



EU CENTER OF EXCELLENCE

Third Semiannual Newsletter

1. Director's Note
2. The Evolving Role of Government: Migration and Education Trends in Europe. Daniel Fass, Fulbright-Schuman Fellow, Department of Sociology, UC Berkeley; Assistant Professor in Sociology at Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland.
3. European Union Conference on Holocaust Era Assets and U.S. State Department Follow-Up. Carla Shapreau, Visiting Scholar, Institute of European Studies (honorary member of the U.S. Delegation to the 2009 EU Conference on Holocaust Era Assets); adjunct faculty, University of California, Berkeley School of Law 2010.
4. Reports from Brussels: EUCE-sponsored Undergraduate Tour. Kristiana Blix, University of Washington; Evan Jaroff, Claremont-Mckenna College; Marco Meissner, University of Koblenz-Landau.
5. EUCE Faculty and Student 2009-10 Grant Awards
6. Fall 2009 Events

Director's Note

Dear EU Studies Community,

Welcome to the third issue of the semiannual newsletter of the European Union Center of Excellence at the University of California, Berkeley. In this issue we feature essays by two visiting scholars at UC Berkeley that address various aspects of European policy-making. In the first piece, Fulbright Scholar Daniel Fass investigates differences among European countries surrounding policies of immigrant integration and language acquisition. In doing so he questions the common assumption that Europe is developing a unified response to immigration, whereas the trend in the US is towards increased diversification. In the second article Visiting Scholar at the Institute of European Studies (IES), Carla Shapreau, reports on a European Union conference held in Prague in summer 2009, addressing unresolved issues from the Nazi Era. She also discusses her

own presentation of research on musical cultural property confiscated, looted, displaced, and swept up as war trophies during the Nazi Era. This past summer the EU Center sponsored a four-day trip to Brussels for the three winners of the best paper award at the annual Claremont-UC Undergraduate Research Conference on the European Union at Scripps College. We conclude the essay section of this newsletter with anecdotal reports of the trip by each of the participants.

In fall 2009 we awarded five student fellowships and four faculty grants for research relating to EU policy-making, and three faculty grants for the development of curricular materials on the EU. As part of our event series we hosted a faculty-led workshop on the Euro, campus visits by two European dignitaries, and a series of scholarly lectures addressing a wide range of themes designed to advance academic and public understanding of the European Union.

As always, 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

*

The Evolving Role of Government: Migration and Education Trends in Europe

Daniel Faas, Fulbright-Schuman Fellow, Department of Sociology, UC Berkeley and Assistant Professor in Sociology at Trinity College Dublin, Ireland.

On May 4, I was invited to speak at a conference on ‘Language Policy as a Tool for Integration: A Comparative Perspective’, cosponsored by the European Union Center and The Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute on Race, Ethnicity and Diversity at UC Berkeley. The event began on the assumption that immigrant integration and language policy differ significantly between European countries and the United States. The United States does not have a coherent, unified national policy on immigrant integration or language access whereas many European countries have explicit goals and funds dedicated to cultural, social and language integration and assimilation. As Michael Fix from the Migration Policy Institute in Washington put it, “there are widely diversified responses to immigration across the US. The US seems to be diverging whereas Europe is converging in their response.” But just how much of a convergence is there really in Europe? I contend that Europe is indeed converging around a civic integrationist agenda which, among other things, fosters language learning but there is also considerable national divergence in managing migration-related diversity and redefining multicultural or intercultural policies and national identity.

Let me begin with a brief juxtaposition of American and European conceptualizations of multiculturalism. Arguably, the US deals relatively poorly with the needs of immigrants and is centered on ‘race’ and civil rights rather than language or culture. There is a policy focus on group differences and mainly Christian communities (such as Latinos), a theoretical focus on empowerment of ethno-cultural groups, and state neutrality towards religion. In contrast, Europe has a sizeable proportion of migrant Muslim communities (15 million or 4% of the total population) and the academic debate has focused more on democratic citizenship and ethno-religious diversity.¹ Despite these differences, there are migrant minorities on both sides of the Atlantic that have been constructed as the ‘Other’, notably Muslims in Europe and Latinos in the United States. This is brilliantly illustrated in a paper entitled ‘Why Islam is like Spanish: Cultural Incorporation in Europe and the United States.’²

What this also shows is that there have been notable transatlantic similarities (a) in terms of creating distinctions between ‘us’ and ‘them’ and (b) in recognizing the need of responding to the increasing migration-related diversity and resulting challenges in areas such as education and the labor market. In short, one of the fundamental questions policymakers and academics alike are facing is how to promote cultural and religious diversity on the one hand whilst also fostering social cohesion on the other? What is the common bond that holds our societies together and what can be done to achieve this common bond without retreating from multiculturalism (or from its updated and less politically charged version of interculturalism) as many governments in Europe are now advocating? These questions are equally pressing on both sides of the Atlantic. 12.5% in the US are foreign-born (with the numbers in California and San Francisco reaching 27.2% and 35.7% respectively). In Europe, most countries regardless of whether they are so-called ‘old migration hosts’ like the United Kingdom and Germany, or ‘new migration hosts’ like Greece and Ireland have a migrant population of more than 10% and this is reflected in primary, and increasingly, secondary schools.

However, there have been noticeable differences in responding to this diversity, not just between the US and Europe but also within the European Union. For example, a closer look at the distribution of migrant students across schools in the OECD countries reveals that the US has one of the most segregated systems whereas countries like Ireland, Spain, Italy and Portugal have a far more equally distributed migrant student population. More alarmingly, international student assessment studies like PISA³ have not only shown that migrant students trail their native peers in all countries, but that second-generation students score worse than first-generation migrants in Germany,

¹ For more details, see Tariq Modood (2007) *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

² Zolberg, A.R. and Woon, L.L. (1999) ‘Why Islam is like Spanish? Cultural incorporation in Europe and the United States’, *Politics and Society* 27(5): 5-38.

³ The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) is an internationally standardised assessment that was jointly developed by participating countries and administered to 15-year-olds in presently 62 countries.

Austria and the Netherlands.⁴ This invites the question of why there are such big gaps in student performance and distribution, and the answer partly lies in the different historical and ideological approaches to managing ethno-cultural diversity. I will look at the UK, Germany, Greece and Ireland to illustrate this point.⁵

The United Kingdom has had over 20 'race' and immigration legislations since World War Two and, given its colonial ties and recruitment of workers based on the assumption that they would stay in the country, embarked on a more multicultural vision than a country like Germany or Denmark, which recruited 'guest workers' on the assumption that they were in the country for just a short period of time. In the aftermath of the 2001 urban riots in northern England and the 2005 London bombings, the government reconsidered its multicultural strategy and has since tried to marry the concept of integration with the British legacy of multiculturalism. Examples of this are the fact that, since 2007, schools have been obliged to educate for community cohesion but students are still able to sit for examinations in 'community languages' such as Urdu or Bengali. Cultural diversity and identity is also one of seven cross-curricular dimensions. However, the numbers of pupils taking 'community languages' continue to fall and their teachers often lack Qualified Teacher Status. Similar to the UK, according to Aída Walqui (Director of Teacher Professional Development, WestEd), Sweden provides mother-tongue teaching in schools and (like the Netherlands) requires 120 hours of professional development per annum compared to just 3 hours in the US.

Germany, by contrast, has only had one immigration act despite 50 years of immigration. Until a decade ago, governments refused to acknowledge that it is an immigration country but since then there has been a comprehensive reform of the citizenship legislation (adding *jus soli* to the predominant principle of *jus sanguinis*), a series of integration summits and separate Islam summits to enter into a dialogue with migrant communities and a National Integration Plan which identifies promoting German language learning as one of ten priority policy areas. The newly established integration courses provide for 900 hours of language learning and 30 hours of cultural, historical and legal input as part of a naturalization test migrants need to pass. The focus on language learning is such that mother-tongue teaching is no longer given any significant credit and several of these measures are bordering on assimilation. Unlike other countries, Germany has had the problem that the two main parties are in a deadlock about what exactly integration means. The conservatives (CDU) argue that it is a precondition for naturalization whereas the Social Democrats (SPD) view citizenship acquisition as a means toward integration and thus advocate double citizenship.

Greece is another country with a historically more monocultural outlook. It experienced mass migration following the fall of the Iron Curtain but has so far struggled to move beyond a mere recognition of the diverse nature of society. It emphasizes instead social homogeneity based on Orthodoxy, citizenship (10 years for naturalization

⁴ Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (2006) *Where Immigrant Students Succeed: a comparative review of performance and engagement in PISA 2003*, Paris: OECD.

⁵ Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (2006) *Education at a Glance*, Paris: OECD.

compared to 8 in Germany, and 4 in the UK and Ireland respectively) and the Greek language. Despite two immigration acts which allow for optional mother-tongue teaching on request, there is little implementation of this in classrooms and the government's policy is based on the odd definition that for a school to be classified as intercultural at least 45% of its student population needs to have a migrant background. Yet, there are schools beyond this threshold which have not been named intercultural. In contrast, Ireland seems to favor a more multicultural approach despite having recently tightened its naturalization regulations and discontinued the National Consultative Committee on Racism and Interculturalism and Ireland Language and Training services for teachers, due to the current economic crisis. Non-nationals are allowed to become part of the police force and the 2009 local elections saw a fivefold increase of candidates from a migrant background compared with 2004.

At the level of the EU, a powerful Green Paper on Migration and Mobility encourages member states to (a) teach an official language of the host State; and (b) teach the mother tongue and culture of the country of origin (heritage language) in coordination with normal education.⁶ Language was also identified as a key factor for social integration, cohesion and success in the European Commission's 'Key Competences for Lifelong Learning' document.⁷ Two of the eight key competences needed in today's knowledge-based societies were identified as communication in the mother tongue and communication in foreign languages. The recent European Pact on Immigration and Asylum is another example of an EU-level response to the issue of migration and was designed to organize legal immigration to take account of the priorities, needs and reception capacities determined by each member state, and encourage integration; control irregular immigration by ensuring the return of irregular aliens to their country of origin or a country of transit; make border controls more effective; construct a Europe of asylum; and create a comprehensive partnership with the countries of origin and transit to encourage the synergy between migration and development. Despite national variations in immigrant incorporation, Europe has made language acquisition a top policy priority.

What are the implications of this for the US? We need to bear in mind here that the United States is not the EU and that EU institutions are relatively powerless in terms of issuing legally binding treaties in areas of education, immigration and language policy. But the guidelines and best practices disseminated via the Open Method of Coordination serve as a powerful tool by which EU institutions are currently reminding member states to become more active in certain policy areas, as is the case with language promotion which is now at the heart of national policy responses in virtually all member states. It is important however for US immigration reform to not simply have language acquisition from pre-kindergarten through to adults at the center of a new law, but to be aware that

⁶ European Commission (2008) *Migration and Mobility: challenges and opportunities for EU education systems*, available online at: http://ec.europa.eu/education/school21/com423_en.pdf.

⁷ Council of the European Union (2006) *Key Competences for Lifelong Learning*, available online at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:394:0010:0018:EN:PDF>.

teachers, schools, de-segregation policies and socio-economic inclusion also matter.⁸ Unlike assimilation, integration is a two-way process involving members of the national majority and minority communities. A top-down focus on host language only would undermine the skills migrants bring with them.

*

European Union Conference on Holocaust Era Assets and U.S. State Department Follow-up

Carla Shapreau, Visiting Scholar, Institute of European Studies (honorary member of the U.S. Delegation to the 2009 EU Conference on Holocaust Era Assets); adjunct faculty, University of California, Berkeley, School of Law 2010 (art and cultural property law)

The international community met at a European Union conference in Prague on June 26-30, 2009, to address unresolved issues from the Nazi Era. The participants included 47 country delegations, 148 organizations, and a representative of the Holy See. This conference on Holocaust Era assets was one of the last acts of the Czech Republic in its capacity as EU President and was held in order to facilitate progress regarding a host of issues addressed by experts, participating governments, and various stakeholders.

Five working groups formed the core of expert discussions regarding the issues of concern, including Holocaust Education; Remembrance and Research; Immovable Property (private and communal); Looted Art (including objects of cultural, historical; and religious importance); Judaica and Jewish Cultural Property; and Caring for Victims of Nazism and Their Legacy, a session which focused on social, medical and economic support granted irrespective of nationality, creed, ethnicity, or current country of residence. Each working group discussed an array of topics over two days of simultaneous expert panel presentations, the details of which may be found online at: <http://www.holocausteraassets.eu>.

Secretary of State Hilary Clinton appointed Ambassador Stuart E. Eizenstat to head the 24-member U.S. Delegation. Ambassador J. Christian Kennedy, Head of the State Department's Office of Holocaust Issues, was also appointed by Clinton as Special Envoy for Holocaust Issues (<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2009/06a/125167.htm>). Among those participating in the opening proceedings were Vaclav Havel, Former President of the Czech Republic; Stefan Füle, Minister for European Affairs, Czech Republic; Simone Veil, Former President of the European Parliament; and Elie Wiesel, author and Nobel Laureate. Madeleine Albright, Former U.S. Secretary of State, also addressed those in attendance.

I represented U.C. Berkeley's Institute of European Studies at the conference with a paper delivered in the Looted Art Working Group entitled *Musical Cultural Property: The Nazi Era and Post-War Provenance Challenges*. An analogous field to fine art

⁸ Faas (2010) *Negotiating Political Identities: multiethnic schools and youth in Europe*, Aldershot: Ashgate (available from March 2010), see also journal articles at: <http://people.tcd.ie/faasd>.

losses, musical cultural property, including musical manuscripts, valuable printed music, antique musical instruments, books, and other music-related materials were confiscated, looted, displaced, and swept up as war trophies during the Nazi Era. Identifying, locating, documenting, and researching the provenance of these items and 21st century implications are the subject of my ongoing research on campus.

Archival records, public and private, both in the U.S. and Europe, as well as post-war accounts and other information, have resulted in mounting evidence confirming such losses, in some instances restitutions to the presumed country of origin, the full contours of which are evolving. Research relating to Austria, Belgium, former Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Russia, and the Ukraine all contribute to an understanding of this lost history.

One of the goals of the conference was an assessment of progress made over the last decade, intended as a 10th anniversary follow-up to the topics addressed at the 1998 Washington Conference on Holocaust-Era Assets. At this conference, which was a watershed event, 44 countries adopted non-binding principles to assist in resolving issues pertaining to Nazi-confiscated art. See

<http://www.state.gov/www/regions/eur/holocausthp.html>.

These principles related in part to changes in the art world regarding museum collection management and transactions involving fine art. They include policies and guidelines promulgated by the American Association of Museum Directors and the American Association of Museums (AAM) pertaining to the unlawful appropriation of cultural objects during the Nazi Era. One of the initiatives of the AAM has been the establishment of the Nazi-Era Provenance Internet Portal, www.nepip.org, which provides a searchable registry of objects in American museums created before 1946 that changed hands in Continental Europe during the years 1933-1945. There are currently 28,034 objects posted from 167 museums listed on this portal. For the art world the last decade has seen a sea change, but for other areas of cultural property the mining of records and progress have lagged behind.

At the conclusion of the Prague EU conference, 46 country delegations signed the Terezin Declaration, a non-binding commitment to further progress regarding the following topics: (1) the welfare of Holocaust survivors, (2) real property restitution or compensation, (3) the identification and protection of Jewish cemeteries and burial sites, (4) the resolution of claims for restitution of Nazi-confiscated and looted art and other cultural property, (5) Judaica and Jewish cultural property protection and claim resolution, (6) improved archival access, (7) education, remembrance, research, and memorial sites, and (8) the formation of the European Shoah Legacy Institute in Terezin. The text of the Declaration may be found at:

<http://www.state.gov/p/eur/rls/or/126162.htm>.

As a follow-up to the EU conference and the U.S. commitment to issues of concern, the State Department held a Town Hall meeting in Washington, D.C. on September 22, 2009. There, a discussion regarding avenues for further progress took place, which addressed most prominently the possible creation of alternative mechanisms to fairly resolve Holocaust Era assets claims including the formation of a national commission or panel with representatives from diverse stake holders, scholars, and other experts in the field. The State Department has indicated that it "would like to propose a

United States commission to mediate claims of disputed ownership of art, other cultural goods and Judaica displaced during the 1933-45 period," and discussions within the art and cultural property community are ongoing. As a result, another Town Hall meeting is scheduled in Washington, D.C. for January 7, 2010 and comments arising from research conducted in the Institute of European Studies will be among those submitted for consideration. The European Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee is also expected to hold a Congressional hearing regarding these and other related matters in the near future.

*

Reports from Brussels: EUCE-sponsored Undergraduate Tour

On April 16th and 17th, 2008, The Institute of European Studies, a partner unit of the EU Center, contributed to the Joint Annual Claremont–UC Undergraduate Research Conference on the European Union. Integrated with curriculum at participating colleges, the primary purpose of this conference is to enhance undergraduate student understanding of the European Union and US-European relations, foster inter-campus exchange and collaboration, and recognize excellent work achieved by students. Following the conference, in June 2009, the EU centers at UC Berkeley and the University of Washington cosponsored a four-day study tour to Brussels for authors of the three best conference papers. UCB center Project Director Jeffrey Pennington and EUCE Associate Director Philip Shekleton of the University of Washington accompanied the students to the European Commission, the European Council, the European Parliament, the EU-Russia Centre, and NATO Headquarters. The following are articles submitted by each of the student travelers, describing their experiences and impressions of the Brussels tour.

Kristiana Blix (University of Washington)

Brussels was never “on my agenda” so to speak. Though the European Union made consistent appearances (enjoyable and fascinating ones at that) in my education at the University of Washington, actually traveling to the literal center of the institution never occurred to me. Denmark, yes. Spain, yes. The U.K., yes. Belgium, however, never popped up on my to-do list. Ironically enough, graduating with a degree in International Studies, I had not studied abroad or traveled much at all during my tenure at UW for reasons both pragmatic and dramatic, which I will not detail. I did however, have the good fortune to find my way to Brussels thanks to the European Union Center at UC Berkeley, an experience and opportunity that I will not soon forget.

My journey to Brussels began with an invitation to participate in the European Union Center of California’s Undergraduate Research Conference on the European Union at Scripps College in Claremont, CA. I was writing my honors thesis on the Danish government’s impact on the labor market activity of ethnic minority women in Denmark. I felt like a bit of a sham for not having had the chance to travel to Denmark

and do more on the ground research, and was taking any opportunity I could to present my work. The EUC conference was a perfect opportunity.

Having come away with one of the top prizes at the conference, shocked and in awe, I found myself planning my adventure to Europe—one that I had so dreamed of since my last trip to Spain 5 years before. I honestly can say I would have never been able to make a trip to Europe on my own without the support of the EU Centers and I feel both proud of my accomplishment and incredibly grateful for the opportunity.

When I arrived in Europe, what struck me most was how Brussels maintains its role as both an international city and a place with a distinct culture and history. The cuisine, la Grand Place, and the cast of characters on this trip were a remarkable blend of old and new. Wanting to take advantage of this unique city, the five days of our program were non-stop adventures. Bouncing from the meeting to meeting during the day and from park to restaurant and around town in the evening, I and the other participants did all we could to soak up the city in the short time we had in Brussels. Not only were there university students and faculty advisors, but also affiliated high school teachers who teach the European Union. It was great to have both the student and teacher perspective during presentations. I cannot write this article without emphasizing how much I enjoyed spending time with the other participants on the program. It was like we had been friends for years, discussing the presentations and our lives without skipping a beat. It is an experience and friendships I won't forget.

It was certain, though all of us had been exposed to the EU, meeting with people in the Council, Commission, and Parliament exposed us to a much more realistic, as opposed to idealistic, vision of the EU. The day to day realities of running the EU and the manpower behind the institutions is reminiscent of a well oiled major corporation as opposed to a nebulous political and economic entity. This almost mechanical nature was highlighted for me by one presenter, who remarked, "What is it with Americans and Turkey?!" It seems, though this contentious issue is a hot topic, there are so many important issues that the EU is in no way under the thumb of contention due to the Turkey issue or any other for that matter. Not only is the EU a forum, but a powerhouse of change, and therefore, a stern negotiator and cooperator. The presenter's exclamation emphasized this sense that the EU in many ways is strictly a business endeavor.

I particularly enjoyed having a lecture from member of European Parliament. She was incredibly unabashed about the difficulties of being a European politician. Having visited right after European elections, it was easy to sense that parliament was preparing for a definite shift as the names and faces in the hemicycle would soon be changing and so would the dynamics of accomplishing the goals they set out. Visiting NATO was definitely a highlight, simply because of the layers of security checks and the real sense that you were in a military location. It was in cases like this that you could ask about what you had read in the news in person from someone who knew exactly what was going on because it was the first line item in their Monday morning meeting. It was like having private radio frequency into institutional meetings in which the next major decisions were to be made. It is those ephemeral expressions we got from our presenters on the issues and their answers, which were not simply analyses but politics they lived in every day, that made what we learned in Brussels so unique and valuable.

The program in Brussels expanded on the extensive knowledge I had accrued on the EU and added a whole new layer of perspective. I never sought out Brussels, though

in retrospect the city and what it represents have a strong correlation with the international themes of my education and was a poignant and fitting way for me to end my college experience.

Evan Jaroff (Claremont-McKenna College)

As I stepped out of Gare Centrale station, I took a moment to stop, put down my luggage, and take in my surroundings. Winding, narrow streets encircled elegant, sand-colored buildings and I was immediately engulfed by one overwhelming feeling: “Ah, I’m in Europe.” Although the skies were slightly overcast and there was a slow drizzling of rain, my first impressions of Brussels were quite positive.

After finding my way (with the help of fellow attendee Kristiana Brix) to the Royal Windsor Hotel, I almost began to feel like a real diplomat. The hotel was beautiful, it was located close to the center of Brussels, and it had amazing views of the city. In just a week, our group of about 30 was easily able to explore Grand Place, witness the Mannequin Pis in full form, and enjoy all of the delicious waffles, beer, chocolate, and fries that the city has to offer.

In terms of the educational value of the trip, it was fantastic. Over the course of one week, our group visited the European Commission, the European Council, the European Parliament, and NATO Headquarters. During these visits, we met with various experts on the EU, EU-US relations, EU-NATO relations, US-NATO relations, and broader, European affairs. Among other topics, our group posed questions surrounding Iceland’s accession into the European Union and also the likelihood (or unlikelihood) of Turkey ever joining NATO.

What made this trip particularly dynamic was its diversity. Our group comprised recent college graduates, current college students, high school teachers, high school administrators, and college professors. Although we were all from different backgrounds and at different stages in our lives, we shared an interest in European politics and benefitted greatly from each other’s questions and discussions. An interesting part about the conversations that we had within our group (and with EU experts), was that they were conducted in both formal and informal settings. We met in places ranging from large conference rooms, to the inside of the chamber of the European Parliament, to the bar at Kitty O’Shea’s Pub. Also, since we toured the College of Europe and Bruges (in addition to the EU institutions and NATO), it gave the trip a good deal of variety, enabling us to get a better feel for Belgium as a country.

My trip to Belgium with the EU Center at UC-Berkeley provided me with some great insights into the inner workings of the massive, European institutions in Brussels, and it also allowed me to interact with a mixture of students, teachers, and administrators with similar interests.

Marco Meissner (University of Koblenz-Landau)

The first thing that comes to my mind: Waffles!

Seriously, I got out of my train (I arrived from southern Germany) at Gare du Midi, and the first thing I noticed was the sweet, welcoming smell of warm Waffles! Amazing! After arriving at the hotel in the late afternoon the group met for the first time for a quick briefing about the trip and an informal dinner. We split up in several small groups and went to explore the Belgian cuisine. Over a portion of mussels and a local beer I got to know the group I was having dinner with. I soon realized that I was in fact one of only two Europeans who attended the summer study tour, so this would be very interesting indeed!

The whole group itself – consisting of two organizing faculty members, EU Center administrators, a group of high school teachers and students, was well balanced and despite being a token European I felt well embedded in this scenario. Everyone was highly motivated and interested to hear about the EU but also to find out about the European way of life.

The program started Monday morning and led us to visit the European Commission, where we had a tour around the house, a lunch at the Commission Cafeteria and several briefings by members of various units within the Commission. It gave us a good first glimpse on what people working for the EU are actually involved in – which is about everything from international relations and diplomacy up to chicken breast. Afterwards a visit to the EU Information Center followed where one could find countless info leaflets, posters and books about the EU – my personal favorite was a one-inch sized copy of the rights as an EU citizen!

Like most of the days that followed the program, this one ended about 5.00 pm and smaller groups went out for the Brussels dining experience. After dinner there was always a bunch of people socializing in one of the many pubs and bars the town has to offer. Seldom in my life have I felt more international than in Brussels; just about every major language can be heard at first hand in the pub scene. So a few conversations and a few beverages later everyone got back to the hotel where the alarm was set for 7AM – no time to lose on this intense “EU-with-5-senses” study tour.

On Tuesday, after an enormous breakfast, visits to the European Parliament and the Council were scheduled with various speakers awaiting our group. Tours of the buildings and insights into the every day life of MEP’s and other officials were just as exciting as the various projects our speakers were involved in. All the Institutions seemed well prepared for our visits and all of the speakers seemed highly enthusiastic about their work and the EU. Everybody was happy and willing to show both sides of their profession, the relevance of their job within the institution and Europe as well as personal anecdotes that filled the often abstract grid with life and the room with laughter- we learned for example about the badly reputed ‘chicken case’ referring to an ongoing and enervating US – EU dispute about the cleaning procedures for exporting chicken meat. After the institutional part was over small groups again dispersed through town center for more Belgian food, chocolate, waffles and drinks – the calories lost by running around all the different institutions all day long sure needed to be replenished! And at this point I should quickly add that Belgian fries (like French fries just Belgian!) are probably the absolute peak in the evolution of fries – they do not even need the array of 20 available dipping sauces to impress – they are just as fantastic without any special effects!

Wednesday started with a tour to the NATO Headquarter and familiarized us with a more militaristic approach to foreign relations. Personally, I could not agree on

everything that was said, but hey, what does the NATO care what I think. After listening to and discussing with NATO and US Officials we moved on to the US Mission to the EU to be welcomed by the Minister Counselor for Public Affairs who gave us a very American angle on the EU and its politics. The day ended with a visit to the EU-Russia centre where the Centre Director gave us a glimpse on the challenges of his work with Russian diplomats and the sometimes thug-like behavior of high-ranking Russian business or state officials. Exhausted from a long day of listening, debating and marching we went back to our hotel, relaxed a little to then again engage in laid back conversations, dinner and night life.

Thursday morning the group took the train to Bruges to visit the College of Europe and the library. We received an introduction to who and what was happening here and why the college deserves the good reputation it has, before taking a final lunch together and exploring around town for the rest of the day – this time like normal tourists, as by then most people of our group were just as well-fed with information as I was. The amount of input one can take certainly is limited, but without crossing the line towards ‘too much’ I still felt, that I would need some time to reflect on all, that was heard and taken in on this trip!

Summing up I have to admit that this was one very intense week, but full of intellectual, cultural and social stimulation which I absolutely enjoyed every minute of! I felt privileged being a part of this study tour and look forward to hopefully seeing some of the now familiar faces again.

*

EUCE Student Predissertation and Dissertation Grants Awarded in 2009

Nilgun Bayraktar. Department of Performance Studies.

Dissertation Research Project Title: *Art Against the Current: The Geo-politics of Mobility in Post-Socialist Europe.*

Abstract: This dissertation investigates socially engaged art works and films which concern questions of space, place and identity in post-socialist Europe. Ms. Bayraktar studies how artistic praxis negotiates or critiques complex European mobilities conditioned by gender, ethnicity, and class. The geo-political aspect of this project focuses on the transitory geographies of East and Southeast Europe (up to and including Turkey), European Southern border, and migratory spaces within Western Europe. The analysis of art works navigates the ‘mobility paradigm’ in social sciences, the ‘mobility turn’ in contemporary art, and the emergence of a new border-regime in Europe. In this frame, artworks by various artists and filmmakers (Ursula Biemann, Angela Melitopoulos, Esra Ersen, Nevin Aladag, Ayse Polat, Emanuel Danesch, Shahram Entekhabi, and Kutlug Ataman) are entangled with the central issues of the European border politics, the new forms of power consolidation, and the gendered and racialized shifts in transnational migration and global labor.

Elizabeth Carter. Department of Political Science.

Dissertation Research Project Title: *The Politics of Wine Production in France and Italy.*

Abstract: Understanding how wine regulation operates in different national contexts is of critical importance to EU politics. In August 2009, control of protected designations of origins – the main regulatory mechanism for quality wine – passed from a national level policy to the auspices of the EU. Despite the fact that France and Italy have nominally identical wine regulation, the two countries are responding differently to today's market challenges. This raises the questions: how does regulation interact with different national contexts? What shapes how countries compete? And what power does the EU have to enhance the competitiveness of national markets?

Zoe Chafe. Energy and Resources Group.

Predissertation Research Project Title: *Climate Change, Health, and Human Rights: Transatlantic Prioritization of an Emerging Aid and Security Nexus.*

Abstract: This project proposes to study 1) whether and how the European Union and United States are collaborating to integrate basic health priorities into climate change mitigation and adaptation-related policy decisions, in a post-Copenhagen context; 2) transatlantic policy negotiations around emerging short-lived greenhouse pollutants and their relation to health; and 3) transatlantic responses to recent human rights-related messaging from developing country negotiating blocs. As EU and US leaders move forward in formal negotiations and (less public) collaboration, the degree to which they prioritize health/climate linkages may determine funding priorities in this area for decades to come.

Kimberly Twist. Department of Political Science.

Predissertation Research Project Title: *The Radical Right's Effect in Europe.*

Abstract: Given the success of radical right parties across Western Europe, this project attempts to explain what happens once these parties have established a presence, particularly with respect to public opinion, European Union referenda, and party positioning. Ms. Twist plans to conduct predissertation research in the United Kingdom, Austria, and Switzerland, with the aim of conducting interviews with selected radical right politicians and supporters and beginning content analyses, so that when she begins her dissertation research she will have established contacts to conduct additional interviews and analyze electoral data.

Zhivka Valiavicharska. Department of Rhetoric.

Dissertation Research Project Title: *Spectral Socialisms: Neoliberalism, Critical Discourses, and the Future of Progressive Politics in Post-Socialist Bulgaria.*

Abstract: This dissertation studies contemporary practices and intellectual discourses in relationship to neoliberal development in post-socialist Bulgaria. It aims to develop a critical analysis of the discursive conditions which structured the peculiar meanings of

Right and Left after socialism, contributing to a hegemony of neoliberal political and intellectual culture. While examining the meanings, functions, and the fate of Marxism and the Left in post-socialist intellectual development, the dissertation also examines the future of progressive politics and critical cultural practice within the possibilities and foreclosures that an EU membership offers.

Faculty Grants Awarded in 2009

Awards for Faculty Research

Vinod K. Aggarwal. Professor of Political Science, UC Berkeley; Director, Berkeley APEC Study Center.

Project Title: *Cooperation among Democracies? India, the US, and the EU*

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 second phase of this three-year project will bring experts together in April 2010 to examine these questions with respect to the rise of India and the political economic and security issues that this shift raises for the transatlantic relationship.

Christopher Ansell. Associate Professor of Political Science, UC Berkeley; Director, Travers Program.

Project Title: *Global Pandemic Response: European, American, and Chinese Responses to H1N1*.

This project investigates the global response to the 2009 H1N1 flu pandemic in the EU, the US, and China. The goal is to evaluate how outbreak response institutions in each state/region mobilized and deployed to manage and mitigate this trans-boundary crisis. Pandemic response is a challenging task. It requires complex and broad-based coordination among many organizations operating at different levels of government and in different political jurisdictions. The purpose of the study is to investigate and compare the specific responses of the EU, the US, and China in order to understand the “lessons learned” that may be useful in preparing for a more virulent pandemic in the future.

Barry Eichengreen. George C. Pardee and Helen H. Pardee Professor of Economics and Political Science, UC Berkeley.

Project Title: *EU and Euro Area Representation in the IMF*

IMF reform is high on the international political and economic agenda. The most important stumbling block in the way of quota reform (larger voting shares for emerging markets) and executive board consolidation (moving from an awkwardly large 24 member board to a smaller board of, say, 20 members, more of whom represent emerging markets) is the fragmentation of European representation. Europe is overrepresented in the Fund, and on its executive board in particular, for historical reasons. The EU has as many as eight seats on the 24 member board (depending on rotation). In some cases EU are in constituencies (share executive board seats) with non-European countries. For all these reasons the EU does not speak with one voice on matters of IMF policy and reform. This project will consider proposals for consolidating EU representation into one (EU) and alternatively two (euro area and non-euro area EU) seats. Voting models will be used to demonstrate how these changes are likely to affect European influence in the Fund. Participant interviews will be used to assess the sources of resistance to consolidating European representation in the Fund.

Philip Martin. Professor of Agriculture and Resource Economics, UC Davis; Chair, UC Comparative Immigration & Integration Program.

Project Title: *High-Skilled Foreigners in S&E: European and American Approaches and Trade Offs*

This project will develop a comparative project to explore the trade offs involved in migration policies and bolstering homegrown talent in science and engineering. Many employers of S&E workers assert that they need to scour the world for the best talent, and that government should minimize hurdles to the admission foreign S&E workers. Critics assert that employers are seeking young workers willing to work long hours for relatively low pay in the hope of earning an immigrant status, and that making entry for foreigners too easy will discourage local students. The project will develop a proposal for a series of conferences and publications exploring this debate.

Awards for Curriculum Development

Jeroen Dewulf. Assistant Professor and Director of the Dutch Studies Program at UC Berkeley.

Module for Dutch 170 – *Multiculturalism in the Netherlands*.

Miriam Golden. Professor, Department of Political Science, UCLA.

Module on “Distributive Politics in the EU” for Political Science 259-3 - *Selected Topics in Comparative Politics*.

G. Matthias Kondolf. Professor,
Curriculum Development for IAS/LA229 - *The EU Water Framework Directive: What Lessons for the US?*

Events: Fall 2009

Thursday, September 24

“EU Asylum and Immigration Policy: “Fortress Europe.”

Jörg Monar, Professor and Director of Political and Administrative Studies, College of Europe (Bruges and Natolin/Warsaw); Professor, Sussex European Institute, University of Sussex).

Thursday, October 1

“Europe's Response to the World Economic Crisis.”

Tomáš Sedláček, Chief Macroeconomic Strategist at ČSOB Bank, Prague

Wednesday, October 7

“Cold War and European Integration in the 1950s: A Biographical Approach.”

Madelon de Keizer, Netherlands Institute for War Documentation, Amsterdam

Monday, October 12

“Education without Borders: Multiculturalism, Integration, and Diversity in European Higher Education.”

Odile Quintin, Director General, European Commission DG for Education and Culture

Thursday, October 15

“The Euro after the Crisis.”

Barry Eichengreen, George C. Pardee and Helen N. Pardee Professor of Economics and Political Science, Department of Economics, UC Berkeley

Wednesday, December 2

“Brussels in the Belgian Labyrinth: Problem or Asset?”

Jeffrey Tyssens, Professor of History at the Free University of Brussels, VUB, and this year's Pieter Paul Rubens Chair at UC Berkeley's Dutch Studies Program.

Tuesday December 1.

“The Swedish Presidency of the European Union: Goals and Accomplishments.”

Ambassador Carl-Magnus Hyltenius, Consulate General of Sweden

Wednesday, December 2

“Transcontinental REACH: How the EU's Chemicals Policy can Promote Green Chemistry in California.”

Klaus Berend, Head of Unit Chemicals, European Commission, Directorate-General Enterprise and Industry.

Friday, December 4

“Global Warming as a Global Externality.”

Armon Rezai, Visiting Scholar, Institute of European Studies.

