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Director’s Note

Dear EU Studies Community,

Welcome to the fifth issue of the semiannual newsletter of the European Union Center of Excellence at the University of California, Berkeley. In this issue we highlight work by undergraduate students, who participated in the 8th annual Claremont-UC Undergraduate Research Conference on the European Union, held in April 2010 at Scripps College. We begin with two short essays by participants in the tour of Brussels awarded by the Center each summer to authors of the three best conference papers. In the first piece, UC Berkeley graduate Norm Waters describes how observing daily activities and procedures at EU institutions enabled him to understand the EU as a work in progress rather than a fully realized vision. In a similar vein, Colby Mangels of Georgia Institute of Technology explains how the tour allowed him to ground his theoretical studies of the EU with concrete insights. These accounts are followed by a condensed version of another award-winning conference paper by UCLA student Neha Jaganathan, exploring the tension between the ideal of a singular European identity and the reality of diverse national identities among the EU’s member states. Full-text versions of papers by Ms. Jaganathan and Mr. Mangels may be found on the online version of the 2010 conference publication.

In Fall 2010, we awarded 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 Fall event series we sponsored two faculty-led workshops examining respectively the economic crisis in Ireland and EU responses to the H1N1 pandemic, and a conference addressing policies aimed at restricting migration in the EU and the US. The Center also cosponsored a range of lectures broaching various aspects of EU history and policy-making, and, as part of our EU Presidency Speaker Series we were delighted to welcome to campus Consul General of Belgium, Geert Criel. This coming Spring we look forward to a full schedule of events designed to advance academic and public understanding of the European Union, including five faculty-led conferences, a workshop for regional K-14 educators, a campus visit by a representative of the Hungarian presidency, and visiting lectures by scholars and professionals.

As always, we invite you to visit our website at eucenter.berkeley.edu for the latest up-to-date information about EU Center activities, 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 or by phone on (510) 643-5777. We look forward to seeing you at our upcoming events!

Beverly Crawford
Codirector

Jeffrey Pennington
Codirector
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In Brussels: Observing the EU Up Close
Norm Waters, UC Berkeley

Standing in the middle of the European Quarter in Brussels, one can’t help but be impressed at the unity and apparent cohesion of the European project. The Commission Headquarters dominates the skyline of old Dutch town homes and demands attention from each onlooker passing along its cobblestone streets. The neighborhood is the embodiment of the intersection between old and new Europe; worn stone buildings against the backdrop of looming glass and metal towers. The area is a veritable melting pot, one hears dozens of languages spoken by the people drawn here from every corner of Europe. But, the reality behind this international microcosm is much more telling and interesting. Though the massive government and office buildings appear the work of some grand master plan, its historic development is much more organic and haphazard.

During my visit to Brussels provided by the European Center of Excellence, I had the privilege of going behind the scenes and of getting different perspectives on the European project, from people directly engaged in its day-to-day operation. During a tour of the Council I was impressed by a massive oval table in a large conference room surrounded by glass paneled booths. Around the table were placed twenty-seven placards each inscribed with the name of one of the twenty-seven member countries in their native languages. The glass-paneled booths housed translators during council meetings, though we were told that increasingly all business tends to be conducted in either French or English. This is encouraged by the fact that, if an official forgoes a translator, the money
may be allocated towards travel expenses the delegation incurs shuttling between their home countries and Brussels. At first this arrangement seems practical, until once considers the size of the European Union and the proximity of Brussels to countries whose native languages are either French or English.

Though the Commission and Council were impressive to say the least, what struck me most was the Parliament. The massive two-tiered chamber houses all 730 odd members of Parliament and reminded me of a giant college lecture hall. During our tour, our Finnish guide presented us with a color coded yearly parliamentary schedule. This normally wouldn’t seem of much interest except for the fact that one-week of each month was highlighted in a different color. This display represented where the Parliament was to meet. Initially, Parliament was strictly located in Strasbourg, France. By the mid-1990’s Parliament had moved the majority of their operations to Brussels (to have better access to the Commission and Council seated there) but retained Strasbourg as its official residence. Thus, once a month, all 736 MEP’s and the majority of their respective legislative staffs must make the journey to Strasbourg. Our guide also informed us that, one year, Parliament only met in Strasbourg eleven times, much to the dismay of France. France ended up suing the Parliament in the European Court of Justice and won. The difficulty posed by this spilt situation is probably not as great as it sounds. Strasbourg is not terribly far from Brussels, and the people making the journey must travel from their home countries anyway. The significance is largely symbolic and illustrative of the historical development of the EU and its governing bodies. Because the EU is by and large an experiment in government, it has developed to suit the needs and demands of member states. Lacking any sort of master plan, there are certain inefficiencies that have developed naturally over the course of its history. Such as dividing where Parliament meets, and encouraging business to be conducted in French and English.

The EU and its practices have followed a particular historical trajectory much like the construction of Brussels’ European Quarter. Different layers of the past form an impressive mosaic of new and old. Organic inefficiencies in EU governance have arisen because of the lack of a master plan. Each decision is a balanced process of give and take between the member states. Though the system may not be perfect, but it was certainly a rich and interesting study, made even more so by getting to see it up close.
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Report from Brussels
Colby Mangels, Georgia Institute of Technology

I feel extremely fortunate to have had the opportunity to take part in this year’s study tour to Brussels, Belgium. Not only did we have many wonderful meetings with distinguished speakers, but there was also the chance to get to know the many other fascinating participants on the tour. Ultimately, I feel that the five days of tours and seminars provided me with that which I had long sought: a relevant insight to the everyday operations of the European institutions to accompany my classroom and theoretical studies of this unique supranational organization.
Arriving in Brussels, I was immediately reminded of the nature of our trip. Our hotel was located directly across from the European Commission buildings, with the Council of European in short walking distance. Throughout the week, the tour’s participants repeatedly enjoyed the hotel’s excellent location as a means of further exploring the more isolated quarters of Brussels.

Beginning the week with visits to the Commission, the tour group was provided with an excellent introduction to the history of the European Union as well as its future goals. Visiting the External Relations Department of the European Commission we learned of the long-standing political and economic ties between the U.S. and European Union member-states. At the Council of Europe, we discussed the intricacies of EU-level decision-making with officials who were directly involved in the processes. Finally, we were offered an excellent view from the other perspective of trans-Atlantic relations with a visit to the U.S. Diplomatic Mission to the European Union.

Two other excursions proved to be just as fruitful in terms of the new insights that were gained. A day spent at NATO headquarters reiterated the new roles of this long-standing defense institution. Furthermore, we were told of its relationship to the European Union (especially in relation to defense policy). Traveling to the UNESCO World Heritage Site of Bruges for a visit to the College of Europe was an excellent way to learn about the opportunities presented to students at that educational institution. At the week’s conclusion I was left with a rewarding feeling brought on by the vast amounts of new knowledge I acquired during the program activities.

I would like to thank UC-Berkeley and the European Union Center of Excellence for making this trip possible. This trip was a wonderful occasion to personally learn about a political institution I had long studied from afar. Furthermore, I sincerely enjoyed meeting the other participants on this tour. From a large variety of backgrounds, I learned a great deal from my conversations with them throughout the week.

* Territorialization of the European Union: Differences in Integration
* Neha Jaganathan, UCLA

The European Union (EU) is among the leading players in the international political arena. Made up of 27 countries and home to 500 million people, the EU is responsible for political, economic, and cultural decisions which impact all its member states and the continent at large. But regardless of the EU’s power in terms of policies and regulations, there still remain more abstract questions about its scope and extent. In particular, scholars have been unable to reach a conclusion on the identity of the EU. The notion of a single identity is complicated by the fact that the EU is neither a body politic which operates in a vacuum, nor merely a sum of its member states (van Gerven, 2005).

The discourse on the EU’s identity may be easier to tackle, however, by creating a framework for discussing the nuisances of the entity and the contemporary issues affecting member nation states. In his article “At the Edge of the World: Boundaries, Territoriality, and Sovereignty in Africa,” Achille Mbembe discusses the challenges in
Africa through a particular conceptual and rhetorical framework (Mbembe, 2000). He states that Africa should be thought of not in terms of fixed, immobile “places” but rather in terms of fluid and changing “territories.” This rhetoric is also extremely useful for discussing the European continent because it differentiates between individual places, nation-states whose borders are fixed, and the greater EU territories, whose scope and boundaries are constantly changing with the inclusion of new members and the enactment of new laws.

There are, however, a few modifications which must be made to the original paradigm used by Mbembe and when applied to a discussion of Europe. First, in Membe’s Africa, territories take clear precedence over places. But in the case of the EU, “The basic question is not whether in the end unity or diversity will prevail: they will both survive. The question is whether Europeans will be able to transcend nationalist(ic) feelings” (van Gerven, 2005). Indeed, it is determining which of the two (territory or place) has a greater role in public life that will ultimately result in the creation of a cohesive EU identity.

Second, while Mbembe characterizes his territories through issues such as violence and resource conflict, territories in the EU can best be thought of in terms of policy domains. Separating the functions of the EU results in three territories: culture, politics, and economics. All EU member states are affected by each of these areas of EU policy, although the degree varies greatly between individual nations. This paper will analyze the relationship between territory and place in the EU by looking at the institution’s cultural, economic, and political territories.

The limits of the EU’s cultural territory are difficult to discern because at the most immediate level of self-identification, the EU only acknowledges its functions in the other two territories. In defining itself, the EU claims to be “a unique economic and political partnership between 27 democratic European countries” (europa.eu). However, the EU has also been making significant efforts to create a European consciousness in an attempt to legitimize its policies and establish a deeper level of integration (Sassatelli, 2002). On another section of the EU website, individuals can learn about European “symbols of unity” such as the European flag, the European anthem, and Europe day (europa.eu). Although these symbols are meant to be universal, there is ample evidence that the presence of EU symbols is not equal in all countries (i.e. the territory does not equally extend to all member states). For example, those parts of Europe which are less wealthy have an increased presence of EU symbols (Dinan, 2005). In former Soviet nations, EU membership is presented as a way to combat Russia and regulate problems

---

1 Many of the modifications and simplifications made to Mbembe’s discussions of Africa are done so to create a basic framework for the purposes of this paper. In reality, Mbembe’s arguments are complex and can be explored at greater length.

2 Although the EU is a complex institution in which there are no bright lines separating various policy areas, for the purpose of this paper I will try to separate issues into a broad category. This is possible because the paper also does not go into details about specific policies but is more concerned with their national impacts.

3 While the question of EU identity is a broad one which can be discussed from many different angles, for this paper I will be discussing it in terms of particular policy domains.
such as crime and migration (Pribersky, 2006). However, messages about the EU are visually accompanied by both EU and national symbols, often presented in tandem. For example, in Central European countries, candidates for EU elections contextualized their European identities by running campaigns which had a significant presence of national symbols (Pribersky, 2006).

Regardless of the differences in the visibility of European symbols in the EU’s member nations, it is unclear what those symbols actually represent and what characterizes the cultural territory. What do the European flag, the European anthem, and Europe day mean in a supranational entity which has 27 member-nations and 23 official languages? How do those 27 countries identify with a wordless anthem and an invented day of celebration which bears no historic significance in a local context? Despite the presence of objects meant to create a unity, “there is as of yet no cohesive European ‘public space’- no media which mobilizes people on issues of the EU or provides info about EU parties,” (van Gerven, 2005). Even in leading Western nations such as France and Germany which are key players in the EU, media coverage of EU issues is only prevalent during elections (Peter and Vreese, 2004). The lack of a unified public space suggests that symbols of an EU cultural cohesiveness are little more than objects; national and local issues still appear to take precedence.

The other way in which to examine the cultural territory of the EU and determine its effect on European places is to analyze the effect of EU membership on identity formation at an individual level. The significance of looking at identities from the perspective of individual citizens is that it allows us to measure the extent of an EU cultural territory. Some scholars argue that younger citizens of the European Union are increasingly identifying themselves as European because of the growing interconnectedness of the world. Their ability to establish an identity which transcends national boundaries is facilitated by tangible representations of a united body, especially Eurorail passes (van Gerven, 2005). However, others argue that the term “European” as a category of identification is as of yet too vague and abstract to resonate with individuals. In a series of personal interviews of EU citizens in which the interviewer showed different images and measured reactions, symbols such as the EU flag did not result in very strong responses. By contrast, images which represented national and local issues elicited strong narratives (Armbruster et. al, 2003). Although scholars differ on whether people view themselves as being “European,” that itself is a problematic term because it doesn’t necessarily measure an attachment exclusive to the political and economic body. Europe has a history of defining itself through negative identities; it is not the West, it is not the Orient, etc. There has, as of yet, been very little research done about the culture of the EU as something distinct from simply being “European.”

The uncertainty of individual identities and the inconsistent relationship between national and EU symbols lead to the conclusion that the European Union does not have a singular effect on the culture of nation-states. As a cultural territory, the EU is still developing and has a much shorter history compared to cultures of places.

Works Cited:


<http://hij.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/9/4/3>.


*Faculty Grants Awarded in 2010:*

**Awards for Curriculum Development**

Sarah Wallace-Goodman, Assistant Professor of Political Science, UC Irvine  
Course module on “EU-Level Immigration” for an existing course on *Immigration Politics in Western Europe*

Carla Shapreau, IES Visiting Scholar and Adjunct Professor of Law, Boalt School of Law, UC Berkeley  
Course module on “Cultural Policy, Law, and Practice in the European Union” for an existing course on *Art and Cultural Property Law*

G. Mathias Kondolf, Professor of Landscape Architecture & Environmental Planning, UC Berkeley  
Course title: *The Living City: Innovation and Tradition in Landscape Architecture in Europe and the Americas*

**Awards for Faculty Research**

Vinod K. Aggarwal, Director, Berkeley APEC Study Center, UC Berkeley  
Project Title: *China Rising: EU and US Responses to a Changing World Order*

China and India are on the cusp of achieving great-power status, while Russia has begun to recover from the Soviet Union’s collapse. 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 US and in Western Europe. In this context, the most important and most
uncertain question facing the West over the next decade is: 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 EU and the US compete for economic and political advantage? The third phase of this three-year project will examine these questions with respect to the rise of China and the political, economic and security issues that this shift raises for the transatlantic relation. It builds on the first phase examining Russia, which was conducted in April 2009, and the second phase examining India, which was conducted in April 2010.

Barry Eichengreen. George C. Pardee and Helen N. Pardee Professor of Economics and Political Science
Project Title: *Imbalances in the Euro Area*

The Crisis in the euro zone has directed attention to the existence of substantial current account imbalances within the monetary union. One set of countries (Spain, Portugal and Greece prominent among them) have been running large current account deficits against their euro-area partners, while a second set (led by Germany and the Netherlands) have been running large surpluses vis-à-vis their monetary union partners. There are two interpretations of these imbalances. The “good imbalance” interpretation points to the scope for catch-up and convergence within the currency area and the intrinsic logic for why capital should flow downhill from high-to lower economies. The “bad imbalances” interpretation argues that capital has flowed toward the euro-area periphery because of domestic distortions. This project will analyze intra-euro-area current account balances and capital flows since 1999, and rigorously test these two hypotheses against one another. It will draw out the policy implications of the findings for the future of the euro zone – asking in particular whether the existence of such large current account imbalances poses a threat to the existence of the single currency.

Patrick Hyder Patterson, Department of History, UC San Diego
Project Title: *Christian Soldiers and the Islamic “Invasions” of the New Europe*

Targeting key Eastern and Western European politics among both EU members and EU candidate/applicant states, this project seeks to determine how and why those Europeans who derive their politics from Christianity have welcomed or rejected the new presence of Muslims, and how they have mobilized for political purposes a potent collection of centuries-old remembrances, fears, stereotypes, and historical images of Islam and its followers. The study will interpret the shifting approaches taken since the 1960s as these critical brokers of immigrant integration – political Christians in church and lay organizations and party groups – have argued over whether Islamic views of society are compatible with Europe’s dominant liberal-secular and (post-) Christian cultural, political, and legal traditions. Contrasting the stances of political Christians in Europe with the often different views on Muslim integration taken by their counterparts in the United States, the project puts Samuel Huntington’s persistent and seductive “clash of
civilizations” thesis to a rigorous, much needed empirical test, establishing how the
civilizational view has, in practice, found militant adherents (“Christian soldiers”) in the
East and the West, and, just as important, explaining those crucial instances in which
some political Christians have opted to become not soldiers but peacemakers instead,
thus undercutting the widely popular Huntington view.

Christina Schneider, Assistant Professor of Political Science, UC San Diego

Project Title: Domestic Elections and Redistribution in the European Union

This project examines the globalization of domestic electoral politics by analyzing how
governments exploit membership in the European Union to enhance their re-election
prospects. Electoral cycles occur when governments increase their membership benefits
from the European Union above average levels in the preelection period in order to
appear politically competent to their voters. That is, voters care about how well
governments perform in international negotiations, particularly if these negotiations have
distributional consequences on the domestic level. Whereas governments are not equally
competent to achieve these extraordinary gains, they can all participate in the electoral
game if covert elite collusion allows them to increase their membership gains in the
preelection period above average levels. The project tests for the existence of electoral
cycles in the European Union with a focus on how governments aim to distort the
distribution of benefits, such as structural aid, before elections. The findings have
important implications on the likelihood that EU governments are able to cooperate in
times of international economic distress and will provide some insights into a potential
reform process to insulate international cooperation from domestic politics.
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Events held in Fall 2010

October 25
“Beyond Arizona: Laws Targeting Immigrants in the US and Europe.”
Conference organized by The Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute on Race, Ethnicity and
Diversity, UC Berkeley.

November 2
“Has Multiculturalism “failed” in Germany? What Next?”
Lecture by Kim B. Olsen, Correspondent for the Danish magazine “Raeson,” and IES
Visiting Scholar.

November 3
“Identity and Immigration: Spain 2010”
Lecture by Norbert Bilbeny, Professor, University of Barcelona, Spain.

November 4
“Old Age Tension in France: Protests Paralyze the Economy: Why?”
Lecture by Jonah Levy, Professor of Political Science, UC Berkeley.

November 8
Lecture by Britta Voss, Research Assistant at the Department of History, University of Munich.

November 8
“Ashes in the Wind – Reevaluation on the Holocaust in the Netherlands”
Lecture by Philo Bregstein, Dutch Filmmaker and Journalist

November 17
“The Morning the Wall Came Down”
Exhibit and Lecture by Colin Campbell, Photographer

November 19
“Will Ireland Go Bankrupt? The Latest Eurozone Crisis”
Workshop led by Barry Eichengreen, George C. Pardee and Helen N. Pardee Professor of Economics and Political Science, UC Berkeley.

November 23
“Fertile Grounds for the Radical Right: Evidence from the Netherlands”
Lecture by Hilde Coffé, Utrecht University, The Netherlands.

November 29
“Seville. Scrutinizing a City’s Character”
Lecture by Christiane Schwab, Department of European Ethnology, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Munich, Germany.

December 1
“The European Union after the Lisbon Treaty: Role and Priorities of the Belgian Presidency”
EU Presidency Lecture by Consul General Geert Criel, Consulate General of Belgium, Los Angeles.

December 1
“Survival, Resistance and Creativity: Romani (Gypsy) Women’s Lives in Western Europe”
Panel Discussion with Laura Fantone, Beatrice Bain Visiting Scholar, UC Berkeley and Visiting Faculty at the San Francisco Art Institute; Michaela Grobbel, Associate Professor of German, Sonoma State University; and Sani Rifati, President of Voice of Roma.

December 2
“Crying “Fire Fire” in Noah’s Flood: What’s behind the call for British Austerity?”
Lecture by J. Bradford Delong, Professor of Economics, UC Berkeley.

December 3
“Interpreting UK Foreign Policy: Traditions and Dilemmas”
Conference organized by the British Studies Program at UC Berkeley.

December 10
“Learning Lessons from the H1N1 Pandemic”
Workshop led by Christopher Ansell, Professor of Public Health and Political Science, UC Berkeley.

For updates on upcoming events in Spring 2011 please visit our calendar at: http://events.berkeley.edu/index.php/calendar/sn/euc.html