Berlusconi on Film and a Conversation with Nicoletta Marini-Malo

On March 14, Columbia's Italian Academy hosted its monthly Seminar in Modern Italian Studies. This month's conversation focused on a talk offered by Professor Nicoletta Marini-Maio of Dickinson College titled “A Very Seductive Body Politic: Berlusconi in the Cinema.” Her talk was an engrossing examination of just one medium through which the iconic personage of former Italian prime minister Silvio Berlusconi can be viewed.

The staff of Europe NYC was fortunate enough to sit down with Marini-Maio to discuss her work before she addressed the other seminar attendees.

The Conversation
My discussion with Professor Marini-Maio opened with a rather broad question about her research entering the evening’s talk. She explained, in short, that the focus of her conversation would be a study of the “pervasiveness of Berlusconi in Italy” through film. Why film? She explains that “cinema intersects many avenues” of culture and society and can “imbue sense to reality” in a way that no other form of media can do quite as well. She pointed out that her research analyzed 22 films that related to or were about Berlusconi in some capacity. This “some” is an important point because of the many ways in which “Berlusconi” appears in cinema. The study includes narrative, documentary and international films that, according to Marini-Maio, “touch every angle of Italian culture through Berlusconi.”

One could not help but be enthralled by her passion for this project, which begged the question of how she arrived at this research topic. She explained that, some time ago, she read an article about a woman suffering from dementia in Italy. This woman could not recognize her loved ones and could recall little about her life, but had no trouble identifying the importance of an image of Silvio Berlusconi. Therefore, Marini-Maio’s research grew from this incredible story of the endurance of the image of Berlusconi and the all-pervasive nature of “Berlusconism.”

This “body politic” established by the image of Berlusconi has identifiable parallels to that of Benito Mussolini during his fascist regime. Marini-Maio responded to this carefully by pointing out that, while similar, the two “body politics” are markedly different. In her view, Mussolini lacked the media empire of Berlusconi and the outright interpersonal skills he makes use of. Berlusconi is also “almost diva-esque” in his oddly feminine portrayal in media, while...
Mussolini exuded an aura and methodology of masculinity. Further, “the body of Berlusconi is not a ‘normal’ body” but one that is very much constructed. Instead of existing as a monolith, she points out, he plays a number of different roles depending on the director, style of film and context. In one instance, she studied a film where four different actors portray Berlusconi while creating a film of their own, further deepening the complexity of his “body.”

To conclude the conversation, I asked where this understanding of Berlusconi situates us in a contemporary context. Are we in a “post-Berlusconi” world? The short answer was “no, he is not a political leader anymore, but we are not yet post-Berlusconi.” However, “Berlusconi is not post-modern.” To Marini-Maio, because he is a figure of the “modern” world, his image does not fit neatly into the “post-modern” reality in which we live. Still, to have “that ‘movie ending’” to the story of Berlusconi, she suggests, “he needs to ‘die’ in some way.” “We require a narrative to ‘end’ the image of his body and we do not have this yet.”

The Talk

Marini-Maio’s talk addressed many of the key elements that emerged in our conversation, though with a much more thorough emphasis on images from the films in question and the narratives constructed through them. She opened with the same story of the elderly woman with the engrained image of the body of Berlusconi and went on to trace the cultural background of his body politic.

According to Marini-Maio, Berlusconi’s body politics can be “traced back to a cultural background that precedes [his] political phenomenon.” Of particular relevance is the concept of l’italiano medio, a term which in past decades has been used to describe the attitudes of the “everyman” in Italy. The manner in which Berlusconi redefines l’italiano medio is important in understanding Italian society’s fascination with his body politic, Marini-Maio explained.

She brought three movies into discussion. First, Ettore Scola’s 1972 film, La più bella sera della mia vita, is about an Italian industrialist named Alfredo Rossi who made his fortune through dishonest and nefarious means. Rossi becomes the victim of a group of retired jurists and finally meets his doom. The film, according to Marini-Maio, transcends the Italiano medio because it critiques the pervasive attitude that certain social forces are inevitable and have to be accepted. It essentially foreshadows the rise of Berlusconi through the auspice of the pervasiveness of the body politic.

Berlusconi’s persona has also deeply impacted contemporary film in Italy. The 2006 film Il Caimano tells the story about Bruno, an Italian filmmaker who insisted on finishing his movie about Berlusconi even after he found out his script touched many sensitive issues—for example, Berlusconi’s legal controversies—and was an affront to the Italian Prime Minister. The four personifications in the movie, each of which “stands for distinctive features of Berlusconi,” according to Marini-Maio, “shows the director’s understanding of the complexity and diversity of Berlusconi’s body.”

Marini-Maio ended her lecture with a brief clip from the 2006 movie Shooting Sisko, which deals with the topic of Berlusconi “in mortem.” The movie tells the story of a young orphan and author, Kurtz, who condemns modern society in general and Berlusconi in particular as “the unquestioned symbol of this age without virtue.” His remedy, to settle the ills of society, is to kill Berlusconi.

“We need to get rid of this man,” Marini-Maio says in summing up the film’s theme, “I find this a very fascinating idea, because, really, Berlusconi is everywhere.” This notion brought her talk full circle to our earlier conversation and to the ultimate question of how and if it is possible to eliminate the pervasiveness of Berlusconi’s body politic.

“The Strangeness of East European History”

NYU, March 12
Hannah Puckett

On March 12, Professor Holly Case of Cornell University spoke at the Center for European and Mediterranean Studies’ Eastern Europe Workshop about eastern Europe’s “strangeness.” Case claimed that within eastern European history there exist major historiographical categories that are considered to be “normal”: Russian, Soviet, German, Ottoman, and the list goes on. She also believes there is a “disequilibrium of familiarity” between historians of eastern European history, and those who work outside that field. While eastern Europeanists have knowledge of other “normal” fields, experts within those fields know little about eastern Europe.

She highlighted several areas that evoke eastern Europe’s strangeness. Eastern Europeanists problematize nationalism and perpetuate its negative associations by attempting to “make it go away.” They also write few works that oppose the imperialism of the Habsburg monarchy, while they are quick to point out the oppressive policies of the Ottoman Empire. She noted that Gavrilo Princip, the Serb nationalist who shot Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo, igniting World War I, is never portrayed as an anti-imperialist, even though he opposed the Habsburg monarchy’s control over Bosnia and Herzegovina.
According to Case, eastern Europeanists tend to avoid narratives of victimization and they often speak in the conditional tense. Both of these are due to the region’s unpredictability. As a graduate student, Case remembered the crisis that erupted in her field when historians failed to foresee the depth of destruction wrought by the Yugoslav wars of the early 1990s. She also maintained that there still exists a strong west versus east dichotomy in Europe that colors perceptions of eastern Europe. For example, she claims that public perception carries heavy weight in the region because eastern Europeanists conceive of the regional mentality as one that is fixed and incorrigible. For this reason, few ideas are exchanged about how to ameliorate the region’s problems.

Case had two solutions to resolve the anxiety that stems from eastern Europe’s strangeness. First of all, she believes that historians should “spread the dissonance” by challenging established narratives in “normal” fields. In other words, eastern Europeanists should not bear the burden of strangeness alone. She said Gavrilo Princip ought to be acknowledged for his anti-imperialist leanings, rather than being written off as a terrorist. Second, she suggests that the study of history is in need of a paradigm shift in which we accept dissonance within communities and individuals. Rather than attempt to create clear categories for analysis, historians must accept that it is possible for a person to possess competing ideologies.

**CEMS’s own Kostis Kornetis presents**

*The Children of the Dictatorship*

NYU, March 12

Kavitha Surana

It is always an exciting development when a doctoral dissertation becomes a full-length book. It was precisely this kind of achievement that the center celebrated on March 12th during the presentation of a new book by Kostis Kornetis, our own Assistant Professor, entitled *The Children of the Dictatorship: Student Resistance, Cultural Politics and the ‘long 1960s’ in Greece.*

The book is about the student movement during the dictatorship of the colonels in Greece, and in particular, the polytechnic student uprising, which was the most important act of resistance. According to Kornetis, the uprising has occupied a central symbolic space ever since the collapse of the junta and was a major legitimizing moment in the transition to democracy.

A Greek native who grew up in the aftermath of the transition to democracy, Kornetis was driven to understand these pivotal events and their afterlives on individual and collective levels.

In order to investigate the role of the individual in the historical process, his main tool was oral history, and he spent extensive time interviewing student leaders and grassroots actors of the time. “By promoting a dialogue between private micro-history and public events, the book explores both the political side of events and people’s life stories,” said Kornetis.

The book tries to demonstrate how new collective identities and student mentalities were shaped, and how these have changed over time. The book is especially concerned with examining how the former revolutionary students look back on their past militancy 35 years later. Kornetis found that present day testimonies reveal a hardening of militancy. The people he spoke with espoused more or less the same political categories and ideologies of the past.

Kornetis also makes the case for the “long 1960s” in his book, in opposition to the prevailing view of the “short 60s” in Greece, a cultural renaissance that was interrupted by the junta’s arrival to power. Kornetis was more interested in finding continuities from the early cultural revolution in the 60s and the milieu of the polytechnic uprising in the 70s.

According to Korentis, the regime was much less impenetrable than we tend to believe, and through television, art, and contact with radical groups abroad, resistance leaders were often “thinking globally but acting locally.” By locating their struggle in the 60s and using the tools of cultural warfare Greeks adopted the counterculture energy of movements like Woodstock and the Columbia University protests.

Upon finishing his overview, Kornetis received high praise from Neni Panourgia, visiting professor of anthropology at the New School, who thanked him for writing the book. She characterized the book as “phenomenally successful” in confronting two types of myths or simplifications. One, that Greeks did resist the junta or that the Greeks did not resist the junta. Two, if the polytechnic did or did not bring about the collapse of the junta. “These sets of myths operate concurrently to each other...and Kostis disrupts and dislocates both those sets of myths,” she said. “He managed to bring all these things that actually constitute the history to a breaking point and then we can actually explore them further.”
IN celebration of the publication of The Bordeaux-Dublin Letters, 1757: Correspondence of an Irish Community Abroad, NYU’s Maison Française and Glucksman Ireland House co-hosted a talk by two of the book’s co-editors. Professors Tom Truxes and John Shovlin of NYU presented a captivating look at the process of unearthing the documents in the book’s title and placing them in their proper historical context. Their talk also took place within an exhibition of their work in the Bobst Library at NYU. It was a riveting display of portraits, maps and documents woven into story of humanness brought forth by the letters.

Before even mentioning the letters, Truxes set out to explain the significance of the “Irish community abroad” in Europe in 1757. He acknowledged that many Irish communities were very small throughout the continent, but they played significant roles wherever they popped up. Irish brigades formed elite portions of various militaries, universities and seminaries spread Irish thought, and well-placed merchants built up business communities that formed markets for Irish produce and brought many fine European wares to Irishmen at home. He noted this in contrast to the role of the Irish community in North America at the same time. In the Americas, the Irish were often laborers and part of the lower classes of society. While this generates the stereotypical vision of the Irish among many in academia and the public, their place in Europe itself was quite different.

With the stage for the Irish set, Truxes discussed his incredible fortune of “having stumbled into” the Bordeaux-Dublin letter collection. He noted that he spends time every year exploring uncatalogued collections in the National Archives of the United Kingdom. In 2011, however, during his annual trip, he discovered a collection of letters from 1757 that had never been opened. With the permission of the archive, he opened the letters and discovered them to have been aboard a ship named the Two Sisters when it was captured by privateers during the Seven Years War. In order for the privateers to claim their bounty, British maritime law required them to present the ship at a hearing. In this instance, the ship was lawfully trading between Ireland and France with the permission of the British crown and was allowed to continue on its way. However, the letters, claimed as evidence by the court, were never delivered and sat in storage for 254 years.

The 125 letters gave a glimpse into the daily lives of Irish merchants, clergy, servants and simple families living in the city of Bordeaux, France during the war. In his readings of the documents, Truxes said that the content “felt familiar” to him and had an incredibly humanizing effect on the history he studies. He noted that the letters included personal letters from priests to various relatives and the same type of correspondence between businessmen and their loved ones.

Excerpt from “Richard Exham, Bayonne Prison, to Mrs Richard Exham, Georges Street, Cork” / NYU Alumni Magazine
New Reproductive Technology in Post-war Germany

NYU, March 28
Paris Liu

THE current debate over reproductive technologies in Germany provides an opportunity to examine the causal relationship between bioethics and the European market, Kristen Loveland explained at a March 28 lecture at New York University's Center for European and Mediterranean Studies (CEMS).

Loveland, a Ph.D. candidate in history at Harvard University, presented the lecture "New Eugenics and Neoliberalism: Rethinking Self-Determination in the Age of Technological Reproduction." She is currently writing her dissertation on reproductive technologies and biotechnologies in postwar Germany.

"In critiquing these reproductive technologies, [feminist writers] have developed a novel and sophisticated critique of neoliberalism," Loveland said. She contrasted the current state of affairs with those of nineteenth-century laissez-faire capitalism.

"In the 1980s, Western feminists realized that new reproductive technologies were vehicles for shaping reproduction to various market potentials," Loveland continued, adding that the new possibilities "opened themselves up to control by the neoliberal state." The consequence was not so much specific prohibitions, but rather a newfound impetus for government "to shape who they were and how they felt."

In the past few decades, advances in biotechnology have provided new potentials for enhancing the viability of a fetus, and for ensuring that the fetus is free from genetic disease. Attention has turned to the role of government in regulating these procedures and in how the ethics of reproductive technologies should be considered, Loveland said.

However, in Germany, the advent of new reproductive technologies such as in-vitro fertilization and genetic testing of embryos has been complicated by the widespread concern for how the country should conduct ethical debates in light of its dark twentieth-century history marred by a "eugenic past." Even further complicating the picture is Germany's role in the economy of Europe, when reproductive technologies have become not only an ethical concern but an economic one as well.

By "eugenic past," Loveland meant the efforts in Nazi German to take control over reproduction—although in a very primitive way by today's standards—in order to better engineer a "superior" citizenry. The Nazis were excoriated for these efforts after the war—and still are, when the topic arises—and this has colored the relationship between modern economic realities and ethics.

But, Loveland concluded, concern for bioethics has also provided "a way for Germany to reclaim her national identity, particularly at the millennium."
management. They are part time employees and owe fiduciary duties to the corporation.

There are two main examples of corporate board quota implementation. Norway was the first to adopt a quota, in 2003. The law, which took effect in 2006-2008, required a 40% floor for representation of either sex on corporate boards. There was complete compliance because the penalty for non-compliance was dissolution of the corporation. There was no limit to how many boards an individual could serve on, and Rosenblum said that this meant top firms identified certain individuals and put them on many boards, perhaps diluting the effect of the law.

The second example is found in France, which enacted a quota law in 2010–2011 and followed the blueprint of Norway’s example with a 40% floor. Enforcement of the law is structured a bit differently because non-compliance with the law does not dissolve the firm, but instead it leaves the board without the power to make legal decisions, effectively leaving the corporation without leadership.

Rosenblum's study focused on the French example. He interviewed ten male and 10 female members of CAC-40 Corporate boards, legislators, recruiters and administrators. His three main questions were: would they comply? Does women’s presence make a difference in terms of process? And, does women’s presence make a difference in terms of substantive decisions?

His findings indicated that the women on corporate boards may not change corporate governance. Though all agreed that compliance was universal, both women and men said that they felt substantive decision making would be the same regardless of the sex of the individuals. He explained this phenomenon with research from Jonathan R. Macey, that shows that diversity matters less with implementation and repetitive work, such as monitoring work based on a set process. Instead, diversity matters more with creative work, such as managerial duties. Since the corporate board’s role is responsive in nature to the more creative managerial level, it has less room to innovate and affect decisions.

Rosenblum posited that this could explain why the quota was adopted in the context of the corporate board, a much more palatable (and plausible) decision than adopting a quota on 40% female CEOs, which would face widespread resistance. Since the board’s role is limited, it was quite possibly the only level of a corporation where this type of law could be implemented.

One hope of the corporate board quota system is that the board would find female members from lower down in the corporate “pyramid,” providing higher-level opportunities for women within France. Unfortunately, Rosenblum said that the companies he looked at showed that they usually took more qualified women from other countries.

Rosenblum also pointed out the role of chivalry in the corporate board, a unique aspect of French society. Since women traditionally speak first at a table, would it provide them an advantage in decision making? Or does it allow a counter argument to be made subsequently to gain momentum?

Rosenblum said that, according to studies, whoever spoke first may grab the discourse, affecting the way participation occurred. In his research, he observed that the two sexes communicated differently. When women spoke first it lead to more methodical deliberations because women were more likely to ask the detail-oriented questions and force a mapping out of the decision making process that drove it away from making intuitive decisions and towards something that is more logical. Thus, Rosenblum said, quotas may be effective for quality of discourse, but in terms of utilitarian effect, he remains relatively skeptical.

He also examined the costs for men, acknowledging that from the perspective of men, quotas signify a loss of male hegemony on boards and they suggest that at least one generation of male candidates will not get board posts. Rosenblum said this might lead to the negative outcome of men resenting women or trying to undermine them. There could be a stigma that women only sit on boards thanks to the quota, but not to their skill set in a meritocracy. Rosenblum’s perspective is that the corporate hierarchy is not always quite such a meritocracy. Men reproduce themselves by looking for people who share their skills and characteristics.

Looking to the future, Rosenblum spoke about other remedies for board diversity beyond mandatory sex quotas. For example, in Spain, sex quotas are voluntary. Tax incentives or sex-neutered remedies such as term limits, could also alleviate the dearth of women on corporate boards. Industry wide “name-and-shame” or “name-and-praise” barometers or reporting (mandatory or voluntary) could also provide nudges towards increasing board equality. Mandates for private sector plans, providing a pipeline for upper level women in the corporation, scholarships to law and business schools for disadvantaged women and high quality day care provided by corporations could also have a broad influence in society.

For the situation in the U.S, Rosenblum reminded the audience that it would be unconstitutional to have a quota. He said that the ethos in the U.S. is firmly fixed on "nudging" corporations towards greater equality. The Securities and Exchange Commission says that firms may, if they choose, report on their diversity efforts. But it leaves up to the firm to define diversity. The system creates a venue for socially conscious firms to legally publicize the way they are engaged in diversity efforts, but it does not force anything.
Visions of European Unity

NYU, February 28—March 1
Stephen Whittaker

At the beginning of March, the Remarque Institute and the Center for European and Mediterranean Studies at NYU hosted a conference titled “Visions of European Unity in the Twentieth Century.” This gathering of intellectual historians and European integration experts sought to address notions of European unity in the years before the “traditional” starting point of integration movements in 1945. Conference participants included panelists from universities in Europe and the United States, with NYU well-represented. Some noteworthy participants included professors Larry Wolff, Mary Nolan, Stephen Gross, Christiane Lemke and Martin Schain of NYU, James Cronin of Boston College, Holly Case of Cornell and the keynote speaker Harold James of Princeton.

The two-day series of panels included discussions ranging from “Precursors to European Integration, West and East,” to “Decolonization, Economic Development and European Integration.” The keynote speech offered by James formed the pinnacle of an intellectually-stimulating conference that was agreed to have been a significantly thought-provoking and exciting period of discussion by many of the attendees. Despite the fact that many of the papers presented were working documents and books in the process of being completed, they still served as excellent conversation starters. Additionally, many of the panelists noted that the commentary and questions from their peers would greatly assist them in the completion of their various projects on European unity.

James opened his keynote talk by asking “why Europeans want Europe” and “what sort of Europe do they want?” He made particular note of these questions because, in his mind, those at the core of Europe are constantly trying to “forget” history. European history is often conflicted and sometimes confused depending on your country of origin or your perspective on particular issues. In his opinion, history is often read differently by the “core nations” of the continent. Charles de Gaulle, a former president of France, believed that European history is a deeply Franco-German story, and that the “French were an oppressed people in the face of Germany decadence.” On the other hand, he noted, there are many in Germany that feel just the opposite.

To James, however, processes of European integration and the formation of a European identity owe little to the great nations and great names that dot the landscape of the past. These “saints” in European history, he argues, are iconic and serve a purpose for starting a conversation about unity, but “Europe” is built on bread-and-butter issues that are driven by the masses. Europe is something “built on the work of farmers and cowheards” that populate the vast majority of space and time. While it is a part of the historical character of Europe to have “saints” to look up to, history is driven from the bottom-up.

Further, James suggested a simplified periodization for European history. In the time before 1848, he posits that “much national discourse is done by philosophers and poets.” In essence, a sense of commonality and a fluid understanding
of collective identity drove relationships and perceptions of self. Discussions about “the national” were abstract and literary. After 1848, the Year of Revolutions in Europe, writing about nations and identity is primarily done by historians and economists. The people of Europe began to embrace a distinct sense of nationhood and self-determined identity that would be carried through much of the next 160 years.

With the rise of European unity following the Second World War and the growth of the European Union since 1992, James put forth the possibility that Europe is entering a “post-visionary” age of unity. Since 1989, the “left” and the “right” have taken on new meaning as the world becomes progressively more interconnected and devoted to transnational issues of human rights and international development. As emphasis is no longer placed exclusively on the nationhood or poetics of the past, James brought his comments to an apex with the belief that we are “living in a bridge time between a Europe that was and one that is meant to be.” It is, of course, unclear precisely how Europe will develop as the European Union grows or diminishes. In Harold James’ mind, however, we are living in a time of great and rapid change, for better or worse.

“"If the Holocaust is evil, it is not banal”

CUNY, March 12
Paris Liu

ONE of the most controversial books on the Holocaust has been and remains to be Hannah Arendt’s *Eichmann in Jerusalem*. In the 1963 book, Arendt proposes the thesis that one of the primary architects of the Nazi Holocaust, Adolf Eichmann, was not necessarily a man of diabolical evil or even of confirmed ideological bent, but rather an unimaginative bureaucratic functionary who did much of his work to curry favor with his superiors.

In a March 12 lecture at the City University of New York (CUNY), Richard Wolin, distinguished professor of history and political science at CUNY, attacked several premises of Arendt’s book and discussed various writings and public comments by Eichmann during and after the war. The evidence demonstrates that Eichmann avidly participated in the mass murder and was “anything but a faceless cog in the Nazi machine.”

Rather, Eichmann “fully subscribed to the ideological role of Nazism,” up to and including his enthusiastic participation in genocide, Wolin argued. Particularly important is the “Eichmann Dossier,” which is more illuminating in judging Eichmann than the transcripts of his 1961 trial, where he was on trial for his life. It was the trial testimony on which Arendt primarily relied for her book.

“To amplify what she meant by the banality of evil, Arendt invoked the concept of administrative murder, which was another way of establishing the primacy of the functionary or death murderer, in keeping with the robotic portrait she had painted of Eichmann,” Wolin explained.

“But there had been nothing in the least administrative or banal about the barbaric mass shootings of the Einsatzgruppen,” Wolin said, adding that the face-to-face killings by special SS forces throughout Eastern Europe had already claimed 1.5 million Jewish lives by the time the Wannsee Conference took place in early 1942—the conference in which the logistics of the death camps were delineated in depth.

“Hence, to describe the Holocaust primarily via the metaphor of the impersonal and bureaucratic machinery of destruction, as Arendt had done in the Eichmann book, is deceptive and misleading. If the Holocaust was evil, then it was not banal. And if it was banal, then it was not evil,” Wolin concluded.

Jeffrey Herf, professor of modern European history at the University of Maryland, in response to Wolin’s thesis, offered a few suggestions for historians who work on Eichmann trial.

According to Herf, Arendt can be credited with countering in her book the diametrically opposed but equally flawed assertion by the Israeli prosecution that Eichmann was the prime reason for the Holocaust, but the Israeli dimension has been somewhat misplaced in the controversy surrounding Arendt’s coverage, Herf indicated. “We need to bring the Israelis back into the story.”

“The story is not primarily about Hannah Arendt. The story is about the Jews and Eichmann, and about the Israelis and Eichmann.” Herf said.

Both Wolin and Herf have written extensively on Nazi Germany. Wolin is the author of *Heidegger’s Children: Hannah Arendt, Karl Löwith, Hans Jonas, and Herbert Marcuse*. Herf won the national Jewish Book Award for his book *The Jewish Enemy: Nazi Propaganda During World War II and the Holocaust*. Richard Wolin and Jeffrey Herf / Paris Liu
UPCOMING EVENTS

—New York University—

CENTER FOR EUROPEAN AND MEDITERRANEAN STUDIES
285 Mercer St., 7th floor
All events take place at the center unless otherwise noted
212.998.3838
cems.as.nyu.edu

FRIDAY, April 18 at 4:30 PM
Workshop: “Women’s Engagement in Anti-Government Protests: The Euromaidan in Ukraine,” by Olena Nikolayenko, Assistant Professor, Political Science, Fordham University with Janet Elise Johnson, Associate Professor, Political Science, Brooklyn College, CUNY. “I had to be a real man,” and Other Reasons Why Putin Took Crimea.”

THURSDAY, April 3 at 6:30 PM

THURSDAY, April 17 at 7:00 PM
Discussion: “Demipage: Editar lo nuevo en españoal,” introduced by Antonio Muñoz Molina. This event is in Spanish.

—Columbia University—

THE BLINKEN EUROPEAN INSTITUTE
420 West 118th Street, International Affairs Building (IAB), Room 1205
All events take place at the Institute unless otherwise noted
212.854.4618
bei.columbia.edu

WEDNESDAY, April 16 at 6:00 PM
Panel: “Cinema in Nazi Germany,” with Volker Berghahn (Columbia), Stefan Andriopoulos (Columbia), Noah Isenberg (The New School).

FRIDAY, April 18 at 3:00 PM
THURSDAY, April 24 at 3:30 PM
Film: “Ali: Fear Eats the Soul,” Dir. Rainer Werner Fassbinder. With Oliver Simmons (Columbia) At room 501, Schermerhorn Hall.

TUESDAY, April 1 at 6:00 PM
Discussion: “French Cuisine / American Taste: Jacques Pepin’s Life as a Chef on Two Continents” with Jacques Pepin (Chef) and Adam Gopnick (The New Yorker). RSVP at rsvp@maisonfrancaise.org.

THURSDAY, April 3 at 10:00 PM
Film: “Step Up to the Plate (Entre les Bras),” Dir: Paul Lacoste.

THURSDAY, April 10 at 6:30 PM

TUESDAY, April 11 at 6:00 PM
Discussion: “In the Museum of Man: Race, Anthropology, and Empire in France, 1850-1950,” with Alice Conklin (Ohio State University), Emmanuelle Saada (Columbia), Vincent Debaene (Columbia), Gregory Mann (Columbia).

WEDNESDAY, April 16 at 6:40 PM
Talk: “After Slavery: from Memory to Reparations in the Atlantic World,” Myriam Cottias (France’s National Committee for the History and Memory of Slavery).

TUESDAY, April 1 at 1 PM

FRIDAY, April 4 at 4:00 PM
Reading: “Poetry Reading with Grzegorz Wroblewski,” English translation with Piotr Gwiazda.

MONDAY, April 7 at 4:00 PM

TUESDAY, April 8 at 12:00 PM
Lecture: “The Construction of International Law in Contemporary Russia,” by Lauri Mälksoo (University of Tartu).

MONDAY, April 14 at 12:00 PM

WEDNESDAY, April 16 at 6:00 PM

THURSDAY, April 24 – SATURDAY, April 26
Conference: “The 19th Annual ASN World Convention,” At International Affairs Building, 420 West 118th Street. Registration is required.

MONDAY, April 7 at 4:00 PM
Discussion: “Gender and Anti-Semitism: Women’s Rights Yesterday and Today,” with Victoria de Grazia (Columbia), Yasmine Ergas (Columbia), Elissa Bemporad (Queens College CUNY).

FRIDAY, April 11 at 6:15 PM
Lecture: “Casalinga o ‘bracciante-modina,” Models of Feminism in the Fight for Women’s Citizenship in Cold War Italy,” by Molly Tambor (Long Island University), with Frank Snowden (Yale).

TUESDAY, April 1 at 6:00 PM
Discussion: “French Cuisine / American Taste: Jacques Pepin’s Life as a Chef on Two Continents” with Jacques Pepin (Chef) and Adam Gopnick (The New Yorker). RSVP at rsvp@maisonfrancaise.org.

THURSDAY, April 3 at 10:00 PM
Film: “Step Up to the Plate (Entre les Bras),” Dir: Paul Lacoste.

THURSDAY, April 10 at 6:30 PM

TUESDAY, April 11 at 6:00 PM
Discussion: “In the Museum of Man: Race, Anthropology, and Empire in France, 1850-1950,” with Alice Conklin (Ohio State University), Emmanuelle Saada (Columbia), Vincent Debaene (Columbia), Gregory Mann (Columbia).

WEDNESDAY, April 16 at 6:40 PM
Talk: “After Slavery: from Memory to Reparations in the Atlantic World,” Myriam Cottias (France’s National Committee for the History and Memory of Slavery).

TUESDAY, April 1 at 1 PM

FRIDAY, April 4 at 4:00 PM
Reading: “Poetry Reading with Grzegorz Wroblewski,” English translation with Piotr Gwiazda.

MONDAY, April 7 at 4:00 PM

TUESDAY, April 8 at 12:00 PM
Lecture: “The Construction of International Law in Contemporary Russia,” by Lauri Mälksoo (University of Tartu).

MONDAY, April 14 at 12:00 PM

WEDNESDAY, April 16 at 6:00 PM

THURSDAY, April 24 – SATURDAY, April 26
Conference: “The 19th Annual ASN World Convention,” At International Affairs Building, 420 West 118th Street. Registration is required.

MONDAY, April 7 at 4:00 PM
Discussion: “Gender and Anti-Semitism: Women’s Rights Yesterday and Today,” with Victoria de Grazia (Columbia), Yasmine Ergas (Columbia), Elissa Bemporad (Queens College CUNY).

FRIDAY, April 11 at 6:15 PM
Lecture: “Casalinga o ‘bracciante-modina,” Models of Feminism in the Fight for Women’s Citizenship in Cold War Italy,” by Molly Tambor (Long Island University), with Frank Snowden (Yale).
IN THE NEWS: EUROPE IN FEBRUARY or UKRAINE AND OTHER THINGS

March 1: Russian President Vladimir Putin asked the Federation Council of the Russian Parliament for approval to use armed forces in Ukraine.

March 2: Ukraine's Navy commander-in-chief, Denis Berezovsky, defected to the Russia-backed Crimea government.

March 3: Italian film La grande bellezza won the Academy Award for Best Foreign Language Film.

March 5: Andrus Ansip resigns after nine years as prime minister of Estonia.

March 6: The European Union froze the assets of former Ukrainian president Viktor Yanukovich, two of his sons, and dozens of his advisers.

March 7: The Winter Paralympics in Sochi, Russia officially opened.

March 11: Protesters clash with police in Turkey after a 15-year-old boy died from a head injury sustained during anti-government protests.


March 14: A French court sentenced former Rwandan army captain Pascal Simbikangwa to 25 years in prison for his role in the 1994 Rwandan genocide.

March 16: In a localized referendum, voters in Crimea voted overwhelmingly to leave Ukraine and rejoin the Russian Federation.

March 18: The parliaments of Russia and Crimea signed an accession treaty. The same day, the Moldovan region of Transnistria also formally requested to join the Russian Federation.

March 19: Russian forces overran the Ukrainian Navy headquarters in Sevastopol and another naval base in Crimea, forcing the withdrawal and relocation of as many as 25,000 Ukrainian soldiers.

March 20: European Union member states and European Parliament negotiators reached a deal on a new regulatory system for banks.

March 21: The Russian Federation Council, the upper house of the Federal Assembly, approved the annexation of Crimea.

March 22: The Veneto region of Italy voted to secede from the Italian Republic in an informal online referendum.

March 24: The interim President of Ukraine, Olexander Turchynov, ordered all Ukrainian forces to withdraw from Crimea.

March 26: The Guardian deputy editor Paul Johnson confirmed that British law enforcement agencies have threatened to close the newspaper over its role in publishing global surveillance information obtained from U.S. whistleblower Edward Snowden.

March 27: The General Assembly of the United Nations passed a motion condemning the Russian annexation of Crimea in a 100–11 vote with 58 abstentions.
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