that the debate on the Constitutional Treaty is wanted to be only about the positive sides of European integration. “People need to feel that Europe provides an added value and they have the ability to affect the way decisions are taken.”<sup>3</sup> Well, but a majority of citizens in the Member States do not believe that their voices count, and the Commission does mention this result of surveys. In one and the same paragraph the Commission first states that a debate is “a listening exercise” and then goes on to tell it is the objective of communicating with citizens to “seek recognition for the added value that the European Union can provide.”<sup>4</sup> Then we read: “The national debates should focus citizen’s attention on the future of Europe, examining their expectations and discussing ...the concrete benefits of Community action.”<sup>5</sup> These few citations might

---

<sup>1</sup> Liesbet Hooghe, Gary Marks, A Postfunctional Theory of European Integration: From Permissive Consensus to Constraining Dissensus. In: British Journal of Political Science 39(2008), pp. 1-23. Cp. figure 4 p.11.

<sup>2</sup> COM (2005) 494 final.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., S.3.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., S.4.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p.5.

suffice to show that in the opinion of the Commission the public debate should be on the positive aspects of the European Union alone.

The same is true for the new enlargement strategy of the Commission. Here again the citizens are very critical. In autumn 2007 only 46% of the citizens in 27 Member States were in favour of further enlargement while 40% were against.<sup>6</sup> Now, the Commission confronted by such survey results, decided to have a new enlargement strategy focusing among others on an “effective communication” with citizens.<sup>7</sup> Again, the Commission defines an effective communication as telling citizens all about the positive effects of the enlargement without mentioning the critical points. An analysis of the document shows that for the Commission enlargement is a process of homogenization, a project built upon common principles, policies and institutions. However, the enlargement is about the difference of principles, policies and institutions as well. Empirical research shows that European governance has not led to an overall homogenization.<sup>8</sup>

Thus, communication policies of the Commission are too much oriented towards the benefits of European integration without taking into account the deficits and too much towards homogeneity without mentioning heterogeneity. Moreover, as it is the task of the public debate to criticize political decisions it cannot be the government or the Commission that organizes the public debate. Governments and the European Commission might have their policies of going public and explaining their decisions. But this should not be misunderstood as being the public debate. The failure of the “Plan D” of the European Commission is not surprising. While there has been an extensive public debate on Europe before the referenda, it could be shown by recent research that there has been little public debate on European constitutional politics during the “reflection period” after the referenda in France and in the Netherlands.<sup>9</sup>

This is why in order to analyze the emergence of a European public sphere one should have a closer look on the arguments and on the difference of ideas and interests in public debates before the referenda in France, in the Netherlands and in Ireland. The analysis should include the debates in television which is the primary source of information of citizens. Do mass media represent the opinion of the political elites and thereby strengthen the elite’s approach towards the difference of ideas and interests? What about other public spheres such as Internet-Weblogs and groups of civil society? The chances as well as the deficits of a European public sphere might become clearer on the basis of a qualitative analysis of the public debates in different public spheres prior to the referenda. After all, a negative result of a referendum should not be interpreted being a tragedy in a

---

<sup>6</sup> Eurobarometer No. 68, Brussels 2008 (survey autumn 2007).

<sup>7</sup> COM (2006) 649 final.

<sup>8</sup> Jan Zielonka, *Europe as Empire*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2nd ed. 2007. Cp. Liesbet Hooghe, Gary Marks, *A Postfunctional Theory of European Integration: From Permissive Consensus to Constraining Dissensus*, op.cit., p.14.

<sup>9</sup> Ulrike Liebert, Hans-Jörg Trenz, *Mass Media and Contested Meanings. EU Constitutional Politics after Popular Rejection*, EUI Working Papers, RSCAS 2008/28.

democracy.<sup>10</sup> It was the good democratic right of the people in France, in the Netherlands and in Ireland to decide that they do not want this specific Constitutional respectively Reform Treaty. And it could have been a chance for a better communication between the political elites and the citizens bringing to the floor the negative as well as the positive aspects of European integration. However, the chance has not been taken.

\*

### **Challenges to Sovereignty From Within the Nation-State: Legitimacy and Politics in French Immigration Administration**

Report on IES-funded Summer Research by Graham Hill, Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Sociology at UC Berkeley.

The relationship between immigration and national sovereignty has long been a subject of discussion. In the political arena, elected officials' attempts to rationalize the deployment of various border-policing practices frequently establish the power to decide who enters a country and how as a fundamental cornerstone of a nation's sovereignty. Over the past 10 to 15 years, social scientists have been evaluating, discussing and disputing the impact of immigration on national sovereignty. This scholarly debate can be roughly divided into two broad camps: there are those who claim that contemporary migration phenomena are increasingly eroding the sovereignty – the capacity to govern or control such phenomena – of immigrant-receiving nation states in Europe and North America; and there are those who argue that, despite increasingly global immigration patterns, forces and jurisdictions, the sovereignty of these nation-states remains in tact and as effective as it ever was<sup>11</sup>.

During the summer of 2008, I received funding from the Center For European Studies at the University of California in order to conduct interview research in France's newly created Ministry of Immigration<sup>12</sup>. My interview data reveals that immigration's impact on national sovereignty is indeed an immediate concern of this ministry and its agents, with increasing the French state's capacity to decide and control the terms of migratory circulation being one of the primary objectives behind the ministry's creation. In discussing the various obstacles to the realization of this objective, however, these ministerial agents cited obstacles that lie within the confines of French national territory, jurisdiction and polity more frequently and with greater emphasis than they cited the

---

<sup>10</sup> Gráinne de Búrca, The European Constitution Project after the Referenda. In: *Constellations* 13(2006), p. 215: "Rather, more robust legitimacy for the European polity can only come about through open public debate and contested political processes – including (though certainly not limited to) those of the kind seen in the context of the French and Dutch referendum debates."

<sup>11</sup> For examples of the former see Sassen (1998) and Soysal (1994); for examples of the latter see Freeman (1995, 1998) and Joppke (1999).

<sup>12</sup> Ministère de l'immigration, de l'intégration, de l'identité nationale et du développement solidaire

supra-national causal forces and jurisdictions that immigration scholars most commonly identify as the sovereignty-eroding potential of contemporary immigration. For agents that I interviewed, the biggest challenge to the Ministry's realization of a voluntaristic state that efficiently and effectively decides and governs the terms of its nation's immigration is, to use the terminology of one of my interviewees, an *ideological battle*, which is taking place in and among the media, educational institutions, electoral campaigns, non-profit immigration associations and the immigration administration structure itself. As my interviewees conceive it, this ideological battle pits the ministry and its agents against most every institutional element of civil society and carries significant stakes: they see their ministry and its work as subject to hostile attack from the large majority of journalists, academics volunteer and professional associations; and the overwhelming opposition of all of these intermediary channels of communication between state and citizen endangers the perceived legitimacy of the ministry and its interventions.

\*

## **EUCE Student Predissertation and Dissertation Grants Awarded in 2008**

Mark Huberty. Department of Political Science.

Predissertation Research Project Title: European Climate Policy and Economic Systems Change

Abstract: This project investigates how domestic patterns of economic production and institutions of economic governance interact with transnational climate policy in the European Union. The European Union has led the world in developing policies to mitigate the effects of global climate change. By mandating fundamental change in the energy systems that underpin modern economic production, responses to climate change will shape the evolution of national systems of economic production. This research program will study how that process has occurred to date, and what implications it suggest for future economic evolution in the European Union.

Alexander Beliaev. Department of Anthropology

Predissertation Research Project Title: Specters of Soviet Affinity: Political Participation among Latvia's Noncitizens

Abstract: This project investigates practices and categories of political practice among Latvia's "noncitizens." Noncitizenship is a legal category that designates neither statelessness (which would mean a lack of citizenship) nor a right to residence (which leaves open a possibility of holding non-Latvian citizenship). Most noncitizens are Soviet Russians who, following the restoration of Latvian independence in 1991, refused to participate in Latvia's national integration. When Latvia joined the EU, a number of agencies approached noncitizenship as an exclusionary category that made political



participation impossible. Arguing against such an approach, this project attends to how noncitizenship enables a series of political practices that problematize nationality as a politically relevant modality of difference and national integration as a political goal.

Nina Horne. Goldman School of Public Policy

Predissertation Research Project Title: Facing New Challenges: EU-U.S. Nanotechnology Cooperation and Harmonization to Solve Global Energy and Environmental Problems

Abstract: Nanotechnology faces the increasing likelihood of U.S. and EU standards disharmonization. This potential threatens to repeat the genetically modified organisms (GMO) experience, which resulted in trade barriers, significant economic loss, and heightened diplomatic distrust. Nanotechnology is critically important to U.S. and EU economic technological development, enabling fundamental improvements to some of our biggest challenges, including energy, water, food, and health. This project seeks to avert the emerging divergence by producing a comprehensive U.S. and EU comparative regulatory analysis between the U.S. and EU, and developing and disseminating policy options to key stakeholders.

Jennifer M. Dixon. Political Science

Dissertation Research Project Title: Changing the State's Story: Understanding the Sources of Change in Official Narratives

Abstract: Official narratives of historical events play a key role in shaping citizens' perceptions of themselves, history and others; and in setting the terms of states' relationships with their own citizens, with other states, and even with other states' citizens. Because of the centrality of official narratives to abstract issues such as national identity and nationalism, as well as concrete decisions about foreign and domestic policy, many groups attempt to influence the content of official narratives. This project investigates this dynamic, asking: What are the sources of change and continuity in official narratives? Using a small, qualitative, process-tracing approach, the question is answered through an in-depth analysis of two states' official narratives of controversial historical events: Turkey's official narrative of the Armenian genocide and Japan's official narrative of the Nanjing massacre. Tracing changes over the past 50 years, the causal influence of different domestic and international factors, analyzing when and how combinations of factors lead to change, tracing the causal mechanisms through which change occurs and identifying factors that prevent change.

Zhivka Valiavicharska. Rhetoric

Dissertation Research Project title: Culture as a Technology of Neoliberal Governance in Post-Socialist Southeastern Europe

Abstract: This dissertation examines the growing number of internationally funded projects in the fields of arts and culture in the Balkans, designed to promote peace "from below" by encouraging cross-border cultural exchange and multi-ethnic regional collaboration. Funded by international NGOs and by European Union cultural policy programs, these projects aim to rediscover commonalities in the histories, cultural

heritage, and the everyday culture of the Balkan peoples in order to build a sense of collective history and common belonging. The project argues however, that the call for peace and mutual understanding is not just a humanitarian endeavor: there is a strong neoliberal rationality present in the agendas of international cultural policy-makers. It offers a critical analysis of how international cultural policy projects in post-communist Southeastern Europe have instrumentalized the contemporary arts to forge neoliberal subjectivities and enhance neoliberal reforms, and will trace the various unintended effects and tactical subversions that these projects generate.

## **Faculty Grants Awarded in 2008**

### **Awards for Faculty Research**

Barry Eichengreen, Professor of Political Science, UC Berkeley

Project Title: Managing Euro Adoption in the New Member States

This project takes as a given that the new Member States of the European Union will adopt the euro in due time; it asks not whether this is a good thing but how they should manage the transition. In particular the project will analyze the boom-bust problem that has afflicted other rapidly-growing catch-up economies adopting the euro (such as Portugal, Spain, Ireland, and Greece). The common pattern experienced by these countries is a decline in real interest rates with adoption of the euro and the import of monetary policy credibility from the European Central Bank, which sets off a consumption binge and housing boom, leading to problems of real overvaluation and eventually a crash. The project will inquire whether the new Member States are similarly at risk of these destabilizing dynamics. Modeling approaches will include (a) undertaking a correlation analysis not only of catch-up economies that experienced boom-and-bust cycles but the whole host of euro adopters, (b) conducting a panel-data based econometric analysis of the determinants of credit growth in middle-income countries, and (c) completing a detailed study of the Polish case. The study will conclude with policy recommendations for new Member States like Poland contemplating eventual euro adoption.

Philip Martin, Professor of Agriculture and Resource Economics, UC Davis

Project Title: High-Skilled Foreigners: EU Blue Cards and US Green Cards

This project compares policies toward highly skilled foreigners in North America and the EU. The US mostly relies on a demand-approach to select skilled foreigners – if a US employer requests or sponsors a foreigner, he/she can get a temporary or immigrant visa, provided that visas remain. Most EU countries use a supply selection system, looking at the characteristics of individuals to determine who can enter. The project will result in a proposal for a multiyear comparative project.

Vinod K. Aggarwal, Professor of Political Science, UC Berkeley

Project Title: The Transatlantic Relationship in a Post-Transatlantic World: Responding to Russia

For the first time in a century, a set of large, populous and increasingly wealthy states – China, India and Russia – are on the cusp of achieving great-power status. These powers are entering an international system still governed by a “Western” conception of order and based on the primacy of post-World War II rules, drawn from liberal models of capitalism and democracy practiced in the U.S. and in Western Europe. In this context, the most important and most uncertain question facing the West over the next decade is this: What will be the relationship between the EU and the US vis-à-vis these rising powers? Will the transatlantic relationship hold and become stronger, faced with this new geopolitical and geo-economic challenge? Or will the US and the EU compete for economic and political advantage? The first phase of this three-year project seeks to examine these questions with respect to the rise of Russia and the political, economic and security issues that this shift raises for the transatlantic relationship.

Christopher K. Ansell, Professor of Political Science, UC Berkeley

Project Title: European Infections Disease Response Capacity

The World Health Organization reports that new infectious diseases appear more frequently and spread more rapidly than in the past due to factors such as climate change, globalization, and international migration. SARS, AIDS, and the Avian FLU have revealed the devastating potential for emerging infectious diseases to develop into global pandemics. This project explores the capacity of both the public and private sector in the U.S., China, and Europe to respond effectively to these infectious disease challenges. Using a scenario conference, interviews with relevant actors, and a survey, the project will identify these three regions to respond in a timely and appropriate manner to emerging threats.

Jack Citrin, Heller Professor of Political Science; Director, Institute of Governmental Studies, UC Berkeley

Project Title: The Political Integration of Immigrants in Europe and North America

International migration is a central feature of a globalized world. Economic pressures and opportunities as well as political convulsions have been transforming the demography of European countries as well as the settler societies of North America. Political elites and governments generally have been favorable to immigration, in part because of the ballast newcomers give to welfare states in aging societies. Yet public opinion is decidedly more skeptical, if not hostile. Popular attitudes easily mobilized by right wing and nationalist parties thus act as a brake on public policy. One important debate in both academic and political circles regards the impact of public policies on the integration of immigrants and their families into the receiving countries. Research is needed to explain the effects of varying policy regimes in assisting acceptance by members of the receiving societies as well as how policy regimes interact with individual attitudes to facilitate or impede the socioeconomic, cultural and political integration of immigrants. This project starts by linking country-level policy data and aggregate data about the demography of these countries over time to survey data regarding individual attitudes. The second phase of the project focuses on immigrants themselves, asking how the spatial concentration of

immigrants both facilitates their political mobilization while slowing the pace of cultural assimilation.

### **Awards for Curriculum Development**

J. Nicholas Ziegler, Professor of Political Science, UC Berkeley  
Graduate Seminar exploring contrasting literatures on institutional analysis versus identity-based approaches to European integration.

### **Awards for Development of Course Modules**

Barry Eichengreen, Professor of Political Science, UC Berkeley  
Module on the European Economy and the European Union for Economics 115, “The World Economy in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century.”

G. Mathias Kondolf, Professor of Environmental Planning, UC Berkeley  
Module on the EU Water Framework Directive within LA222, Hydrology for Planners and LA 229, Mediterranean-Climate Landscapes.

\*

### **EUCE Fall Guest Interviews - Conversations with History**

Harry Kreisler, Executive Producer and Host.

Margot Wallstrom  
<http://globetrotter-demo.berkeley.edu/people8/Wallstrom/wallstrom-con0.html>

Jocelyne Cesari  
<http://globetrotter-demo.berkeley.edu/people8/Cesari/cesari-con0.html>

\*

### **Events: Fall 2008**

Tuesday, September 30  
“Women and Global Security”  
Margot Wallstrom.  
*Vice President of the European Commission*

Friday, October 17

“Islam and Europe: Multiculturalism and the Challenge of Tolerance”

Ian Buruma

*Henry R. Luce Professor of Human Rights and Journalism, Bard College*

Monday, October 20

Roundtable: European Perspectives on the US Election

Eric Dupin

*Chief Editorialist of the French Magazine "Marianne"*

Andreas Kluth

*Correspondent of "The Economist"*

Christine Landfried

*Visiting Professor at the EU Center of Excellence*

Cas Mudde

*University of Antwerp*

Friday, November 7

“From Famine to Food Crisis, Lessons and Limits of the European Experience”

Eric Vanhaute

*Professor of Economic and Social History and World History, Ghent University, Belgium*

Monday, November 10

“A Few Reasons to Be Confident in the Future of the European Union”

Pierre Francois Mourier

*The Consul General of France, San Francisco*

November 10, 2008

“Environmental Entrepreneurship”

Warner Philips

*Co-Founder, Tendris*

Thursday, November 20

“The Early Modern Roots of the Postmodern Condition: The Reformation, Modern Philosophy, and the State”

Brad S. Gregory

*Associate Professor, University of Notre Dame*

Monday, November 24, 2008

“The US and the EU in the Obama Era”

David Allen

*Professor of European and International Politics and Head of the Department of Politics, International Relations and European Studies at Loughborough University, United Kingdom, Visiting Scholar at IGS*

Wednesday, December 3

“The Collapse of The Euro Area”

Barry Eichengreen

*Professor of Economics Dept., UC Berkeley*

Thursday, December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2008

Roundtable on the Immigration and Integration of Muslim Women in Europe

"Gender Issues as the main topic of Shari'a in the West"

Jocelyne Cesari

*Harvard University*

“Women of Migrant Muslim Descent The Case of France”

Marieme Helie Lucas

*Women Living Under Muslim Laws*

“Muslim Women and the Politics of Representation”

Minoo Moallem

*UC Berkeley*

December 11, 2008

“Riots against the state: Ideology, anarchy and order in modern Greece”

Theocharis Grigoriadis

*Ph. D. Candidate in Political Science, former consultant to the Moscow World Bank Office and the European Union Delegation to Russia*

## **Events: Spring 2009**

January 27<sup>th</sup>

Conference: “Substitute it Now: Understanding the Origins and Exploring the Potential of ChemSec’s Bold List of “Bad Actor” Chemicals”

Organizers: Megan Schwarzman, Michael Wilson

*Research Scientists, School of Public Health, UC Berkeley*

Feb. 11<sup>th</sup>

“European Public Spheres.”

Christine Landfried

*EUCE Scholar-in-Residence; Universität Hamburg, Institut für Politische Wissenschaft.*

Wednesday, February 18

“The Netherlands between Accommodation and Commotion”

Ido de Haan

*Professor of Political History, Utrecht University*

Feb. 25<sup>th</sup>, 26<sup>th</sup>

“Cover-up: French Gender Equality and the Islamic Headscarf “

Joan Wallach-Scott, *Princeton University*

Olivier Roy (moderator), *CNRS, France*

March 30<sup>th</sup>

Conference: “The Transatlantic Relationship In a Post Transatlantic World; Responding To The Russian Challenge.”

Vinod Aggarwal, *Convener and Director, IES/BASC (Berkeley APEC Study Center)*

April 4<sup>th</sup>

“European Union: A Teacher’s Institute”

Sponsored by the EUCE at UC Berkeley. Co-sponsored by the Office of Resources for International Studies (ORIAS) at UCB, and WorldSavvy.

April 22<sup>nd</sup>

“EU relations with the US in light of the new Obama administration.”

Luc Veron, Bill Burros

*EU Delegation*

April 30 - May 1

Conference: “Climate Change Mitigation: Considering Lifestyle Options in Europe and the US.”

Falk Schuetzenmeister, Convener

*IES Visiting Scholar*

May 4<sup>th</sup>

Conference: “Language Policy as a Tool for Integration for Young Adults: A Comparative Perspective”

Aarti Kohli, Convener

*Director of Immigration Policy, and Legislative Counsel, The Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute on Race, Ethnicity and Diversity, UC Berkeley.*

July 19-21

Conference: “Europe-U.S. Infectious Disease Response.”

Chris Ansell – Convener

*Associate Professor of Political Science, UC Berkeley*