

2013

In 2013 the *Stiftung Deutsch-Amerikanische Wissenschaftsbeziehungen* (SDAW/Foundation German-American Academic Relations), which annually offers funding for transatlantic study groups exploring topics of particular interest for the transatlantic relationship, from a large number of submissions decided to fund the following new projects:

Babies, Bonds and Buildings: The Societal Consequences of the Financial Crisis in a Transatlantic Perspective

Prof. Herman Schwartz, Ph.D. (University of Virginia, USA), Prof. Dr. Hubert Zimmermann (Philipps-Universität Marburg, Germany)

The consequences of the financial crisis are more profound than the much-discussed relationships between financial speculation and the debt of governments or banks. They reach deep into society. In particular, they affect three closely related areas of private life: the financing of housing, pension systems and fertility – briefly: “babies, bonds and buildings”. The project investigates how relationships and dynamics within this triangle are influenced, by now extensively though in varying degrees, by the financial system, both in Europe and the United States. Scholars from Germany, the Netherlands and the United States will investigate these issues comparatively in a study group.

Previous studies about the current financial crisis dealt particularly with the details of bailout plans, the reforms in the field of financial regulation, the causes of the euro crisis or the impact of austerity measures on social welfare programs. They thus focused mainly on government policy decisions and the reactions of governments and financial actors to the crisis. However, the growing role of financial markets, the dynamics unleashed as a result of the crisis and changing economic conditions have also deeply influenced developments within societies. In particular, they affected three central, closely related issues of private life: systems of housing finance, savings for retirement and the decision to raise children. The type of available housing finance, for example, has in many countries a decisive influence on the design of the pensions. The long-term stability of pensions in turn depends heavily on reproductive rates. The latter in turn are closely related to the age at which couples form independent households and thus enter the housing market. The sooner this is possible, the sooner couples are opting to start a family. The availability of adequate housing depends strongly on the types of financing offered by financial markets. Due to increasing life expectancy and demographic developments, the related problems of sustainable pensions, fertility levels and the increasing tax burden on a numerically shrinking workforce in OECD countries have long been apparent. The privatization of pension systems in the U.S. and Europe has led to an increasing dependence on the financial returns achieved by the large institutional investors, where these funds are parked, often in government bonds.

The core hypothesis of the project thus claims that fertility, pensions and housing finance are influenced in different, but related ways by the financial system and thus have been subject to the effects of the financial crisis. This research project therefore tries to determine the ways in

which different systems of housing finance as well as of pension welfare shape the reactions of individual consumers and households, especially with regard to fundamental life choices. What overall effect has the new role of financial markets on these areas? What are the differences between the U.S. and European countries in this respect? And how can such differences explain divergent policies in the U.S. and Europe?

CC-VISAGES: Climate Change – Vulnerability Inferred through Social Analysis, Geography and Environmental Systems

Dr. Götz Kaufmann (Freie Universität Berlin, Germany), Jason Samson, Ph.D. (McGill University, Montreal, Canada)

The project seeks to shed light on the impacts of climate change assuming equal distribution factors for suffering from environmental burdens and benefiting from environmental quality. In consequence, the goal of the CC-VISAGES project is to investigate the possibility of a general environmental justice pattern of climate change impacts on the nationwide and community level. The distribution of environmental burdens and the access to environmental goods in a climate change context are generalized across countries on both side of the Atlantic based on social marginalization and ecological climate change variables. We will assess the presence of a general environmental justice pattern of climate change impacts by conducting field research in both Canada and Germany. We will first create a geographical representation of climate change vulnerabilities for these two countries based on ecological, social, and climate variables through a geographical information system (GIS). We will then select areas in each country with high climate change vulnerabilities and perform comparative field research to understand the local perspectives on climate change impacts. From these field analyses of stakeholders' perceptions, we will seek a general pattern of environmental justice. Our results will provide a strong framework for stakeholders of all kind (political and economic decision-makers, NGOs, civil society) to make appropriate climate change adaptation plans informed by both ecological and social realities.

The CC-VISAGES project will provide a much needed multi-disciplinary perspective for both European and North American nations to deal with the multifaceted issue of climate change. Furthermore, the German – North American Science Cooperation will be strengthened by the establishment of an interdisciplinary research unit that will outlive the period of funding.

Revolving Doors in the USA and Europe: Comparing Patterns of Changeover between Political Elites and Interest Groups on both Sides of the Atlantic

Prof. Bruce E. Cain, Ph.D. (Stanford University, USA), Prof. Sergio Fabbrini (LUISS Rome, Italy), Prof. Claudius Wagemann, Ph.D. (Goethe University Frankfurt, Germany), Edoardo Bressanelli, Ph.D. (King's College London, UK), Lee Drutman, Ph.D. (Sunlight Foundation Washington, DC, USA), Markus Siewert, M.A. (Goethe University Frankfurt, Germany)

The aim of our international study group is to assess, in a comparative perspective, the revolving door effect, i.e. the shift from political office to positions within the interest group sector and vice versa. In the United States, the relationship between the political sphere and the interest group sector in general is highly regulated by federal law. This is especially true for the transition from one arena into the other. In Europe, by contrast, only a few countries, like Germany, France, the United Kingdom, Poland, Slovenia, and Lithuania, have enacted

rules on its national interest groups. On the supranational level, the European Union has passed lobbying regulations in 2011, setting up a voluntary registration system for lobbyists. However, even if such regulations on lobbying exist, they are either weak or poorly implemented when it comes to actual revolving door processes.

Focusing on politicians and political staffers within the legislative branches, our study group tackles the following research questions and tasks: first, relating to the legal frameworks: What rules do exist concerning politicians and political staffers switching to the interest group sector and how are these regulations implemented? Second, relating to the scale of the revolving door effect: How many politicians and staffers enter the lobbying sector after leaving office? Third, some countries only recently implemented their regulations on the revolving door, e.g. new EU rules will come into effect in 2014. This allows us to measure the effectiveness of these regulatory changes via quasi-experimental research designs. Fourth, the results of the previous research steps will be combined in a cross-case analysis to analyze patterns of revolving door in a comparative perspective via Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA).

The research funds, provided by the SDAW, are used to start this international study group and to draft a research design for application on follow-up funding, with a long-term aim. Concretely, to this end, a joint workshop is organized at the Goethe University, Frankfurt, in July 2014. Additionally, a publication on the legal frameworks of the revolving door in the United States and Europe is envisaged.

Globalization of Arms Transfers and Production from a Transatlantic Perspective

Marc DeVore, Ph.D. (University of St. Andrews, UK), Prof. Jennifer L. Erickson, Ph.D. (Boston College, USA), Moritz Weiss, Ph.D. (LMU, Munich, Germany)

The defense industry is different from most economic sectors to the extent that governments sponsor research and development, regulate transfers and constitute the primary clients of production. On both sides of the Atlantic, the defense-industrial sector's place between the state and the market is increasingly challenged by globalization. For instance, the growing internationalization of supply chains is undermining the states' capacity to meet their defense needs solely through domestic production. This even applies to the United States, the world's largest arms producer, arms market, and arms exporter. In addition, the emergence of multinational defense contractors is rendering state control over arms production and weapons transfers increasingly problematic.

The study group's key questions are, first, how to explain the similarities and differences of how states respond to the challenge of defense-industrial globalization; and, second, whether these dynamics lead to increased competition or to more collaboration at both the corporate and the political levels.

Our transatlantic study group examines these issues, whereby we will fill several gaps in the literature. Most crucially, research on the globalization of the defense sector so far misses a transatlantic perspective because existing studies focus either on the United States as the undisputed defense-industrial superpower or on the fragmented European market. The comparative perspective is absent. To fill this lacuna, the individual contributions will trace how these globalizing trends have challenged governments' ability to steer the domestic defense sector; and, to what extent governments have resisted or embraced these developments in terms of public policy instruments (regulation vs. expenditures). For

example, group members arrived at the result that even small and medium states can develop defense-industrial capabilities that enhance both their ability to autonomously employ their armed forces and secure access to foreign armaments. This implies, however, a fundamental choice between accepting foreign direct investment and pursuing unrestrained arms exports. While those governments unwilling to sanction foreign ownership of their defense industries can have recourse to unrestricted exports, those states uncomfortable with liberal exports can encourage foreign direct investment.

2012

In 2012 the *Stiftung Deutsch-Amerikanische Wissenschaftsbeziehungen* (SDAW/Foundation German-American Academic Relations), which annually offers funding for transatlantic study groups exploring topics of particular interest for the transatlantic relationship, from a large number of submissions decided to fund the following new projects:

The Global Scramble for Natural Resources and Transatlantic Options

Prof. Dr. Raimund Bleischwitz (Wuppertal Institute, Germany), Prof. Dr. Stacy VanDeveer (University of New Hampshire, USA), Prof. Dr. Philip Andrews-Speed (University of Singapore), Tim Boersma (University of Groningen, Netherlands), Dr. Geoffrey Kemp (Center for the National Interest, USA), Prof. Dr. Corey Johnson (University of North Carolina, USA)

The impact of growing demand for natural resources and environmental pressures on national and international politics puts the transatlantic community at a crossroads with both opportunities of new innovations and global risks of intense conflicts. Certainly, tight commodity markets also offer business opportunities for saving materials purchasing costs and to innovate. Comparing the United States with Europe, it seems that the strategy of resource efficiency is high on the European policy agenda while it is largely absent across large parts of the United States (with huge variations across countries and states). Yet market volatility, the frequent lack of transparency and openness of many commodities markets and poor governance deter the investments and innovations needed, absent better governance. Much more stringent effort is required to unleash resource efficiency on all relevant markets both in the transatlantic community and internationally. With proper policies in place, the 95 resource-dependent countries that exist worldwide could potentially turn their endowments into development opportunities for the bottom billion of poor people. High commodity prices also have spurred technological development and created new energy resources, ranging from offshore oil fields to unconventional gas.

A main research premise of this study group is that without an explicit international dimension, resource efficiency strategies face an uphill battle against existing distortions and unfair international competition.

The study group focuses attention on the complex webs of connections existing between different resources, and the challenges and opportunities these pose on governance. These attempts to grapple with the complex inter-linkages among multiple resource issues on different scales, can be called the resource nexus approach.

The study group was established, as a group of resident fellows, at the Transatlantic Academy, at the German Marshall Fund of the United States, in Washington DC in September 2011. Its members have published a joint report in June 2012, as well as a set of working papers. The aim of this project is to sustain and expand the work of the group over the next year, bringing their draft work to fruition in 2013 by publishing papers and a book.

The Intellectual Foundations of Global Commerce and Communications

Prof. Richard R. John, Ph.D. (Columbia University, USA), Dr. des. Simone Müller-Pohl (FU Berlin, Germany), Heidi J.S. Tworek, M.A. (Harvard University, USA)

Our international study group investigates visions of world communications and commerce in the first modern age of globalization (1860–1930). Scholars from Germany, France and the United States will examine interrelations between ideas of global commerce and communications and delve into these ideas' practical impact. Overall, we seek to link individuals and ideas with infrastructures and institutions and aim to understand the interaction between imaginations of communications and economic world orders. The study group will focus on four main groups of research questions: (1) the interaction between visions of global economy and global communications in the first modern age of globalization. (2) A comparison of how European and American ideas of global economy and communications transferred and interacted with each other. (3) The implications of English-German semantic differences between *Verkehr*, which encompasses commerce, communications, and infrastructure and a non-existent English equivalent. (4) The practical impact of these ideas and intellectual concepts.

We will show that bringing these two fields of academic research into conversation with each other illuminates hitherto unrecognized interactions between visions of the global economy and global communications. The study group will illustrate that economic visions of world order rested on assumptions about communications that had a significant impact on patterns of global trade. Similarly, contesting visions of economic systems directly translated into competing ideas of *Weltcommunication* and universal peace. The study group will provide answers about how these interrelations functioned and their practical impact. Indeed, we hope to understand why the very language to discuss these concepts differs so dramatically in German and English.

Through two workshops at Harvard University and the Freie Universität in Berlin respectively in 2013, the study group will establish lasting connections between scholars of economic history and scholars of communications history. We intend this study group to provide a springboard for further fruitful collaboration between American and European academics on the subject of global and transnational imaginaries. We will publish our results from our two workshops in the form of an edited volume.

Globalization of Arms Transfers and Production from a Transatlantic Perspective

Marc DeVore, Ph.D. (European University Institute, Florence, Italy), Prof. Jennifer L. Erickson (Boston College, USA), Moritz Weiss, Ph.D. (LMU, Munich, Germany)

The defense industry is different from most economic sectors to the extent that governments sponsor research and development, regulate transfers and constitute the primary clients of production. On both sides of the Atlantic, public authorities provided companies with protected markets and companies provided governments with secure supplies of domestically manufactured weaponry. This equilibrium –which placed the defense-industrial sector *between the state and the market* – is increasingly challenged by globalization. Today, the escalating costs of developing weapons and the growing internationalization of supply chains are undermining the states' capacity to meet their defense needs solely through domestic production. This even applies to the United States, the world's largest arms producer, arms market, and arms exporter. At the same time, the emergence of multinational defense

contractors is rendering state control over arms production and weapons transfers increasingly problematic.

The study group's key questions are, first, how to *explain* the similarities and differences of how states respond to the challenge of defense-industrial globalization; and, second, whether these dynamics lead to increased *competition* or to more *collaboration* at both the corporate and the political levels.

Our transatlantic study group examines these issues, whereby we will fill several gaps in the literature. Most crucially, research on the globalization of the defense sector so far misses a transatlantic perspective because existing studies focus *either* on the United States as the undisputed defense-industrial superpower *or* on the fragmented European market. The comparative perspective is absent. Moreover, research on the globalization and regionalization of export controls is emerging on the European Union but does not extend much further. As a result, to what extent both sides of the Atlantic affect each other remains under-researched, despite being closely tied by co-production arrangements, export markets, and military alliance. To fill this lacuna, the individual contributions will trace how these globalizing trends have challenged governments' ability to steer the domestic defense sector; and, to what extent governments have resisted or embraced these developments in terms of public policy instruments (regulation vs. expenditures).

2011

In 2011 the *Stiftung Deutsch-Amerikanische Wissenschaftsbeziehungen* (SDAW/Foundation German-American Academic Relations), which annually offers funding for transatlantic study groups exploring topics of particular interest for the transatlantic relationship, from a large number of submissions decided to fund the following new projects:

Transatlantic Perspectives on the 'Re-Railed' Post-Industrial Metropolis: Comparing the Prospects for New High-Speed Railway Hubs in the Rhein-Ruhr and Los Angeles Metropolitan Regions

Dr. Deike Peters (University of Southern California, Los Angeles, USA), Dr. Frank Roost (Research Institute for Regional and Urban Development ILS, Dortmund, Germany), Prof. Dr. Rainer Danielzyk (ILS, Dortmund, Germany), Dr. rer. pol. Angelika Münter (ILS, Dortmund, Germany), Prof. Dr. Christa Reicher, (TU Dortmund University, Germany), Prof. Dr. Tridib Banerjee (USC, LA, USA), Prof. Dr. Hilda Blanco (USC, LA, USA), Prof. Dr. Lisa Schweitzer (USC, LA, USA), Prof. Dr. Anastatia Loukaitou-Sideris (University of California Los Angeles, USA)

Our transatlantic study group will comparatively investigate recent initiatives towards the development of new high-speed rail hubs in large, globalizing metropolitan regions with polycentric settlements structures. More specifically, we will compare developments in West Germany's former industrial heartland, the Rhein-Ruhr region, with developments in the Los Angeles metro region. The overall aim is to improve our transatlantic understanding of the likely effects of and prospects for new high-speed passenger railway hubs on their surrounding metro regions.

The study group applicants, Deike Peters and Frank Roost, will lead the group's efforts by assembling, analyzing, synthesizing, and initiating a structured comparison of pre-existing and currently ongoing academic research related to new rail hubs. Our joint meetings/workshops will discuss the following questions:

- How do decision-making structures for rail-based development differ in Germany and the US? What about the roles of railway companies, real estate industry, local government, transport agencies, federal and state-level support?
- What about public perceptions and public support regarding new rail developments. Which strategies are employed by proponents and opponents?
- What can we learn from failed rail station redevelopment initiatives such as the Dortmunder 'Ufo'?
- Which land-uses are being envisioned around new rail hubs? What potential is there to attract 'creative industries' in the two regions?
- What are some 'best practice' urban design solutions around new rail hubs: planning/zoning measures to ensure intermodality, walkability, attractive urban spaces?

The face-to-face meetings and workshops will provide participants with a unique opportunity to share and compare insights at a transatlantic level, resulting in at least one major joint publication in the end.

Deutsche Leitkultur and American Dream: Integration and Citizenship

Prof. Dr. Stefan Immerfall (University of Education at Schwaebisch Gmuend, Germany), Prof. Antonio Menéndez-Alarcón, Ph.D. (Butler University, Indianapolis, USA), Prof. Dr. Hermann Kurthen (Grand Valley State University, Grand Rapids, USA)

Questions of diversity and identity have become prime topics of political contention and social concern over the last decade. This is particularly true for a country like Germany, which has still difficulties in assuming its status as a country of immigration. A simple look at the numbers would reveal that Germany is not so much a country of immigration as a country of immigrants. While net immigration is low, around 15 per cent of its population has a migration background. Consequently, issues of social integration are at least as important as immigrant admission into the country. Yet, the question of what “integration” means in the context of Germany is still unresolved, and the polemics created from time to time have created more confusion than clarification.

It has been traditionally accepted that the key ingredient of immigrants’ integration into Germany was the acquisition of German nationality. The German approach to citizenship originates from the traditional nation-state idea of homogeneity regarding ethnicity, citizenship, culture, and community. However, this “homogenous model of belonging and citizenship” is now questioned by the fact that many immigrants have not been integrated as expected into the dominant culture.

A comparative analysis of other countries might shed light into this complex issue, and explore possible alternatives and/or modifications to the German citizenship and integration model. The case of the United States might offer a valuable lesson to understand this fundamental issue for contemporary German society. Building on previous research on transatlantic differences and similarities, this study group analyzes questions of citizenship, defined as sense of “belonging” and “being accepted,” in the US and Germany, and how the U.S. idiosyncrasies, such as the “American dream” and the cultural practice of hyphenation could inform the German immigration experience.

Our research intends to overcome the divide between European and North American approaches to social integration. Instead of putting Germany and the United States in distinct and opposing regime categories, as it is so frequently done in the comparative literature on immigrant’s integration, we compare micro processes of integration while analyzing transatlantic differences in national identification and prejudice. This will include an evaluation of existing literature, a secondary analysis of cross-national surveys, a document analysis, and in-depth, semi-structured individual interviews.

2010

In 2010 the *Stiftung Deutsch-Amerikanische Wissenschaftsbeziehungen* (SDAW/Foundation German-American Academic Relations), which annually offers funding for transatlantic study groups exploring topics of particular interest for the transatlantic relationship, from a large number of submissions decided to fund the following new projects:

Inclusive Multilateralism: Transatlantic Policy for the Post-Transatlantic Age

Prof. Dr. Harald Müller (Peace Research Institute Frankfurt, Germany), Prof. Dr. Charles Kupchan (Georgetown University, Washington D.C./Council on Foreign Relations, Washington D.C., USA)

The aim of this study group is to generate a model for stable international governance that is conducive to peace and cooperation between the most powerful actors. The goal is to identify instruments suitable for mutually recognising and preserving the vital interests of the relevant players; for integrating different notions of justice and good order; for guaranteeing “ownership” of the order by all major players; and for fair participation in order-shaping and specific decision making.

This list of tasks is an explicit call for a sophisticated multilateral approach -- an inclusivity which only extensive and deep multilateralism can offer. This idea of inclusive multilateralism is not at its high point in the present debate on future world order in the Western discourse. On the one hand, we observe proposals coming from political theory and philosophy to establish a Western-modeled system of governance based on elements of cosmopolitan democracy and the institutionalisation of democratic structures at the global level. On the other hand we are confronted with blueprints for an exclusive Western multilateralism instead of a truly universal one.

At the same time, existing formal structures of more inclusive multilateral governance that reach beyond the borders of the transatlantic world are not ideally fit to serve as effective institutions for security governance. The United Nations is hampered by an antiquated composition of its key decision-making body. Important players are absent, and decision rules hamper rather than foster efficient decision-making. The G-8 is much too exclusive, the G-20 too inclusive, and the formats in between not stable and constructed with unequal membership status. Regional organizations across the globe are of unequal impact; the best of them appear to be able to deal with their regional environment, but none is capable of addressing global security.

The challenge of the project thus is to devise multilateral institutions and practices that fulfil the requirements of “ownership” for all relevant players, that manage disputes among them successfully, that promote order among great powers without frustrating smaller players – all while sustaining a reasonable degree of transatlantic influence and advancing the values and aspirations of the transatlantic community.

American and European Approaches to Energy Security: Divergence, Convergence and Future Cooperation”

Prof. Dr. Karen Smith-Stegen (Jacobs University Bremen, Germany), Dr. habil. Martin Thunert (Heidelberg Center for American Studies, University of Heidelberg, Germany)

The overarching aim of the project is to gain a comprehensive understanding of the views of strategic elites—from government, think tanks, the security community, lobby groups, media, NGOs, energy companies, and universities—on issues related to energy security in both Germany and the US. The primary goal of our empirical research will be to ascertain if American and German/European approaches to energy policy are more likely to converge or diverge and to identify likely future areas of either cooperation or disagreement.

On the heels of the 1970s energy crises, American and European approaches to energy security — defined at that time as *security of supply at an affordable price* — for the most part converged and joint actions were taken. These joint actions were then followed by 10-15 years of divergence, during which environmental issues and activism came to the fore and energy security policy concerns were broadened to include sustainability. In recent years, however, several events have occurred that could prompt renewed alignment on the three corners — *sustainability, security of supply, and affordability* — of the energy security triangle.

But not all signs indicate a transatlantic energy rapprochement and points of contention still exist, particularly American chagrin at Europe’s growing dependence on Russian energy supplies. The US portion of NATO have pushed for Europe to become less dependent on Russia and have watched with some dismay as Europe, in particular Germany, has pursued pipeline (e.g. Nordstream) and other projects that would increase Europe’s vulnerability to potential Russian manipulation. In response, the US has backed the Nabucco gas pipeline, which would bypass Russian transit routes, and has proposed that energy security assume a greater role in NATO’s mandate.

The project team has been conducting interviews on these and other energy security issues with members of strategic elites in Germany and the U.S. in person and through questionnaires. In addition, the project was accompanied by an energy security workshop funded by the German Program for Transatlantic Encounters of the German Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology (BMWi), which took place in May 2011 at the University of Heidelberg and featured European and American scholars and practitioners of energy related issues. With the dissemination of our results by means of workshops, journal articles etc., the project team hopes to educate the public about energy security concerns and to apprise policy makers, scholars and the media of the specific research and interview results.

Global Holocaust? Memories of the Destruction of European Jews in Global Context

Prof. Dr. Philipp Gassert (Augsburg University, Germany); Prof. Dr. Alan E. Steinweis, (University of Vermont, Burlington, USA)

The memory of the victims of the Holocaust is a central element in present-day European, Israeli, and North American historical consciousness. Recent publications also point to its "global" and "universal" character. The working group asks whether this assessment is still correct. To what extent is it justified to speak of a "globalization of Holocaust memory"? Or, has the globalization of memory not been a peculiar development among nations of the old, mostly North-Atlantic West, possibly including parts of former Communist Eastern Europe?

The majority of the world's current population, especially the citizens of the rising giants India and China, but also most of those in newly-industrializing countries like Brazil and Indonesia, live outside Holocaust-related memory cultures. What are the implications for Western historical consciousness in general, and for transatlantic relations in particular?

Ironically, while the number of people living in post-Holocaust societies may be dwindling, the Holocaust still has a growing potential as a marker of universal remembrance. This is evident in the establishment of Holocaust Memorial Day by the UN's general assembly in 2005. In several countries, the Holocaust has been a point of departure for the study of genocide in other historical contexts. Therefore, we also ask what the central themes of Holocaust memory are in nonwestern societies. Do nonwestern agents see the Holocaust as a uniquely European event or an event with universal implications? Which institutions are in charge of researching and teaching the Holocaust, and by whom are these activities funded? How is the Holocaust understood in relation to the history of local oppression and genocide, such as Apartheid, Stalinist crimes, or the Nanking massacre?

The study group met for an inaugural conference in Augsburg in June 2011 and is planning its next meetings in different locations (including one at the University of Haifa, Israel, in January 2012, and one at the University of Vermont in 2013). The final results of our investigations will be published as a volume geared toward academic and general audiences.

For further information please check the project's website at: <http://www.philhist.uni-augsburg.de/de/lehrstuehle/geschichte/transatlantische/forschung/Projekte/Holocaust/>

2009

In 2009 the *Stiftung Deutsch-Amerikanische Wissenschaftsbeziehungen* (SDAW/Foundation German-American Academic Relations), which annually offers funding for transatlantic study groups exploring topics of particular interest for the transatlantic relationship, from a large number of submissions decided to fund the following new projects:

Control of Irregular Migration and Its Impact on Immigrant Communities in Europe and North America

Dr. Mechthild Baumann (Institute for Migration and Security Studies Berlin, Germany), Prof. Dr. Astrid Lorenz (Humboldt University of Berlin, Germany), Kerstin Rosenow (Ruhr University Bochum, Germany), Dr. Sandra Gil Araujo (University of Granada, Spain), Dr. Gerda Heck (University of Munich, Germany), Basak Bilecen (University of Bielefeld, Germany), Dr. Sabine Hess (University of Cologne, Germany), Marianne Haase (University of Erlangen, Germany), Dr. Axel Kreienbrink (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, Nürnberg, Germany), Dr. Serhat Karakayali (University of Halle-Wittenberg, Germany), PD Dr. Heidrun Frieze (University of Frankfurt, Germany), Prof. Wayne Cornelius (UCSD, San Diego, USA), Prof. Kathleen Staudt (University of Texas, El Paso, USA), Prof. Avital Bloch, Alejandra Rocha (University of Colima, Mexico)

The purpose of the project is to set up a transatlantic and interdisciplinary study group of political scientists and ethnographers which aims at comparing former and current developments in the implementation of migration management policies while emphasizing their impact on irregular migrant communities. It focuses on two major areas of immigration: the EU and the USA.

The researchers aim for a transatlantic comparison of migration management policies by combining political science and an ethnographic approach. On the one hand, the study group seeks to find out from a political perspective in which way the national interests of receiving and bordering transit countries influence the implementation of migration management policies. On the other hand, the ethnographic perspective can highlight how migrants react towards the policies during their migration process.

This project is intended to contribute to the design of a human migration management policy which takes into consideration not only the interests of the receiving and transit states but also those of the migrants themselves. A transatlantic comparison of migration management policies will enable scientific experts to offer a differentiated view to policy makers in the EU and the USA on this complex issue of irregular migration. Best practices can be communicated for the regions in need, such as the EU and the USA.

“From-Heres” and “Come-Heres”:

Perceptions of the Immigrant Other and Transcultural Encounters in Virginia and North Rhine-Westphalia

Prof. Page R. Laws, Ph.D. (project organizer, Norfolk State University, USA), Cathy Waegner, Ph.D. (project co-organizer, University of Siegen, Germany), Prof. Dr. Mita Banerjee (University of Siegen, Germany), Susanne Engelmann (University of Siegen, Germany),), Prof. Charles H. Ford, Ph.D. (Norfolk State University, USA), Sonja Georgi, MA (University of Siegen, Germany), Melanie Jäger (University of Siegen, Germany), Isabel Killough, MA (Norfolk State University, USA), Assoc. Prof. Geoffroy deLaforcade, Ph.D. (Norfolk State University, USA), Florian Nölting (University of Siegen, Germany), Assist. Prof. Robert K. Perkins, Ph.D. (Norfolk State University, USA), Stephanie Walker, MA (Norfolk State University, USA), Janine Werner (University of Siegen, Germany)

An interdisciplinary team of faculty and students from the historically black Norfolk State University in Virginia (USA) is collaborating with a team from the University of Siegen (North Rhine-Westphalia, Germany) to study the ways immigrants are perceived (and perceive 'natives') in our respective parts of the world. Empirical studies and application of transculturality theory will be considered in connection with schools, languages, small businesses, cultural events, popular culture and media (film, television, newspapers, literature).

By investigating regional immigrant groups as well as public discourses and images, the project will examine to what extent new diasporic and migrational patterns arouse ill will and conflict, but are also dealt with through negotiation and transculturality, resulting in transformed meso-structures in schooling, commerce, and media.

The project will include March and June 2010 exchanges of research teachers and advanced students, with forums at the two universities. The project group will also present a double cross-faculty panel at the MESEA (Multi-Ethnic Studies: Europe and the Americas) conference on “Travel, Trade and Ethnic Transformations” in Pécs/Hungary in June 2010. Since both the German “Ruhrgebiet” and Hungarian Pécs are Cultural Capitals of Europe 2010, one strand of the panel papers will connect with that axis. Preparations for the forums and conference panel are being accomplished through monthly video conferences and semester-long seminars at both institutions, during which the students and faculty undertake relevant “micro-projects”.

The publication of the project findings will both document the contest for geographical/work/community space and place it in larger theoretical and specific historical contexts. We will test this hypothesis: Pécs’ 2010 motto of “the borderless city” suggests an ideal which is seldom realized in the perceptions of and by immigrant groups, although protracted transcultural encounters are transforming received notions of ethnicity and ethnic hierarchy in our two test-case regions, Virginia and North Rhine-Westphalia.

2008

In 2008 the *Stiftung Deutsch-Amerikanische Wissenschaftsbeziehungen* (SDAW/Foundation German-American Academic Relations), which annually offers funding for transatlantic study groups exploring topics of particular interest for the transatlantic relationship, from a large number of submissions decided to fund the following new projects:

The Transcultural Atlantic: Constructing Communities in a Global Context

Dr. Wilfried Mausbach (Heidelberg Center for American Studies, Germany), Prof. Jeremi Suri (University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA), Prof. Eric Jarosinski (University of Pennsylvania, USA), PD Dr. Philipp Gassert (German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C., USA), Prof. Leopoldo Nuti (Machiavelli Center for Cold War Studies, Rome, Italy), Prof. Adam Walaszek (Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland), Dr. Thomas Gijswijt (Radboud University, Nijmegen, Netherlands), Adi Gordon (Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel)

This multidisciplinary and multinational research project explores the Transcultural Atlantic as a realm of crosscultural interaction throughout the period of the Cold War and beyond. More precisely, it investigates various processes of transatlantic networking, community-building, and dissent in the realms of business, academia, the media, popular culture, government, and the military. The project seeks to shed new light on the men and women who shaped this culture of transatlantic exchange and cooperation; on the transfer and adaptation of ideas and values across the Atlantic; and on the changing nature of the Atlantic space in an increasingly globalized world. It is neither limited to diplomatic history and political science studies dealing with alliance politics nor to cultural studies that have long focused on the construction of national identities. Instead, the project aims at synthesizing both research areas, thus trying to arrive at a fuller understanding of processes of transatlantic community-formation since 1945. By covering a broad period of time, we expect to trace changes in the culture of different, sometimes competing communities in the Atlantic realm, and to reassess the impact of major developments throughout the era of the Cold War to current debates about the future of the West in the new millennium.

A first meeting of the study group took place in March 2008 in Wisconsin; a second SDAW-funded workshop is scheduled for May 2009 in Heidelberg. Other activities to be pursued include the implementation of an exchange program to open up multiple research opportunities for the scholars involved, the establishment of public lecture series and the development of new interdisciplinary curricula to aid the teaching of the Transcultural Atlantic in advanced undergraduate and graduate courses. Finally, scholarly manuscripts arising out of these efforts will be published with a prestigious English-language press.

Approaching Normality, Defining Disability. Special Education and Disability Policy in Historical and Comparative Perspective

Dr. Justin J.W. Powell (Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB), Germany), Prof. John G. Richardson, Ph.D. (Western Washington University, USA)

The goal of this research project is to reconstruct and synthesize the phases of development in responses to disability and deviance, examining special education systems in particular. Whereas care, compensation, and rehabilitation were typical mechanisms to deal with disability through the 1960s, contemporary social and political approaches instead emphasize equal opportunities and human rights as well as participation and inclusion. The reach of the state grew with the extended duration of schooling and the rising importance of credentials as educational exclusion was reduced and, by the 1980s, eliminated. Yet the quantity and quality of participation, then as now, depends substantially on dominant disciplinary approaches to ab/normality, measurements of intelligence, and legal definitions of dis/ability that shaped educational systems during their genesis and expansion. Today, inclusive education is the strived-for ideal, yet realized only in some localities and states. Comparative studies of educational system development are needed to shed light on when and the extent to which these contrasting ideals have been reached in the Atlantic world since the mid-1800s.

Discussing educational and social policy reforms relating to student disability and abnormality, the study group participants will focus on the German-American comparison, which offers particularly instructive insights due to the enduring transatlantic linkages in the development of science and education, as these nations have continuously borrowed each other's educational ideas and policies. Both federal democracies, with decentralized control over education but specific attempts to meet the needs of disabled, disadvantaged, and immigrant children, maintain educational systems that produce highly successful graduates as well as school-leavers who fail to attain even minimal certification. Thus, special education offers a vital but neglected field to examine the trade-offs between principles of merit and equality and the resulting educational and social inequalities. Yet very few studies on special education have an extended historical reach or compare nations in-depth.

With funding from the *Stiftung Deutsch-Amerikanische Wissenschaftsbeziehungen* (SDAW), this study group will compare the institutions of special education cross-nationally, leading to a co-authored book.

2007

In 2007 the *Stiftung Deutsch-Amerikanische Wissenschaftsbeziehungen* (SDAW/Foundation German-American Academic Relations), which annually offers funding for transatlantic study groups exploring topics of particular interest for the transatlantic relationship, from a large number of submissions decided to fund the following new projects:

A Divided West?

Human Rights Activism, United Nations Reforms, and Transatlantic Relations

Dr. habil. Volker Heins (McGill University, Montreal, Canada/Institute for Social Research, Frankfurt/M., Germany), Prof. Dr. Klaus Günther (Frankfurt University, Germany), Prof. Andrei Markovits, Ph.D. (University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA)

The aim of this project is to investigate the scope and depth of shared understandings between key actors in the U.S., Germany and Canada with regard to the reform of human rights-related mechanisms within the broader context of current UN reforms. How can we describe and explain differences in approaching UN reforms? Do they amount to the consolidation of a “Divided West” (Habermas)—or perhaps a divide between Germany and Canada on the one hand, and the U.S. on the other? If yes, is the divide about moral values or interests, or both?

To gain a better sense of areas of divergence and convergence between the United States, Germany and Canada, we will conduct interviews and study official documents, background reports and newspaper articles from those three countries. In contrast to many conventional studies, the method used to identify country-specific differences will include NGOs.

The project is expected to yield data to test three hypotheses.

(1) *Encompassing Agreement*. With regard to key UN reforms in the human rights field, convergence outweighs differences both at the governmental and the nongovernmental level.

(2) *Transatlantic Civil Society*. The transatlantic consensus on human rights and necessary reforms of UN human rights mechanisms is significantly stronger among human rights NGOs than among governments, mostly because NGOs are not bothered about strategic interests. The convergence among nongovernmental activists leads to a closing of the transatlantic divide at a time when governments are in disagreement.

(3) *Deep Divide*. A pervasive disaffection with “America” in Germany which may or may not be mirrored in corresponding attitudes among Americans vis-à-vis Europeans leads to a divide over possible futures of the U.N. that affects even NGOs. Underneath the bland surface of a common rhetoric, *both* governments and NGOs are at loggerheads. Differences among NGOs translate into or reflect differences between governments.

The Role of Research Managers A Comparative Study on Science Organization in Germany and the U.S.

Prof. Beverly Crawford, Ph.D. (UC Berkeley, USA), Prof. Dr. Jost Halfmann (Dresden University of Technology, Germany), Falk Schützenmeister, MA (Dresden University of Technology/UC Berkeley)

The comparative study focuses on the role of formal organizations in climate research and microbiology by studying the role of research managers in Germany and the U.S. The necessity to *organize* research evolved from the need to coordinate the increasing societal demands that confront science. With the appearance of large-scale research, a new managerial role evolved, which differs significantly from the classical role of scientists working at the laboratory bench. The research project is meant to identify the challenges to the system of higher education in preparing scientists for their role as research managers.

Different from the common assessment that formal organization and freedom of research contradict each other, the main hypothesis guiding the project is that research managers do boundary work by supplying science with the necessary resources from other realms of society.

The leading assumption of the project is that different types of research management – compared in terms of goals, hierarchy, degree of formalization, and cooperation – are formed mainly by *five* factors: (1) the societal environment shaped by different research policies and R&D systems; (2) the different cultures of scientific disciplines, which include certain cognitive, methodological, and ethical rules of doing good science; (3) the demand for cooperation between disciplines and research organizations; (4) the size of the projects being managed; and (5) the specific professional roles of scientists within different institutional settings such as university, industry, or publicly funded large-scale research.

This hypothesis will be tested with 20 to 30 in-depths interviews with leading research managers in Germany, California, and Washington, DC.

The project has two main goals: First, the results will be presented in a comprehensive research article; and second, the identification of the main issues for a comparative in-depth research proposal on science organization.

Democracy and Democratization in Europe Revisited

Prof. Giovanni Capoccia, Ph.D. (Oxford University, UK), Prof. Daniel Ziblatt, Ph.D. (Harvard University, USA)

Social science's understanding of how democracy is secured owes a great debt to Europe's historical experience. The question of how civil liberties came to be entrenched, why the suffrage was extended, why democracy collapsed in interwar Europe, and how democracy was reconstructed and stabilized after World War II have been the basis of many of our most-prized theories of democratization. Yet, the standard accounts of the European experience—and the lessons drawn from that experience-- have been premised on a theoretical foundation which draws loose inspiration from modernization theory, and is thus nearly entirely “structural” in nature with a focus on class actors acting out of economic self-interest (as the carriers and opponents of democratization).

While taking the core insights of earlier work seriously as our starting point, we emphasize the role of three underappreciated factors—ideas, contingency/uncertainty, and social learning-- that represent the foundational elements of an alternative account of European democratization. A main conjecture of our approach is that democratization is usefully studied not only in its grand sweep, but in its more incremental steps or “episodes” of reform

in which uncertainty and contingency take center stage. Moreover, by adopting a different “unit of analysis” (the reform episode) that focuses on key historical passages of reform, we turn our attention to a wider range of possible motivations, ideas, perceptions, and analogies (drawn from the past or other national experiences) that political actors utilize when making momentous decisions. Our aim is to offer a new vantage point on the achievement of democracy in Europe and that brings scholars of the European experience into conversation with scholars of democratization in other places and time.

The study group will explore the following themes:

- Economic Liberalization and Democratization
- Balancing Reform and Concessions
- Restricting and Protecting Rights: Dealing with Extremism
- Religious Conflict and Church-State Relations
- The Challenge of Ethnic Heterogeneity.

Several experts from both the USA and Europe have been asked to participate; the final composition of the group will be finalized soon.

2006

In 2006 the *Stiftung Deutsch-Amerikanische Wissenschaftsbeziehungen* (SDAW/Foundation German-American Academic Relations), which annually offers funding for transatlantic study groups exploring topics of particular interest for the transatlantic relationship, from a large number of submissions decided to fund the following new projects:

Second Transatlantic Dialogue

“Questioning the Nation – La Nation en question – Die Nation auf dem Prüfstand“

Dr. Sabine v. Oppeln (Freie Universität Berlin, Germany), Prof. Dr. Peter Hayes and Prof. Dr. Michael Loriaux (Northwestern University, Chicago/Evanston, IL, USA), Prof. Dr. Hélène Miard-Delacroix (Ecole Normale Supérieure - Lettres et Sciences humaines, Lyon, France), Prof. Dr. François Cochet and Prof. Dr. Olivier Dard (Université Paul Verlaine, Metz, France), Prof. Dr. Dr. h. c. Rainer Hudemann, Prof. Dr. Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink and Prof. Dr. Manfred Schmeling (Universität des Saarlandes, Saarbrücken, Germany and Sciences Po Paris, France)

Scholars, Ph.D. students and exam candidates from the departments of history, political science, comparative literature, French cultural studies and intercultural communication at six different universities worked on the German-French border near Metz and Saarbrücken by questioning the term “nation”: “Questioning the Nation“. The participants were able to establish an innovative interdisciplinary dialogue that was pursued from a variety of disciplinary perspectives.

Starting point was both the making of nations since the eighteenth and nineteenth century and its contemporary reflection in the historical sciences, literature and in political discussions. This was then confronted with modern scholarly approaches in various disciplines. European and American case studies stood alongside examples from Algeria, Palestine or the Philippines. Metz, Verdun and Saarbrücken as venues vividly demonstrated the diverse forms of nation making and nationality-based conflicts and their overlapping in areas close to national borders. Trinational work groups stressed on the following topics:

- Concepts of the nation, images of the nation, symbolism of the nation
- Nation, conflicts, patterns of remembrance
- Verdun as a place of national remembrance
- Modes of making a nation and Europe
- Limits of the term “nation”

The five day seminar was prepared by co-ordinated courses at the universities involved and integrated via internet. It will hopefully lead to a transatlantic network and to long-term cooperation in the areas of teaching and research.

The main results of the Second Transatlantic Dialogue will be published in 2008 as second volume of the culture studies publication series of the Frankreichzentrum “ViceVersa – Deutsch-Französische Kulturstudien” (“ViceVersa – German-French culture studies”, published at Akademie Verlag Berlin).

Skilled Migrants in Germany and the U.S.

Jeanne Batalova, PhD. (Migration Policy Institute, Washington, DC, USA), Prof. Dr. Claudia Diehl (Universität Göttingen, Germany)

The goal of the research group on “Skilled migrants in Germany and the US” is to shed light on the following two questions: How successful is Germany compared to the US in attracting highly skilled migrants, i.e., immigrants who have completed tertiary education? And how do skilled migrants differ in terms of their economic integration in both countries?

Whereas implications of low-skilled immigrant workers have generated ample research and heated public and political debates in the US and Germany, the impacts and integration of the highly skilled foreign born have gathered relatively little attention on either side of the Atlantic. This, however, has considerably changed in the recent years. The shift in attention was prompted by a number of factors. First of all, as multinational firms and research institutions have changed their recruitment strategies in order to attract foreigners, labor markets for professionals and researchers have become increasingly international. Secondly, the share of skilled migrants who possess the necessary skills and experience required to be internationally mobile has increased. Thirdly, many countries have invested significant amount of capital and resources and introduced changes in their immigration legislation to attract foreign talent. Accordingly, the international competition for foreign skilled labor has increased substantially. Thus, the analysis of immigration and integration processes of the highly skilled in Germany and the US is particularly interesting given that the two countries differ substantially in terms of their recruitment strategies and opportunities for integration.

Our basic hypothesis is that the US is more successful in both attracting and integrating skilled foreign labor. We intend to test this hypothesis by using German Microcensus data and US Census data from 2000. More specifically, we plan *first*, to systematically compare the legal framework for the immigration of highly skilled migrants in Germany and the US; *second*, to compare the share of skilled migrants among recent arrivals in Germany and the US and to describe their individual-level characteristics (e.g., countries of origin, education, family status) as well as their duration of stay in the countries; and *third*, to perform an analysis of their labor market integration in the US and in Germany.

The research group is funded by SDAW with a travel grant for a kick-off meeting in Washington, DC.

2005

In 2005 the *Stiftung Deutsch-Amerikanische Wissenschaftsbeziehungen* (SDAW/Foundation German-American Academic Relations), which annually offers funding for transatlantic study groups exploring topics of particular interest for the transatlantic relationship, from a large number of submissions decided to fund the following new project:

Transatlantic Comparison of Continental Innovation Models: A Differentiation of Regionalised Processes of Innovation in Europe and the United States

Prof. Dr. Ulrich Hilpert and Dr. Dietmar Bastian (University of Jena), Prof. Dr. Alberta Sbragia, Prof. Dr. Vijai Singh and Dr. Christopher Briem (University of Pittsburgh, USA), Prof. Dr. Nicola Bellini (University of Pisa, Italy), Prof. Dr. Desmond Hickie (Liverpool University, UK), Dr. Helen Lawton (University of London, UK)

Under the umbrella of the "Standing Group on Politics and Technology" of the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) and in co-operation with the "Working Group on Sub-national Collaboration for Regional Development" of the Regional Studies Association (RSA) the study group is working on comparisons of continental innovation models based on a differentiation of regionalised processes of innovation in Europe and the United States.

Based on earlier scientific work on the regionalisation of processes of innovation and empirical evidence from a large-scale research project in the field of biotechnology and the new life sciences, which both provide an understanding of the socio-economic dynamics that influence the geographical expression of new technologies, the project takes a comparative perspective across the North-Atlantic. Departing from an interest in how regionalised processes of innovation differ between Western Europe and the United States, preparative workshops (Jena 2007, Pittsburgh and Pisa 2008) are held to move towards a comparative framework of continental innovation models.

Three major dimensions give shape to related scientific discussion: a) the continental dimension in innovation processes as a contrasting view to the concepts of (regional, national, etc.) innovation systems, b) the differences between science-based and technology-based innovations as an approach to delineate the dynamics of international research and production networks, and c) the simultaneity of an evolving global division of labour among continents and the regionalisation of globalised processes of innovation.

The individual contributions of the study group are intended to result in a publication with international scope (e.g. Routledge Ltd. in London & New York) in order to enable a widespread diffusion in the areas of science, politics and business.

2004

In 2004 the *Stiftung Deutsch-Amerikanische Wissenschaftsbeziehungen* (SDAW/Foundation German-American Academic Relations), which annually offers funding for transatlantic study groups exploring topics of particular interest for the transatlantic relationship, from a large number of submissions decided to fund the following new projects:

Transatlantic Relations from a Social Psychological Perspective: Explicit and Implicit Forms of Intergroup Perceptions of Americans and Germans

Gerald Echterhoff, Ph.D. and Stephan Groll (University of Cologne, Germany), Prof. D.r Gerd Bohner (University of Bielefeld, Germany), Ina Kerner (Free University of Berlin, Germany), Prof. John M. Levine, Ph.D. and Leslie R. M. Hausmann (University of Pittsburgh, USA), Prof. E. Tory Higgins, Ph.D. (Columbia University, USA), Johanna Vollhardt (University of Massachusetts, Amherst, USA)

The goal of the project is to investigate the relationship between Germany and the U.S. from the micro-perspective of intergroup social psychology.

Political analysts as well as the media have focused on the extent to which the transatlantic relationship has been strained by recent political developments on a macro scale. However, relatively less attention has been devoted to whether individuals on both sides of the Atlantic actually exhibit biased social perceptions and evaluations of each other. In addition to surveys and opinion polls (such as the Pew Global Attitudes Survey), which often elicit socially desired or intentionally controlled responses, the present approach addresses implicit and uncontrollable perceptions of the “transatlantic other.” Explicit measures, such as traditional self-report or rating items, probe directly for people’s attitude towards members of the out-group, while implicit measures tap covert forms of bias and cognitive associations, of which even well-intentioned people are largely unaware. We plan to employ two classes of implicit measures: the Implicit Association Test (IAT) and a new measure which is currently developed by the members of the research group (i.e., an index of shared reality denial). Experimental studies and an online testing center on the Internet will be employed to assess not only explicitly stated opinions but also attitudes which people may be unwilling or unable to communicate overtly.

Leading research on intergroup biases and underlying cognitive processes has been conducted by study group members at the Social Cognition Lab at Columbia University (E. Tory Higgins), the Group Interaction Lab at the University of Pittsburgh (John M. Levine, Leslie R. M. Hausmann), the Experimental Psychology lab at the University of Cologne (Stephan Groll), and the Social Psychology Lab at the University of Bielefeld (Gerd Bohner, Gerald Echterhoff). In order to expand the scope of the present project beyond the core social psychological dimension, the study group is joined by scholars from the Otto-Suhr-Institute of Political Science at the Free University Berlin and the recently founded interdisciplinary program “Psychology of Peace and the Prevention of Violence” at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Transatlantic Network of Philanthropy Researchers

Prof. Dr. Thomas Adam (University of Texas at Arlington, USA), Dr. Gabriele Lingelbach (University of Trier, Germany/Harvard University, USA)

This project is intended to help intensify the academic contacts between German and American scholars who are working in the field of historical study of philanthropy and the third sector.

Investigations into the historical, economic, cultural and sociological nature of philanthropy have a long tradition in the United States. American scholars have extensively analyzed the social background of philanthropists as well as their motives and economic potential. In the American setting, philanthropy is seen as an essential element of civil society and a democratic order. In Germany, philanthropy attracted the interest of historians only recently. Most German historians have focused so far on private support for artistic enterprises such as museums and art galleries and neglected the financing of social institutions.

This project is intended to build academic bridges across the Atlantic to provide a basis for the cross-fertilization of American and German inquiries into philanthropy and civil society. To this end, Thomas Adam and Gabriele Lingelbach in collaboration with the German Historical Institute in Washington, D.C., are preparing an international conference to take place in Washington, D.C. in March 2006. The organizers will invite scholars from both sides of the Atlantic to discuss their concepts and findings. This meeting will path the way for future transatlantic collaboration and the integration of German and American philanthropy research. Such an approach will benefit both sides and contribute greatly to the ongoing search for a definition of the third sector.

2003

In 2003 the *Stiftung Deutsch-Amerikanische Wissenschaftsbeziehungen* (SDAW/Foundation German-American Academic Relations), which annually offers funding for transatlantic study groups exploring topics of particular interest for the transatlantic relationship, from a large number of submissions decided to fund the following new projects:

Temporary Irritation or Enduring Crisis? Exploring the Deep Structure of the Current Transatlantic Conflicts

**Prof. Jeffrey Anderson, Ph.D. and Prof. John Ikenberry, Ph.D. (Georgetown University, USA),
Prof. Dr. Thomas Risse and Dr. Ingo Peters (Free University of Berlin, Germany)**

The purpose of the study group is to undertake a comprehensive stock-taking effort of structural features of the U.S.-European relationship from a variety of disciplinary perspectives. The group will address the following questions:

1. What features distinguish the current situation from the various transatlantic disputes in the history of the alliance?
2. Are we witnessing a world order conflict pitching European preferences for multilateralism and international institutions against American unilateralism and/or imperial ambitions in a unipolar world? Is there a fundamental dispute about international law and the legalization of global governance including notions of national sovereignty? To what extent are different understandings about the use of military force at the core of current transatlantic conflicts?
3. We need to explore whether the current situation still results from the repercussions of the end of the Cold War, i.e. the end of bipolarity and the emergence of a unipolar system. Are the transatlantic conflicts fundamentally the result of U.S. power and European weakness? Alternatively, the conflicts could also be explained by the gradual emergence of the EU as an emerging political system on the world scene. And what is the structural impact of September 11, 2001, and the rise of transatlantic networks of terrorism for the transatlantic relationship?
4. Do the current disputes result from different domestic coalitions with different world views in charge of foreign policy in Europe as compared to the U.S.? Is the transatlantic community still bound together by shared values and a collective identity in a democratic security community?
5. Depending on the answers to the various sets of questions, what are the likely scenarios for the future of the transatlantic relations? The purpose here is not to come up with concrete policy recommendations to deal with the immediate future, but to map out the various pathways for the future and to attach probabilities to them.

Trans-Atlantic Perspectives on Adolescence and Immigration Building an Inter-University Study-Group on Research Strategies and Policy Recommendations

PD Dr. Lena Inowlocki and Prof. Dr. Ursula Apitzsch (Johann Wolfgang Goethe University Frankfurt/Main, Germany), Charles D. Kaplan (Maastricht University, Netherlands/University of Houston, USA), and Prof. Avelardo Valdez, Ph.D. (University of Houston, USA)

This project aims to build a transatlantic and inter-university study group on adolescence and immigration that will develop new research perspectives on clusters of social problems and theoretical issues. These concern adolescence, generation relations in families, gender and peer-group socialization, education and work in immigrant families, migration patterns, political status, social mobility, and quality of life issues. The study-group will be composed of members from the Center of Drug and Social Policy Research, Graduate School of Social Work, University of Houston, and from the Department of Social Science, Institute for Socialization Research and Social Psychology, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-University, Frankfurt/Main and the International Graduate Center (IPC) of the department.

The research of the Houston group is strongly policy-oriented and involves interventions with high-risk immigrant families. The Frankfurt group also plays a leading role in Germany and Europe. The Frankfurt research, in cooperation with partners from other EU countries, addresses the opportunities for upward mobility and social integration through work and education. In both the Houston and Frankfurt research, three significant dimensions of living in situations of disadvantaged socio-economic status and lacking social recognition are analyzed: a) crisis coping in adolescence, b) gender specificity, c) relations between the generations in families.

In two transatlantic meetings, new research dimensions and strategies will be explored and elaborated. The objective of these meetings is to develop broader theoretical perspectives as well as more accurate methods of research, through comparative biographical case analyses and discussions of observations and findings. At the occasion of these meetings, substantive as well as methodological issues relevant to larger audiences at the respective universities will be discussed in order to broaden the scope of dissemination of research findings. Proceedings of the meetings will be elaborated and published in a joint volume on "Adolescence and Immigration in Transatlantic Perspectives".

German–Jewish Social Scientists in American Exile Studies on the Construction of Identities

Amalia Barboza and Christoph Henning (TU Dresden, Germany)

This group of younger researchers proposes to study the biographies of émigré German-Jewish social thinkers in order to specify what role elements of specific Jewish identity may have played for them in Germany and then in the United States. Fully recognizing the diversity of experience -- some emigrants dropped any identification as Jews; others rediscovered a sense of affiliation they had not earlier had -- as well as the differing senses of Jewish assimilation in the host cultures at different times, the researchers seek to isolate the function that the émigrés' self-awareness as Jews may have had in mediating between more general constellations of German and American identity and in influencing their intellectual output.

For German-Jewish sociologists in Germany, the issue of semi-assimilation, semi-distanced social integration (e.g. the role of "the stranger" in Simmel and König) seems to have been a major impulse to sociological work. In the U.S. the immigrants were outsiders both as Germans and as Jews; on the other hand, there was less pressure to dissolve one's own identity in

a higher national unity. The researchers ask how these conflicting pressures had an impact on their social science.

The researchers will use personal and institutional archives in the United States and Germany focusing on the group of social scientists assembled at the University in Exile and the subsequent New School for Social Research. They will also study a control group of non-Jewish emigrant social scientists. The project builds on graduate research work in Dresden. Project members plan to develop contacts with other scholarly centers in the U.S. devoted to study similar issues. Preliminary research findings will be presented at conferences in Germany and in the U.S.

Recognizing the current interest in issues of identity of national styles in the social sciences, and the explorative nature of this project, the Stiftung Deutsch-Amerikanische Wissenschaftsbeziehungen has granted the researchers a sum of 5.000 Euro for initial work on this project idea.