

# Cultural Rights and Civic Virtue

Richard Thompson Ford  
NOTA DI LAVORO 99.2003

**NOVEMBER 2003**

KNOW – Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital

Richard Thompson Ford, *Stanford Law School, Stanford California, USA*

This paper can be downloaded without charge at:

The Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Note di Lavoro Series Index:

[http://www.feem.it/web/attiv/\\_wp.html](http://www.feem.it/web/attiv/_wp.html)

Social Science Research Network Electronic Paper Collection:

[http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract\\_id=XXXXXX](http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract_id=XXXXXX)

The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position of  
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei

The special issue on *Economic Growth and Innovation in Multicultural Environments (ENGIME)* collects a selection of papers presented at the multidisciplinary workshops organised by the ENGIME Network.

The ENGIME workshops address the complex relationships between economic growth, innovation and diversity, in the attempt to define the conditions (policy, institutional, regulatory) under which European diversities can promote innovation and economic growth.

This batch of papers has been presented at the third ENGIME workshop:

*Social dynamics and conflicts in multicultural cities.*

ENGIME is financed by the European Commission, Fifth RTD Framework Programme, Key Action Improving Socio-Economic Knowledge Base, and it is co-ordinated by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM).

Further information is available at [www.feem.it/engime](http://www.feem.it/engime).

### **Workshops**

- **Mapping Diversity**  
Leuven, May 16-17, 2002
- **Communication across cultures in multicultural cities**  
The Hague, November 7-8, 2002
- **Social dynamics and conflicts in multicultural cities**  
Milan, March 20-21, 2003
- **Governance and policies in multicultural cities**  
Rome, July 2003
- **Trust and social capital in multicultural cities**  
Athens, November 2003
- **Diversity as a source of growth**  
Milan, April 2004

### **Partners of the ENGIME network:**

- Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milano, Italy
- Psychoanalytic Institute for Social Research, Roma, Italy
- Institute of Historical, Sociological and Linguistic Studies, University of Ancona, Italy
- Centre for Economic Learning and Social Evolution, University College London, UK
- Faculty of Economics and Applied Economics, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium
- Idea Consult, Bruxelles, Belgium
- Maison de la Recherche en Science Humaines, Laboratoire d'Analyse Socio-Anthropologique du Risque, Maison de la Recherche en Sciences Humaines, Université de Caen, France
- Centre for Economic Research and Environmental Strategy, Athens, Greece
- Institute of Higher European Studies, The Hague University of Professional Education, The Netherlands

# Cultural Rights and Civic Virtue

## Summary

This paper will address the potential tension between two broadly stated policy objectives: one, the preservation of distinctive cultural traditions, often through the mechanism of formal legal rights, and two, the fostering of civic virtue, a sense of local community and the advancement of common civic enterprises.

Many political liberals have argued that liberal societies have an obligation to accommodate the cultural traditions of various sub groups through legal rights and a redistribution of social resources. The “right to cultural difference” is now widely (if not universally) understood to be a basic human right, on par with rights to religious liberty and racial equality.

Other theorists writing in the liberal, civic republican, and urban sociology traditions have expounded on the necessity of civic virtue, community and common enterprises initiated and executed at the local or municipal level of government or private association. These theorists have argued that common projects, shared norms and social trust are indispensable elements of effective democratic government and are necessary to the altruism and public spiritedness that in turn secure social justice.

These two policy goals therefore may at times be in conflict. This conflict is especially severe in larger culturally diverse cities, where social trust and civic virtue are most needed and often in shortest supply. Policies designed to counter cosmopolitan alienation and anomie by fostering civic virtue, social trust and common social norms will inevitably conflict with the cultural traditions and sub group identification of some minority groups. Accommodation of any and all sub group cultural practices will make it difficult if not impossible to foster a common civic culture and social trust.

Programmatically speaking, the paper will argue that such conflicts are often best confronted on the field of political debate and policy analysis, not in the language of civil rights. Rights discourse, with its inherent absolutism, is ill suited to the type of subtle trade offs that these conflicts often entail. While local government and public institutions must be sensitive to the needs of all cultural groups that they affect, the need for civic enterprise and social trust should not be subject to absolute and non negotiable demands for the accommodation of cultural traditions. The accommodation of some cultural traditions will impose severe costs in terms of strife, conflict and the inability effectively to pursue other important social goals—in at least some cases, the cultural traditions, and not the other social goals, should yield.

**Keywords:** Law, Rights, Multiculturalism

*Address for correspondence:*

Richard Thompson Ford  
Stanford Law School  
559 Nathan Abbott Way  
Stanford, CA 94305  
USA  
Phone: (650) 723-2796  
E-mail: rford@stanford.edu

## **The Problematic: Rights to Cultural Difference and Civic Virtue**

Avishai Margalit and Moshe Halbertal begin their essay: Liberalism and the Right to Culture with this sentence: “Human Beings have a right to culture—not just any culture, but their own.”<sup>1</sup> The rest of the essay is concerned, not with defending this proposition, but with exploring how it might be put into practice. This is only one example of a very widely held conviction. For many, one of the most crucial imperatives of a multicultural society is what one might call a “right to culture.” Many argue that the statement in United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, “everyone has the right to participate in the cultural life of the community,” entails a right to cultural *difference*: the right of ethnic and cultural sub groups to retain and perpetuate the practices, norms and mores of their culture.

A right to culture may be a rhetorical figure meant to signal a significant ideological commitment. As an ideological commitment, the right to culture may take the form of a general commitment to learn about and respect the cultural traditions of various culturally distinct groups in a society. It would counsel tolerance of cultural difference and an embrace of a multicultural society; it would stand in opposition to the policies of national assimilation that have so often characterized the nation states of the West. This strikes me as a sensible (though not unassailable) ideological commitment; it is not the focus on my discussion herein.

Often, however, the term “right” is not meant loosely or figuratively; indeed a number of governments or quasi governmental organizations have adopted formal “rights to culture” that anticipate some institutional enforcement mechanism: litigation, administrative dispute resolution, or formal sanctions.

This suggests a vague but pervasive ideological commitment, backed by a embryonic jurisprudence. Here, “culture” is understood to be an important value that decent societies must protect against infringement or dilution, and it is urged that the formal power of government should be deployed in the service of such protection.

Formally, we can imagine two broad categories of activity or regulation that might be invalidated by a right to culture: “public” regulation promulgated by the state—law and

---

<sup>1</sup> Liberalism and the Right to Culture, Social Research Vol 61, 491 (1994).

legislation—and “private” regulations or policies of certain actors in the institutions of the market economy (typically such laws might apply to employers, private universities and schools, landlords and proprietors of public accommodations such as restaurants, theaters and hotels). The former might be described as rights-against-government and the latter as rights-against private institutions. Normatively it may matter a great deal whether the right in question is good against government or against private actors.

There are other complexities. For instance, it will not be at all an easy matter to determine which group practices are considered “culture” for purposes of legal enforcement of a right to culture. In the broadest sense any social practice that is not universally shared among humankind is a product of “culture.” “Culture” include practices that are relatively trivial and unworthy of judicial attention as well as practices that are potentially socially destructive. The American custom of drinking coffee (too often bad coffee) with milk or cream along with dessert rather than espresso coffee after dessert is “culture” and so are the American practices of capital punishment and wide availability of firearms. A formal right to culture cannot employ such a capacious definition of culture, yet practical, working definitions of culture are surprisingly scarce.

These cavils aside, my primary concern herein is that cultural rights and especially *the ideas about group difference and culture on which they often are premised* may be socially destructive in the context of a relatively small and interdependent democratic institution such as a city. This is a different matter than saying that the cultural *practices* of certain “cultural minorities” are per se socially destructive, as I will make clear.

My working hypothesis is that multicultural cities are the vital site of a potentially creative and also potentially destructive tension. They are multicultural on the one hand: polyglot, cosmopolitan, fractured into sub groups by race, ethnicity, custom, economic class and ideology. This suggests an inevitable divergence of opinions, experiences and ways of life, a divergence that will nurture sub group affiliations and loyalties at the expense of understanding, trust and familiarity across the sub groups. They are *cities* on the other hand: the customary location of small scale, if not face-to-face, participatory democracy. The city-state of the middle ages and Renaissance, the early American town studied by Alexis de Tocqueville and the regional governments of the Italian federalist

reform of the 1970s all suggest the importance of smaller, more manageable and more participatory forms of government. And a crucial feature of this smaller scale government is social trust—precisely what the fragmentation of multiculturalism can make difficult to achieve and at worst unavailable.

### **The Value of Civic Enterprise:**

In a (perhaps romanticized) past, great cities inspired collective pride and one of the functions of city government was to encourage citizens to participate in great common projects to the benefit of all. People remarked in admiration and awe at public projects such as bridges, subways, parks, waterways, ports and civic buildings. People beamed with pride at civic culture: museums, public events and the lively arts.

But today any ambitious public project is immediately bogged down in ideological conflict that is often fatal: How can you celebrate Columbus when he was a imperialist who smoothed the way for the oppression of indigenous peoples? How can you be proud of destroying the natural landscape to build a dam, bridge or a freeway? How can you justify spending public money on the bourgeois Opera or Museum of Fine Arts when grass roots folk music/feminist free verse poetry/ ethnic interpretive dance languishes for lack of support?

These questions, and many others like them, are good questions that need to be asked. But too often, we are quick to point out the inevitable incompleteness or bias of any public vision and slow to notice the erosion of the public sphere that comes from no vision or an anti-vision. Without such collective projects and social vision we are without any sense of participation in the civic life of the cities in which we live.

But of course, explicit public vision comes with certain risks. Utopian urban planning, for instance, has often ignored urban diversity and the vibrancy of city street life, imposing instead a uniform, theoretically pure master plan that crushed anything it could not assimilate. Literally scores of authors have commented on the destructive “purity” of modernist city planning. The exemplary prototype was Baron Haussmann’s remaking of Parisian neighborhoods during France’s Second Empire, through which the winding pathways of old Paris (and the buildings that lined them) were made to yield to

the grand boulevards that grace the city of Light today.<sup>2</sup> More recent examples have remade the American urban landscape: Robert Moses's freeways cut swatches through working class immigrant neighborhoods in New York City<sup>3</sup>; the urban renewal of the 1960s displaced the thriving African-American Fillmore district in San Francisco, the Latino communities of downtown Los Angeles were literally pushed East to make way for the corporate headquarters of the West Coast's business and finance capital.<sup>4</sup> Le Corbusier's modernist plan for Paris was (mercifully) never realized, but a visit to Stuyvesant Town in New York City would make one think that the *Ville Radieuse*<sup>5</sup> had found a home in the New World. Some of these civic visions are of such inspired beauty that one cannot help but think it worth the loss (marvel at Place de Concorde and tell me you long for the fetid labyrinth of medieval Paris); others are a crime against the social fabric and an assault on the eye; still others simply incomplete and abandoned, a betrayal of the public trust and an insult to the lives they displaced.

But the attempts to control such civic enterprises by tying the hands of government have not eliminated the type of violent displacement that the critics of utopian planning deplore. Instead, the displacement now occurs under the guise of "efficiency," or the market, rather than under the rubric of progress or urban beautification. The imperialism now occurs through market forces and malign neglect: shopping malls and office complexes replace highways and public works as the engines of displacement; the corporate headquarters as a monument to capital replaces the public sculpture as a monument to the civic hero or heroine. While modern urban planning threatened to destroy communities in the name of the *Ville Radieuse*, today the ethnic neighborhood is slowly destroyed through disinvestment and neglect or displaced by gentrification and spiraling rents: housing abandonment or condominium conversions replace the wrecking ball and the bulldozer of urban renewal.

In the United States, a combination of left wing skepticism of "cultural imperialism" and neo-conservative hostility to government enterprise generally have combined to

---

<sup>2</sup> David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity* at 16, 25.

<sup>3</sup> See generally Robert Caro, *The Power Broker*

<sup>4</sup> See generally, Mike Davis, *City of Quartz*

<sup>5</sup> See Le Corbusier, *La Ville Radieuse* (The Radiant City).

discredit many civic projects. But the retreat from governmental planning and civic vision has not left the city “free” to develop naturally or in response to organic social groups and social interactions. Instead, when civic vision has been abandoned, the state has quietly ceded the field to a destructive clash of covert plans and anti-plans: the acquisitive frenzy of the real estate speculator and the reactionary populism of the selfish or frightened homeowner.

What is needed, then, is not a return to imperialistic planning, but a new if tentative vision. A vision that is coherent, yet open to revision, a vision that is confident, but not arrogant, a vision that is inspiring but does not descend into demagoguery. Such a vision is not imposed from above, but rather is assembled, piece by piece from the fragments of our collective aspirations and ideals.

### **The Common Good?**

Cities need common enterprises and civic vision in order to be livable cities. They also need common civic enterprises and a belief in “the common good” in order to be effective local democracies according to a significant number of social scientists and political theorists. Consider the following statement from the political science Robert Putnam:

In the civic community... citizens pursue what Tocqueville termed “self interest properly understood, that is, self interested defined in the context of broader public needs, self interest that is “enlightened” rather than “myopic,” self interest that is alive to the interests of others. [By contrast] [t]he absence of civic virtue is exemplified in...“amoral familism”...“Maximize the material, short-term advantage of the nuclear family; assume all others will do like-wise.... Citizens in a civic community, though not selfless saints, regard the public domain as more than a battleground for pursuing personal interest.”<sup>6</sup>

Civic virtue’s enlightened self interest requires a commitment to a public sphere and public values shared by all, or at least the vast majority of citizens. Divergence of opinions and views are to be expected, but at the same time there must be some conception of the common good that is widely shared. We may disagree about whether

---

<sup>6</sup> Robert Putnam, *Making Democracy Work* at 88.



to prioritize, say, public education over police. We may fight to the bitter end over the issue. But we need to share some at least vague sense of what would make ours a “better city” (better public education and more effective police). Things would become much more problematic if a significant group of citizens thought children should learn on the job as apprentices or if a large faction thought crime prevention better left to private vigilantes. They would be worse yet if some people didn’t care about education at all or sided with the criminals on the belief that private property is immoral. In these latter cases, we would not have routine political disputes and divergent preferences—precisely what a well functioning government and a free market are supposed to mediate—but rather something like a radical disjuncture in terms of the grammar in which the common good is imagined.

Even if each group perceives its goals as compatible with its conception of the common good, outsiders may (mis)perceive those goals as a reflection of what Putnam calls “amoral familism”. Lack of understanding and real, at times radical, divergence in conceptions of the good may erode public trust, encourage citizens to abandon public virtue and instead “maximize the material, short-term advantage of the nuclear family” (or ethnic group) while also promoting the self fulfilling view that “all others will do the same.” Multiculturalism in its stronger manifestations seems to threaten this, and multicultural rights, in their stronger manifestations threaten to entrench it.

### **Rights Assertion and the Habits of Citizenship.**

Consider another of Putnam’s findings:

Citizenship in the civic community entails equal rights and obligations for all. Such a community is bound together by horizontal relations of reciprocity and cooperation, not by vertical relations of authority and dependency. Citizens interact as equals, not as patrons and clients nor as governors and petitioners.<sup>7</sup>

In the classical liberal model, rights are a precondition to effective citizenship: civil rights secure the political equality of citizens that distinguishes democracy from aristocracy and civil liberties allow citizens participate in politics without fear of reprisals from the

---

<sup>7</sup> Id.

individuals currently in control of the formal power of the state. In this model, formal rights assertion against government or private actors should be extraordinary. For the most part, rights should function in the background, as guarantors of equality and liberty whose effectiveness is reflected in the fact that they rarely need be evoked formally. When this is true, we needn't pay much attention to the effects of formal rights assertion on the "habits of citizenship".

But multicultural rights are predicated on the political powerlessness of minority cultural groups: because the minority groups are likely to be the victims of illegitimate bias, their legitimate interests are likely to be systematically undervalued by most citizens. Here rights are not a background norm underlying democratic politics, but instead a corrective to a failed or degenerate democracy, as a fix for "process failure" in the language of legal theorist John Hart Ely. In this "process failure" model, rights assertion becomes an alternative to democracy for groups who are likely to be systematic losers in majoritarian politics. As such, rights assertion may become a frequent event in the collective life of these sub groups and these groups may come to define their role as citizens, primarily in terms of the act of rights assertion before courts, rather than as participants in political dialogue with other citizens. At this point we may worry, in Putnam's terms, that the "horizontal relations of reciprocity and cooperation" necessary to good citizenship will become supplanted by "vertical relations of authority and dependency" between subjects dependent on the authority of courts or governmental bureaucracies that enforce rights to culture.

This isn't to suggest that minority rights are never necessary; indeed such rights are essential to realize the promise of multicultural cities, as I will argue below. But minority rights must not become a substitute for engagement with the rough and tumble of democratic politics. Political dialogue empowers members of minority sub groups as equal participants in a political process and thereby fosters horizontal relationships among citizens rather than vertical relationships between individuals and the administrative or judicial institutions that enforce rights to culture. Political dialogue can be an opportunity to foster mutual trust between the ethnic groups which make up a city; by negotiating cultural differences, groups may come to understand that group based differences are not as severe as they imagined and that members of other ethnic groups

are people of good will who can be enlisted in mutually beneficial enterprises for the common good.

This leads us to another of Putnam's observations:

Participation in civic organizations inculcates skills of cooperation as well as a sense of shared responsibility for collective endeavors. Moreover, when individuals belong to "cross-cutting" groups with diverse goals and members, their attitudes will tend to moderate as a result of group interaction and cross pressures... associationism is a necessary precondition for effective self-governance.<sup>8</sup>

Political organizing around specific social *practices*, rather than litigation asserting rights to "culture", might foster coalitional politics and the "cross cutting" group membership that Putnam and others suggest will help produce more moderate attitudes. For instance, recent immigrants might ally themselves with local religious minorities in order to lobby for, say the accommodation of distinctive apparel in public schools (as was at issue in the famous French "affair of the head scarves" in which French school authorities forbade the wearing of headscarves and other religious dress in public school), or with organized labor to press for a generally applicable autonomy over grooming and dress or for flexible work schedules (to accommodate religious or cultural rituals or traditions) in employment contexts. In the process they will often need to compromise in order to maintain a successful alliance. Such a compromise is more likely to be experienced as voluntarily chosen in the way many politically necessary compromises are ("on balance, the compromise was worth it") leading to the mediation of attitudes Putnam describes. By contrast, if a court offers a compromise (say, in the form of a limited cultural rights protection) it may be experienced by the group as a betrayal of their "true" culture or even as a form of compulsory assimilation imposed by a judicial system that is, after all, thoroughly implicated in the norms of the dominant culture.

### **"Cultural Difference" as a Threat to Civic Dialogue and Sound Policy**

What is important to notice is that none of the problems I have identified make reference to the *specific* features of any cultural tradition. The claim here is not that certain cultural traditions are incompatible with democracy, capitalism or political

---

<sup>8</sup> Putnam at 90.

liberalism because, for instance, they're too hierarchical, too theocratic, too communal and therefore fail to respect individual autonomy, disregard the equality of women, etc. As a general matter I often find such claims wildly overbroad, alarmist, inattentive to similarities between the "alien" practices and values and readily available analogous Western practices and values and quite often just plain bigoted, (although, in certain contexts, the claims strike me as quite plausible.) For my purposes in this essay I'm agnostic as to these claims.

My claim is that the mere *perception* of cultural difference and the resulting social divisions—objective and imagined—can trouble democratic institutions and enterprises that require social trust and even a thin commitment to shared ideals. At the same time there may be somewhat less than meets the eye to the crisis multiculturalism presents in terms of conflicts involving actual social practices (as opposed to widespread *perceptions* of difference.) To be sure, modern cities consist of people with divergent goals, ideals and conceptions of the good life, but this is type of conflict that liberal democratic institutions are designed to mediate. My hypothesis is that perception of group cultural difference—a sort of "difference panic" on the part of some and fetishization and valorization of group difference on the part of others-- may be much more destructive of civic enterprises than the normative conflict generated the actual practices of various social groups. If so, then the discourse surrounding "multicultural rights" may be a part of the problem, not so much because multicultural rights "go too far" (or because opposition to cultural rights is unacceptably intolerant) but because the arguments *for and against* cultural rights share a socially destructive and at least overblown (if not downright incorrect) presumption: that "cultural" conflict is novel and unprecedented because, unlike garden variety forms of social conflict, *cultural* conflict involves a clash of radically divergent, incompatible, mutually inscrutable and incommensurable value systems.

Cultural difference rhetoric (pro and con) encourages us to see social conflicts in terms of inscrutable group difference. But often, conflicts filed under the label "cultural difference" are better understood in terms of the type of ideological or normative conflict that democracies and markets routinely mediate. Often the reason a social practice in another culture is disturbing is because it is uncomfortably similar to a controversial

practice internal to “our own” culture. In these cases, practices that could be dealt with under existing laws and procedures are unnecessarily complicated by the introduction of a rhetoric of cultural difference.

For instance, the ongoing public outcry over female circumcision is generally presented as a case of “cultural difference.” The rhetoric evokes traditional cultural and religious values in need of protection from “western cultural imperialism” or, alternatively, savage African or brutal Islamic practices that the “civilized world” should unite to combat. This framing, encouraged by *both* those who would defend the practice (or practices) as “cultural traditions” and those who would forbid them as barbaric, clouds the issue and blind us to reasonable policy solutions.

For instance, when doctors in Seattle area hospitals began encountering requests for female circumcision from Somali immigrants in the mid 1990s, the hospitals formed a committee to study the issue. The committee found that refusal to consider performing the practice would lead many to attempt to perform it outside the hospital setting, either at home or in their native country, both options that would often involve severe procedures under unsanitary conditions. By contrast, the committee discovered that a quite small ritual cut in the tissue surrounding the clitoris would satisfy the Somalis cultural and religious needs while leaving only small scar and resulting in little or no long term loss of sensation, sexual function or lasting physical trauma. An obstetrician/gynecologist opined that such a procedure would be less traumatic than the male circumcisions performed as a matter of course on new-born boys in the United States.<sup>9</sup> A form of civic dialogue that emerged in a local context in which the conflict actually arose and that focused on the specific practice at issue, rather on sweeping ideas of cultural difference, enabled the Somalis and the American doctors arrive at a solution that satisfied both Somali traditions and American norms and laws.

Nevertheless, driven by the fear of a “barbaric” (this term was used to describe the Somalis with shocking confidence and regularity) foreign culture, opponents lobbied for and secured the passage a sweeping federal law that arguably prohibits any form of “female circumcision. The federal law potentially undermines the hard won compromise

---

<sup>9</sup> Carol Ostrom, Hospital Debates Issue of Circumcising Muslim Girls, Seattle Times-Picayune, September 29, 1996.

hammered out by at least one community that was directly involved in the conflict. It fails to discriminate between a symbolic procedure that satisfies the religious and cultural traditions of a group of citizens while causing less trauma than other procedures that are routinely performed in the United States and a potentially life threatening procedure that at its worst severely interferes with healthy biological function and condemns the woman a life of pain and disfigurement.

Do we need the new federal law to prohibit the more severe form of female circumcision? The answer is no because every jurisdiction in the United States has generally applicable laws against child abuse and endangerment. If the practice amounts to child abuse the abusers can and should be prosecuted under those laws. Viewed as a child endangerment issue, the practice is similar to the refusal of certain Christian denominations, such as the Jehovah's Witnesses to allow medical interventions for ill children, an issue that has been confronted and mediated by American medical professionals and courts.<sup>10</sup> Like the Jehovah's Witnesses, many of the practitioners of female circumcision believe their religion requires it.<sup>11</sup> In both cases the children arguably are not capable of freely choosing or rejecting the religious practices of their parents.

One cannot help but wonder whether what is really so disquieting is not the supposed radical difference but rather the striking *similarity* between this cultural practice and the practices that regularly occur in the West. For instance, children with "irregular" genitals are routinely operated on in the United States, for no reason other than aesthetics (one of the reasons cited by the African practitioners of female circumcision.)<sup>12</sup> Male infants in the United States are routinely circumcised despite the consensus that the practice has no clear medical justification. And consider the types of bodily "mutilation" (anorexia, bulimia, a growing number of cosmetic surgeries) that Western women regularly endure, again, in order to conform to the gender norms of their culture.

---

<sup>10</sup> See, e.g., *Jehovah's Witnesses v. King County Hospital*, 390 U.S. 598 (1968) (children declared wards of the state when parents refused to allow blood transfusions).

<sup>11</sup> , see, CELIA W. DUGGER Tug of Taboos: African Genital Rite vs. U.S. Law, *The New York Times*, December 28, 1996, Section 1; Page 1; Column 3.-

<sup>12</sup> See NATALIE ANGIER New Debate Over Surgery On Genitals, *New York Times*, May 13, 1997, Section C; Page 1; Column 1

This example demonstrates that the rhetoric of “cultural difference” that cultural rights discourse encourages doesn’t necessarily lead to the preservation of minority cultural practices. It can lead us *either* to turn a blind eye to a practice that we should confront and condemn (“it’s ‘their culture’ and therefore not our concern”) or to prematurely condemn a practice we should seek to understand (“it’s ‘barbaric’ and an assault on our values.”) Regardless of whether one favors or opposes the practice in question, little is gained by shrouding a social practice in the rhetoric of “cultural difference,” a rhetoric that too often suggests that we are incapable of evaluating the practice in a context specific way, as we would any other social practice. We should confront disquieting and controversial practices in their specifics as a practices that occur in our society, rather than attempt to establish a distance from them by describing them as alien and foreign.

Cultural differences in and of themselves do not pose a threat to the type of civic dialogue that theorists such as Putnam see as central to making local democracy work. What does pose a threat to civic dialogue is the belief that “culture” provides an excuse to opt out of the dialogue and resort to premature defiance or premature coercion. We can and we must engage in dialogue (and when necessary face conflict) concerning social practices about which people will differ. In this sense, “cultural difference” is simply the latest manifestation of that most ancient political dilemma: how can a just society manage desires of citizens with incompatible visions of the good?<sup>13</sup>

### **Mediation of Cultural Conflict Through Political Dialogue**

Notice how the tensions between cultural difference and civic virtue are attenuated by describing the conflicts in terms of a clash of values, goals and practices instead of in terms of inscrutable group cultures. Conceived of in the former, more universal terms, what once were seen as inscrutable foreign practices may instead be seen to involve commitments and norms which other members of a community can understand, if not embrace. So rather than see clitoretectomy as an effect of a foreign culture that is beyond our comprehension, we can see it as a controversial social practice, mild in some of its manifestations, severe in others, and arguably analogous to some more familiar practices,

---

<sup>13</sup> See Isaiah Berlin, Two Concepts of Liberty in Four Essays on Liberty 118-119, 170-72 (1969).

such as cosmetic surgery or male circumcision. Instead of a clash of incommensurable values, we are faced with a *political* disagreement susceptible to resolution through the normal institutions of liberal societies: political dialogue, negotiation and persuasion.

Political dialogue and negotiation can reveal the diversity of opinion *within* sub groups that may seem unanimous at first glance: for instance, there are indigenous feminist movements within many ethnic and religious groups struggling to resist “traditional” practices that undermine equality between the sexes; there are intense and compelling struggles over the appropriate interpretation of religious doctrine and the traditional status of many practices, there are more and less cosmopolitan elements within most ethnic groups and more and less progressive views regarding traditional practices. Cultural rights might bolster a practice that is under attack *within* an ethnic group and thereby unwittingly take sides in an “internal” dispute; by contrast, an effective political dialogue can allow such divergent voices within cultural groups a platform from which to speak, in some cases lessening the apparent tension between the norms of various groups in a society and facilitating a richer and more nuanced understanding of group cultural practices.

Political dialogue can be an opportunity for groups to come to understand each other and may help the group that loses a political conflict better accept the outcome. In some cases a group that fails to convince its fellow citizens of the merits of a cultural practice may come away somewhat more receptive to a generally applicable prohibition if their members were involved a conversation about the rationale for the prohibition. Political dialogue can educate recent immigrants as to the norms and values that are dominant in their new or temporary homes; in many cases newcomers are happy to comply with social norms when they know of and understand them.

Consider the following case. Two arranged marriages involving two girls of 13 and 14 years and two men roughly twice their age took place in the state of Nebraska<sup>14</sup>. After local law enforcement was informed of the incident, the father of the two girls, a refugee from Iraq, was charged with criminal child abuse and the grooms, fellow Iraqis, were charged with statutory rape for consummating the “marriages” on their wedding

---

<sup>14</sup> Don Terry, Cultural Tradition and Law Collide in Middle America, The New York Times, Dec 2, 1996, A10.



night. The girls were taken into the protective custody of the state. The lawyer for the Iraqi men reported that none of them could understand why they were arrested: they were simply unaware that the marriage was illegal and that sexual intercourse between “married” minors and adults was considered criminal sexual assault. According to a friend of the accused men, “They were only doing what we have done for centuries. This is not a case of disrespect for the law. We did not know the law.” Another friend who became a sort of unofficial spokesperson for the accused men added “But now that we know there will be no more incidents. We love this country.”

Perhaps this reaction is a ruse to avoid criminal penalties. But on its face, the reaction suggests that what might appear to be an intractable cultural conflict may instead be a simple question of “ignorance of the law,” easily resolved through education. And although at first blush the practice of the Iraqi refugees may seem a radical departure from Western practices, it bears noting that the legal age of consent for sexual intercourse is as low as 14 in some parts of the United States and the legal age for marriage is also as low as 14 if the marriage takes place with parental consent: in other words, for the older of the two girls both the marriage and the sexual intercourse charged as child abuse and statutory rape in Nebraska would have been *legal* in other parts of the United States. And as a consequence of the American constitutional principle that the laws of any state be given “full faith and credit” in other states, a couple legally married in any state generally remains married in any other state of the union, even if the marriage in question could not be entered into under the laws of the new state.

There are good reasons to think that a marriage involving a 14 year old is problematic. But it is not clear why it is more problematic when it arises from the traditions of rural Iraqis than when it arises from the traditions of rural Americans. The Nebraska controversy raised difficult legal and moral issues, but none of the issues were unprecedented or unique to “multiculturalism.” Multicultural rhetoric led the media and local law enforcement into a sort of “difference panic.” Viewed through lens of cultural difference, the practice could only be seen as the effect of an inscrutable foreign culture. At this point only two options are cognizable: protect the practice under the rubric of cultural autonomy, or prohibit it as inconsistent with the norms of Western civilization. Either outcome is destructive of social trust because either outcome reinforces the idea

that the sub-group is radically distinct from the “mainstream” of society, they are *in* but never *of* the local and national community. Viewed through this lens, the sub group is either a candidate for liberal *noblesse oblige* manifested in cultural rights or for isolation and suspicion as a foreign contagion that threatens the community character.

If, by contrast, the local Nebraska authorities had viewed the practice of underage “marriages” without prejudice, several equitable solutions suggest themselves. First and most obviously, take pains to educate newcomers of the applicable marriage and statutory rape laws. More controversially, exercise case-by-case prosecutorial discretion in dealing with child endangerment/abuse and statutory rape violations that involve good faith mistakes about the governing legal norms. The maxim “ignorance of the law is no excuse” is routinely honored in the breach: to be blunt, I find it hard to imagine that an identical fact pattern involving people of European decent from a state where marriages between 14 year olds are legal with parental consent would have resulted in prosecutions for rape and child abuse. Instead, I suspect the parties would have been informed of the governing law, told that the marriage was invalid under Nebraska law and advised to either wait until the daughters reached the age of majority in Nebraska or to travel to North Carolina, marry under *that* state’s law and then return (Nebraska might then recognize the marriage under the full faith and credit clause and the practice of comity between the American states.)

Finally, and again more controversially, enforce the governing law and prosecute willful violations accordingly. Newcomers have the right to expect that they will be treated equitably and they have the right to attempt to change laws they find inappropriate or burdensome through the political process. They don’t have the right to expect established laws, norms and mores to change to suit them or to demand exceptions to generally applicable rules. In this respect, the adage, “when in Rome, do as the Romans do” is apt: for the most part, people who arrive in a new social environment legitimately can be expected to conform their behavior to established norms. Cultural traditions can and do change in response to new circumstances and social expectations. Such a process of change is not necessarily a violation of rights or an instance of cultural imperialism. In this respect it is worthy of note that according to observers of Iraqi society, marriages involving teen-age girls are by and large limited to rural areas and very rare in Iraqi

cities: if rural Iraqis can adapt their marital practices to the dominant cultural norms of Baghdad, they can also adapt them to the dominant norms of Lincoln, Nebraska and other Western cities.

### **Status-based Discrimination as an Impediment to Successful Integration**

Although it would require a separate essay to even summarize the argument, it is long established in liberal societies that there is a relevant distinction between discrimination on the basis of status or group membership and “discrimination” on the basis of behavior or practices. While discrimination based on status is understood to be illegitimate with rare exceptions, in a sense, discrimination on the basis of behavior is the *sine qua non* of law. My suggestion that formal cultural rights (in the form of demands for accommodation of distinctive practices) should be approached with caution and attention to the potential costs in terms of civic trust does not suggest circumspection toward more traditional civil rights prohibiting discrimination on the basis of ascriptive social statuses such as race and national origin.

Indeed, in some instances, the commitment to group cultural difference may be a reaction to the failure of liberal societies to confront and eliminate bias and discrimination on the basis of race or national origin. Consider a conflict over arranged marriage reported several years ago in the *New York Times*.<sup>15</sup> The *Times* covered the story of the son of a Turkish immigrant to Denmark who consented to an arranged marriage at the behest of his parents. The largely assimilated son married a native Turkish woman and eventually the couple settled in Denmark. The cultural gulf between the relatively westernized husband and his traditional wife made the relationship impossible. Ultimately, the husband divorced his traditional wife in order to marry a more assimilated woman of Turkish decent who, like him, had grown up in Denmark. This caused a great deal of animosity between the husband and his own extended family and between the husband’s family, the first wife’s family and the second wife’s family (all of whom hailed from or lived in the same small village in Turkey.)

---

<sup>15</sup> Roger Cohen, For “New Danes” Differences Create a Divide” *The New York Times*, December 18, 2000 A1.

The aftermath of this story sounds a cautionary note: one might expect that, “having suffered at the hands of old Turkish custom, the young, bruised couple [the son and his second wife], both Danish citizens, should be enthusiastic supporters of their adoptive land and its campaign to bring ‘Danish culture’ to all, including the more than 8 percent of inhabitants who are immigrants.” But the young couple complain of discrimination in employment and note with dismay that “there is always the sense of “us” and “them,” the old Dane and the new Dane, the blue-eyed and the dark-skinned” and that “the Danes say one thing, that they want to integrate us, and do another. That’s why we fight.”

These statements suggest that robust prohibitions against discrimination on the basis of *status*es such as race, religion and national origin may be a precondition to effective social integration and necessary to foster social trust between ethnic and cultural groups. They also suggest that compromise and negotiation of the conflicts surrounding cultural practices are possible: if offered a consistent message and a realizable goal, recent immigrants would be happy in many cases to integrate into a multicultural society, even at the expense of some traditional practices.

### **Assimilation and the Promise of Multicultural Cities**

At this point it bears noting that some degree of assimilation is arguably an indispensable component of modern nationalism generally, whether it involves “foreign” cultural practices or not. For instance, long before the French attempted to Gallicize their Algerian colonial subjects French elites Parisian-ized the French peasantry, repressing local dialects and rewarding fluency in Parisian French, incorporating certain local customs into a unified national identity and discouraging others.<sup>16</sup> This is a standard story of nationalism generally, and applies to some degree to most nation states. This does not of course, serve as an apology for French (or any other) colonialism, but it does cast the problem of assimilation in a useful historical frame: to a real extent almost all of the world’s currently existing cultures are the product of assimilation. It is understandable but perhaps wrongheaded to presume that the processes of cultural melding that produced the civilizations we enjoy today should stop with the present

---

<sup>16</sup> I take this to be a quite conventional account of French national formation. See e.g., Eugen Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen*

generation. Perhaps the difference between the type of successful, if partial, assimilation that is at the heart of national unification and the so far unsuccessful assimilation of contemporary multiculturalism is precisely that of racism and status hierarchy.

Recall that the foregoing analysis doesn't rely on reference to any specific cultural practice or norm: the claim is not that certain cultural traditions are incompatible with democracy or capitalism and political liberalism because, for instance, they're too hierarchical, too theocratic, too communal, disregard the equality of women, etc. Instead, it's the *perception* of cultural difference as an unprecedented phenomenon involving radically alien practices and inscrutable beliefs that threatens social trust and the conditions favorable to civic virtue. My argument doesn't suggest that cultural rights are dangerous because they protect inherently dangerous practices, but rather that they are dangerous because they are premised on the view that conflicts involving practices identified with ethnic sub-groups are distinct from the run-of-the-mill political and ideological conflicts that complex societies routinely confront. Cultural rights presume that group cultural differences are fixed and therefore the inevitable basis of social division. Based on this presumption, they foreclose many of the numerous mechanisms that well ordered societies possess for dealing with normative and social conflicts and for mediating, complicating and softening group based affiliations, biases and divisions.

It is consistent with this argument that social trust in multicultural cities could emerge *either* through sufficient assimilation of cultural minorities to currently dominant customs and values, *or* through sufficient assimilation of all members of the community to some common set of norms and values that would represent an amalgamation of previously distinct and alien customs and values. This latter ideal—a polyglot civic community—is, to my mind, the great, unfulfilled cosmopolitan promise of multicultural cities. This cultural intermarriage and the new artistic, creative and social forms it might produce is what the multicultural city has to offer the multicultural nation state and ultimately the multicultural world: new ways of imagining community and new ways of living together that bridge—and at times transcend—cultural group difference.

Sound utopian? Well, I do use the term assimilation, and I use it advisedly. I don't imagine we can have the kind of multicultural civic community I've described without some changes; changes that some will find unwelcome. Some sacred cows would have

to be butchered, some ritual daggers pounded into ploughshares. And while the polyglot society would to some extent be mix of all the various cultures in a society, let's not fool ourselves: there's simply no way to guarantee that each group will have equal influence. Larger groups, more established groups and groups with disproportionate economic and social influence will have more power to shape the direction of a common multicultural society than recent immigrants with little wealth or social prestige. From the perspective of cultural rights, this is an injustice; I fear it is an injustice law and social policy cannot easily remedy.

Moreover, much of what animates cultural rights is the desire for group self-perpetuation: it not simply a desire to have equal influence over a polyglot society but a desire to remain distinctive. It's not an accident that all of the examples of cultural conflicts I've offered have involved marriage, procreation, children or sexuality. These issues are of central importance because they involve more than simple conflicts between legally competent, adults; they also involve a struggle over the affiliations and socialization of future generations. They are about the future of societies, the continuity of civilizations and the survival of ethnic groups *as groups*.

For instance, arranged marriage is an especially potent symbol of multicultural conflict because it implicates a practice that is valued not only for its own sake but also as a means of maintaining a common group identity. For some immigrant communities, arranged marriage may take on greater importance in the host country than it ever had "at home" because without it there would be no certain means of ensuring a connection between subsequent generations born in the West and the old country. The stakes of the conflict are "cultural survival." As the philosopher Anthony Appiah argues:

the desire for survival is not simply the desire that the culture that gives meaning to the lives of currently existing individuals should continue for them, but requires the continued existence of the culture through indefinite future generations.... Let me stress first that the indefinite future generations in question should be the descendants of the current population. The desire for the survival of the... identity is not the desire that there should always be people somewhere who speak that ...language and practice those ... practices... A proposal to [pay]... a group of unrelated people to carry on [the] culture on some island in the South Pacific simply would not meet the need.

This matters because it seems to me not at all clear that this aim is one that we can acknowledge while respecting the autonomy of future generations.<sup>17</sup>

Arranged marriage is perhaps an emblematic multicultural conflict precisely because it implicates the ability of groups to perpetuate group customs and affiliations intergenerationally *and* the often very strongly held aversion to such intergenerational control in liberal societies. There are very good reasons for liberal societies to prohibit marriages involving children unable to make autonomous decisions and to encourage people to socialize across of ethnically-defined lines. While ethnic sub groups are entitled to promote group solidarity through voluntary association, it is not at all clear that they are entitled to hinder younger generations from considering and pursuing alternative affiliations, lifestyles and relationships outside the group. An inevitable and perhaps desirable result of growing up in a multicultural society will be the gradual erosion of some of the most distinctive elements of ethnic group culture and the supplementation of ethnic group affiliations with new, more cosmopolitan modes of action, beliefs and ways of life.

It's precisely the possibility of this type of slow erosion of group identity that many would like to forestall with cultural rights. It seems to me such desires, while understandable, are not desires liberal societies can accommodate. And perhaps it bears noting that even this characteristic demand of cultural difference is, in one sense, not unique to cultural minorities. Parents everywhere and of all races, creeds and classes, desperately wish for more control over their children than modern, dynamic, cosmopolitan and liberal societies can offer or are prepared to yield to them.

Multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism are increasingly the conditions of our age. We will do better to confront and manage the conflicts that arise with compassion, equity and pragmatism than to attempt to banish them with absolutes, be it rigid prohibitions or indiscriminate accommodations and entitlements.

---

<sup>17</sup> Charles Taylor (Amy Gutman ed) Multiculturalism: examining the politics of recognition, 157 (Princeton 1994)

## NOTE DI LAVORO DELLA FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI

### Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Working Paper Series

Our working papers are available on the Internet at the following addresses:

<http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/WPapers/default.html>

<http://papers.ssrn.com>

SUST	1.2002	<i>K. TANO, M.D. FAMINOW, M. KAMUANGA and B. SWALLOW: <u>Using Conjoint Analysis to Estimate Farmers' Preferences for Cattle Traits in West Africa</u></i>
ETA	2.2002	<i>Efrem CASTELNUOVO and Paolo SURICO: <u>What Does Monetary Policy Reveal about Central Bank's Preferences?</u></i>
WAT	3.2002	<i>Duncan KNOWLER and Edward BARBIER: <u>The Economics of a "Mixed Blessing" Effect: A Case Study of the Black Sea</u></i>
CLIM	4.2002	<i>Andreas LÖSCHEL: <u>Technological Change in Economic Models of Environmental Policy: A Survey</u></i>
VOL	5.2002	<i>Carlo CARRARO and Carmen MARCHIORI: <u>Stable Coalitions</u></i>
CLIM	6.2002	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI, Alessandro LANZA and Matteo MANERA: <u>Rockets and Feathers Revisited: An International Comparison on European Gasoline Markets</u></i>
ETA	7.2002	<i>Effrosyni DIAMANTOUDI and Efthios S. SARTZETAKIS: <u>Stable International Environmental Agreements: An Analytical Approach</u></i>
KNOW	8.2002	<i>Alain DESDOIGTS: <u>Neoclassical Convergence Versus Technological Catch-up: A Contribution for Reaching a Consensus</u></i>
NRM	9.2002	<i>Giuseppe DI VITA: <u>Renewable Resources and Waste Recycling</u></i>
KNOW	10.2002	<i>Giorgio BRUNELLO: <u>Is Training More Frequent when Wage Compression is Higher? Evidence from 11 European Countries</u></i>
ETA	11.2002	<i>Mordecai KURZ, Hehui JIN and Maurizio MOTOLESE: <u>Endogenous Fluctuations and the Role of Monetary Policy</u></i>
KNOW	12.2002	<i>Reyer GERLAGH and Marjan W. HOFKES: <u>Escaping Lock-in: The Scope for a Transition towards Sustainable Growth?</u></i>
NRM	13.2002	<i>Michele MORETTO and Paolo ROSATO: <u>The Use of Common Property Resources: A Dynamic Model</u></i>
CLIM	14.2002	<i>Philippe QUIRION: <u>Macroeconomic Effects of an Energy Saving Policy in the Public Sector</u></i>
CLIM	15.2002	<i>Roberto ROSON: <u>Dynamic and Distributional Effects of Environmental Revenue Recycling Schemes: Simulations with a General Equilibrium Model of the Italian Economy</u></i>
CLIM	16.2002	<i>Francesco RICCI (I): <u>Environmental Policy Growth when Inputs are Differentiated in Pollution Intensity</u></i>
ETA	17.2002	<i>Alberto PETRUCCI: <u>Devaluation (Levels versus Rates) and Balance of Payments in a Cash-in-Advance Economy</u></i>
Coalition Theory Network	18.2002	<i>László Á. KÓCZY (liv): <u>The Core in the Presence of Externalities</u></i>
Coalition Theory Network	19.2002	<i>Steven J. BRAMS, Michael A. JONES and D. Marc KILGOUR (liv): <u>Single-Peakedness and Disconnected Coalitions</u></i>
Coalition Theory Network	20.2002	<i>Guillaume HAERINGER (liv): <u>On the Stability of Cooperation Structures</u></i>
NRM	21.2002	<i>Fausto CAVALLARO and Luigi CIRAOLO: <u>Economic and Environmental Sustainability: A Dynamic Approach in Insular Systems</u></i>
CLIM	22.2002	<i>Barbara BUCHNER, Carlo CARRARO, Igor CERSOSIMO and Carmen MARCHIORI: <u>Back to Kyoto? US Participation and the Linkage between R&amp;D and Climate Cooperation</u></i>
CLIM	23.2002	<i>Andreas LÖSCHEL and ZhongXIANG ZHANG: <u>The Economic and Environmental Implications of the US Repudiation of the Kyoto Protocol and the Subsequent Deals in Bonn and Marrakech</u></i>
ETA	24.2002	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI, Louis J. MACCINI and Fabio SCHIANTARELLI: <u>Inventories, Employment and Hours</u></i>
CLIM	25.2002	<i>Hannes EGLI: <u>Are Cross-Country Studies of the Environmental Kuznets Curve Misleading? New Evidence from Time Series Data for Germany</u></i>
ETA	26.2002	<i>Adam B. JAFFE, Richard G. NEWELL and Robert N. STAVINS: <u>Environmental Policy and Technological Change</u></i>
SUST	27.2002	<i>Joseph C. COOPER and Giovanni SIGNORELLO: <u>Farmer Premiums for the Voluntary Adoption of Conservation Plans</u></i>
SUST	28.2002	<i><u>The ANSEA Network: Towards An Analytical Strategic Environmental Assessment</u></i>
KNOW	29.2002	<i>Paolo SURICO: <u>Geographic Concentration and Increasing Returns: a Survey of Evidence</u></i>
ETA	30.2002	<i>Robert N. STAVINS: <u>Lessons from the American Experiment with Market-Based Environmental Policies</u></i>



NRM	31.2002	<i>Carlo GIUPPONI and Paolo ROSATO</i> : <u>Multi-Criteria Analysis and Decision-Support for Water Management at the Catchment Scale: An Application to Diffuse Pollution Control in the Venice Lagoon</u>
NRM	32.2002	<i>Robert N. STAVINS</i> : <u>National Environmental Policy During the Clinton Years</u>
KNOW	33.2002	<i>A. SOUBEYRAN and H. STAHN</i> : <u>Do Investments in Specialized Knowledge Lead to Composite Good Industries?</u>
KNOW	34.2002	<i>G. BRUNELLO, M.L. PARISI and Daniela SONEDDA</i> : <u>Labor Taxes, Wage Setting and the Relative Wage Effect</u>
CLIM	35.2002	<i>C. BOEMARE and P. QUIRION</i> (lv): <u>Implementing Greenhouse Gas Trading in Europe: Lessons from Economic Theory and International Experiences</u>
CLIM	36.2002	<i>T. TIETENBERG</i> (lv): <u>The Tradable Permits Approach to Protecting the Commons: What Have We Learned?</u>
CLIM	37.2002	<i>K. REHDANZ and R.J.S. TOL</i> (lv): <u>On National and International Trade in Greenhouse Gas Emission Permits</u>
CLIM	38.2002	<i>C. FISCHER</i> (lv): <u>Multinational Taxation and International Emissions Trading</u>
SUST	39.2002	<i>G. SIGNORELLO and G. PAPPALARDO</i> : <u>Farm Animal Biodiversity Conservation Activities in Europe under the Framework of Agenda 2000</u>
NRM	40.2002	<i>S.M. CAVANAGH, W. M. HANEMANN and R. N. STAVINS</i> : <u>Muffled Price Signals: Household Water Demand under Increasing-Block Prices</u>
NRM	41.2002	<i>A. J. PLANTINGA, R. N. LUBOWSKI and R. N. STAVINS</i> : <u>The Effects of Potential Land Development on Agricultural Land Prices</u>
CLIM	42.2002	<i>C. OHL</i> (lvi): <u>Inducing Environmental Co-operation by the Design of Emission Permits</u>
CLIM	43.2002	<i>J. EYCKMANS, D. VAN REGEMORTER and V. VAN STEENBERGHE</i> (lvi): <u>Is Kyoto Fatally Flawed? An Analysis with MacGEM</u>
CLIM	44.2002	<i>A. ANTOCI and S. BORGHESI</i> (lvi): <u>Working Too Much in a Polluted World: A North-South Evolutionary Model</u>
ETA	45.2002	<i>P. G. FREDRIKSSON, Johan A. LIST and Daniel MILLIMET</i> (lvi): <u>Chasing the Smokestack: Strategic Policymaking with Multiple Instruments</u>
ETA	46.2002	<i>Z. YU</i> (lvi): <u>A Theory of Strategic Vertical DFI and the Missing Pollution-Haven Effect</u>
SUST	47.2002	<i>Y. H. FARZIN</i> : <u>Can an Exhaustible Resource Economy Be Sustainable?</u>
SUST	48.2002	<i>Y. H. FARZIN</i> : <u>Sustainability and Hamiltonian Value</u>
KNOW	49.2002	<i>C. PIGA and M. VIVARELLI</i> : <u>Cooperation in R&amp;D and Sample Selection</u>
Coalition Theory Network Coalition Theory Network	50.2002	<i>M. SERTEL and A. SLINKO</i> (liv): <u>Ranking Committees, Words or Multisets</u>
ETA	51.2002	<i>Sergio CURRARINI</i> (liv): <u>Stable Organizations with Externalities</u>
ETA	52.2002	<i>Robert N. STAVINS</i> : <u>Experience with Market-Based Policy Instruments</u>
ETA	53.2002	<i>C.C. JAEGER, M. LEIMBACH, C. CARRARO, K. HASSELMANN, J.C. HOURCADE, A. KEELER and R. KLEIN</i> (liii): <u>Integrated Assessment Modeling: Modules for Cooperation</u>
CLIM	54.2002	<i>Scott BARRETT</i> (liii): <u>Towards a Better Climate Treaty</u>
ETA	55.2002	<i>Richard G. NEWELL and Robert N. STAVINS</i> : <u>Cost Heterogeneity and the Potential Savings from Market-Based Policies</u>
SUST	56.2002	<i>Paolo ROSATO and Edi DEFRANCESCO</i> : <u>Individual Travel Cost Method and Flow Fixed Costs</u>
SUST	57.2002	<i>Vladimir KOTOV and Elena NIKITINA</i> (lvii): <u>Reorganisation of Environmental Policy in Russia: The Decade of Success and Failures in Implementation of Perspective Quests</u>
SUST	58.2002	<i>Vladimir KOTOV</i> (lvii): <u>Policy in Transition: New Framework for Russia's Climate Policy</u>
SUST	59.2002	<i>Fanny MISSFELDT and Arturo VILLAVICENCO</i> (lvii): <u>How Can Economies in Transition Pursue Emissions Trading or Joint Implementation?</u>
VOL	60.2002	<i>Giovanni DI BARTOLOMEO, Jacob ENGWERDA, Joseph PLASMANS and Bas VAN AARLE</i> : <u>Staying Together or Breaking Apart: Policy-Makers' Endogenous Coalitions Formation in the European Economic and Monetary Union</u>
ETA	61.2002	<i>Robert N. STAVINS, Alexander F. WAGNER and Gernot WAGNER</i> : <u>Interpreting Sustainability in Economic Terms: Dynamic Efficiency Plus Intergenerational Equity</u>
PRIV	62.2002	<i>Carlo CAPUANO</i> : <u>Demand Growth, Entry and Collusion Sustainability</u>
PRIV	63.2002	<i>Federico MUNARI and Raffaele ORIANI</i> : <u>Privatization and R&amp;D Performance: An Empirical Analysis Based on Tobin's Q</u>
PRIV	64.2002	<i>Federico MUNARI and Maurizio SOBRERO</i> : <u>The Effects of Privatization on R&amp;D Investments and Patent Productivity</u>
SUST	65.2002	<i>Orley ASHENFELTER and Michael GREENSTONE</i> : <u>Using Mandated Speed Limits to Measure the Value of a Statistical Life</u>
ETA	66.2002	<i>Paolo SURICO</i> : <u>US Monetary Policy Rules: the Case for Asymmetric Preferences</u>
PRIV	67.2002	<i>Rinaldo BRAU and Massimo FLORIO</i> : <u>Privatisations as Price Reforms: Evaluating Consumers' Welfare Changes in the U.K.</u>
CLIM	68.2002	<i>Barbara K. BUCHNER and Roberto ROSON</i> : <u>Conflicting Perspectives in Trade and Environmental Negotiations</u>
CLIM	69.2002	<i>Philippe QUIRION</i> : <u>Complying with the Kyoto Protocol under Uncertainty: Taxes or Tradable Permits?</u>
SUST	70.2002	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Patrizia RIGANTI and Alberto LONGO</i> : <u>Can People Value the Aesthetic and Use Services of Urban Sites? Evidence from a Survey of Belfast Residents</u>
SUST	71.2002	<i>Marco PERCOCO</i> : <u>Discounting Environmental Effects in Project Appraisal</u>

NRM	72.2002	<i>Philippe BONTEMS and Pascal FAVARD</i> : <u>Input Use and Capacity Constraint under Uncertainty: The Case of Irrigation</u>
PRIV	73.2002	<i>Mohammed OMRAN</i> : <u>The Performance of State-Owned Enterprises and Newly Privatized Firms: Empirical Evidence from Egypt</u>
PRIV	74.2002	<i>Mike BURKART, Fausto PANUNZI and Andrei SHLEIFER</i> : <u>Family Firms</u>
PRIV	75.2002	<i>Emmanuelle AURIOL, Pierre M. PICARD</i> : <u>Privatizations in Developing Countries and the Government Budget Constraint</u>
PRIV	76.2002	<i>Nichole M. CASTATER</i> : <u>Privatization as a Means to Societal Transformation: An Empirical Study of Privatization in Central and Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union</u>
PRIV	77.2002	<i>Christoph LÜLSFESMANN</i> : <u>Benevolent Government, Managerial Incentives, and the Virtues of Privatization</u>
PRIV	78.2002	<i>Kate BISHOP, Igor FILATOTCHEV and Tomasz MICKIEWICZ</i> : <u>Endogenous Ownership Structure: Factors Affecting the Post-Privatisation Equity in Largest Hungarian Firms</u>
PRIV	79.2002	<i>Theodora WELCH and Rick MOLZ</i> : <u>How Does Trade Sale Privatization Work? Evidence from the Fixed-Line Telecommunications Sector in Developing Economies</u>
PRIV	80.2002	<i>Alberto R. PETRUCCI</i> : <u>Government Debt, Agent Heterogeneity and Wealth Displacement in a Small Open Economy</u>
CLIM	81.2002	<i>Timothy SWANSON and Robin MASON (Ivi)</i> : <u>The Impact of International Environmental Agreements: The Case of the Montreal Protocol</u>
PRIV	82.2002	<i>George R.G. CLARKE and Lixin Colin XU</i> : <u>Privatization, Competition and Corruption: How Characteristics of Bribe Takers and Payers Affect Bribe Payments to Utilities</u>
PRIV	83.2002	<i>Massimo FLORIO and Katuscia MANZONI</i> : <u>The Abnormal Returns of UK Privatisations: From Underpricing to Outperformance</u>
NRM	84.2002	<i>Nelson LOURENÇO, Carlos RUSSO MACHADO, Maria do ROSÁRIO JORGE and Luis RODRIGUES</i> : <u>An Integrated Approach to Understand Territory Dynamics. The Coastal Alentejo (Portugal)</u>
CLIM	85.2002	<i>Peter ZAPFEL and Matti VAINIO (Iv)</i> : <u>Pathways to European Greenhouse Gas Emissions Trading History and Misconceptions</u>
CLIM	86.2002	<i>Pierre COURTOIS</i> : <u>Influence Processes in Climate Change Negotiations: Modelling the Rounds</u>
ETA	87.2002	<i>Vito FRAGNELLI and Maria Erminia MARINA (Iviii)</i> : <u>Environmental Pollution Risk and Insurance</u>
ETA	88.2002	<i>Laurent FRANCKX (Iviii)</i> : <u>Environmental Enforcement with Endogenous Ambient Monitoring</u>
ETA	89.2002	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Timothy M. SWANSON (Iviii)</i> : <u>Lost Horizons. The noncooperative management of an evolutionary biological system.</u>
ETA	90.2002	<i>Hans KEIDING (Iviii)</i> : <u>Environmental Effects of Consumption: An Approach Using DEA and Cost Sharing</u>
ETA	91.2002	<i>Wietze LISE (Iviii)</i> : <u>A Game Model of People's Participation in Forest Management in Northern India</u>
CLIM	92.2002	<i>Jens HORBACH</i> : <u>Structural Change and Environmental Kuznets Curves</u>
ETA	93.2002	<i>Martin P. GROSSKOPF</i> : <u>Towards a More Appropriate Method for Determining the Optimal Scale of Production Units</u>
VOL	94.2002	<i>Scott BARRETT and Robert STAVINS</i> : <u>Increasing Participation and Compliance in International Climate Change Agreements</u>
CLIM	95.2002	<i>Banu BAYRAMOGLU LISE and Wietze LISE</i> : <u>Climate Change, Environmental NGOs and Public Awareness in the Netherlands: Perceptions and Reality</u>
CLIM	96.2002	<i>Matthieu GLACHANT</i> : <u>The Political Economy of Emission Tax Design in Environmental Policy</u>
KNOW	97.2002	<i>Kenn ARIGA and Giorgio BRUNELLO</i> : <u>Are the More Educated Receiving More Training? Evidence from Thailand</u>
ETA	98.2002	<i>Gianfranco FORTE and Matteo MANERA</i> : <u>Forecasting Volatility in European Stock Markets with Non-linear GARCH Models</u>
ETA	99.2002	<i>Geoffrey HEAL</i> : <u>Bundling Biodiversity</u>
ETA	100.2002	<i>Geoffrey HEAL, Brian WALKER, Simon LEVIN, Kenneth ARROW, Partha DASGUPTA, Gretchen DAILY, Paul EHRlich, Karl-Goran MALER, Nils KAUTSKY, Jane LUBCHENCO, Steve SCHNEIDER and David STARRETT</i> : <u>Genetic Diversity and Interdependent Crop Choices in Agriculture</u>
ETA	101.2002	<i>Geoffrey HEAL</i> : <u>Biodiversity and Globalization</u>
VOL	102.2002	<i>Andreas LANGE</i> : <u>Heterogeneous International Agreements – If per capita emission levels matter</u>
ETA	103.2002	<i>Pierre-André JOUVET and Walid OUESLATI</i> : <u>Tax Reform and Public Spending Trade-offs in an Endogenous Growth Model with Environmental Externality</u>
ETA	104.2002	<i>Anna BOTTASSO and Alessandro SEMBENELLI</i> : <u>Does Ownership Affect Firms' Efficiency? Panel Data Evidence on Italy</u>
PRIV	105.2002	<i>Bernardo BORTOLOTTI, Frank DE JONG, Giovanna NICODANO and Ibolya SCHINDELE</i> : <u>Privatization and Stock Market Liquidity</u>
ETA	106.2002	<i>Haruo IMAI and Mayumi HORIE (Iviii)</i> : <u>Pre-Negotiation for an International Emission Reduction Game</u>
PRIV	107.2002	<i>Sudeshna GHOSH BANERJEE and Michael C. MUNGER</i> : <u>Move to Markets? An Empirical Analysis of Privatisation in Developing Countries</u>
PRIV	108.2002	<i>Guillaume GIRMENS and Michel GUILLARD</i> : <u>Privatization and Investment: Crowding-Out Effect vs Financial Diversification</u>
PRIV	109.2002	<i>Alberto CHONG and Florencio LÓPEZ-DE-SILANES</i> : <u>Privatization and Labor Force Restructuring Around the World</u>
PRIV	110.2002	<i>Nandini GUPTA</i> : <u>Partial Privatization and Firm Performance</u>
PRIV	111.2002	<i>François DEGEORGE, Dirk JENTER, Alberto MOEL and Peter TUFANO</i> : <u>Selling Company Shares to Reluctant Employees: France Telecom's Experience</u>

PRIV	112.2002	<i>Isaac OTCHERE</i> : <u>Intra-Industry Effects of Privatization Announcements: Evidence from Developed and Developing Countries</u>
PRIV	113.2002	<i>Yannis KATSOULAKOS and Elissavet LIKOYANNI</i> : <u>Fiscal and Other Macroeconomic Effects of Privatization</u>
PRIV	114.2002	<i>Guillaume GIRMENS</i> : <u>Privatization, International Asset Trade and Financial Markets</u>
PRIV	115.2002	<i>D. Teja FLOTHO</i> : <u>A Note on Consumption Correlations and European Financial Integration</u>
PRIV	116.2002	<i>Ibolya SCHINDELE and Enrico C. PEROTTI</i> : <u>Pricing Initial Public Offerings in Premature Capital Markets: The Case of Hungary</u>
PRIV	1.2003	<i>Gabriella CHIESA and Giovanna NICODANO</i> : <u>Privatization and Financial Market Development: Theoretical Issues</u>
PRIV	2.2003	<i>Ibolya SCHINDELE</i> : <u>Theory of Privatization in Eastern Europe: Literature Review</u>
PRIV	3.2003	<i>Wietze LISE, Claudia KEMFERT and Richard S.J. TOL</i> : <u>Strategic Action in the Liberalised German Electricity Market</u>
CLIM	4.2003	<i>Laura MARSILIANI and Thomas I. RENSTRÖM</i> : <u>Environmental Policy and Capital Movements: The Role of Government Commitment</u>
KNOW	5.2003	<i>Reyer GERLAGH</i> : <u>Induced Technological Change under Technological Competition</u>
ETA	6.2003	<i>Efrem CASTELNUOVO</i> : <u>Squeezing the Interest Rate Smoothing Weight with a Hybrid Expectations Model</u>
SIEV	7.2003	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Alberto LONGO, Stefania TONIN, Francesco TROMBETTA and Margherita TURVANI</i> : <u>The Role of Liability, Regulation and Economic Incentives in Brownfield Remediation and Redevelopment: Evidence from Surveys of Developers</u>
NRM	8.2003	<i>Elissaios POPYRAKIS and Reyer GERLAGH</i> : <u>Natural Resources: A Blessing or a Curse?</u>
CLIM	9.2003	<i>A. CAPARRÓS, J.-C. PEREAU and T. TAZDAÏT</i> : <u>North-South Climate Change Negotiations: a Sequential Game with Asymmetric Information</u>
KNOW	10.2003	<i>Giorgio BRUNELLO and Daniele CHECCHI</i> : <u>School Quality and Family Background in Italy</u>
CLIM	11.2003	<i>Efrem CASTELNUOVO and Marzio GALEOTTI</i> : <u>Learning By Doing vs Learning By Researching in a Model of Climate Change Policy Analysis</u>
KNOW	12.2003	<i>Carole MAIGNAN, Gianmarco OTTAVIANO and Dino PINELLI (eds.)</i> : <u>Economic Growth, Innovation, Cultural Diversity: What are we all talking about? A critical survey of the state-of-the-art</u>
KNOW	13.2003	<i>Carole MAIGNAN, Gianmarco OTTAVIANO, Dino PINELLI and Francesco RULLANI (lix)</i> : <u>Bio-Ecological Diversity vs. Socio-Economic Diversity. A Comparison of Existing Measures</u>
KNOW	14.2003	<i>Maddy JAASSENS and Chris STEYAERT (lix)</i> : <u>Theories of Diversity within Organisation Studies: Debates and Future Trajectories</u>
KNOW	15.2003	<i>Tuzin BAYCAN LEVENT, Enno MASUREL and Peter NIJKAMP (lix)</i> : <u>Diversity in Entrepreneurship: Ethnic and Female Roles in Urban Economic Life</u>
KNOW	16.2003	<i>Alexandra BITUSIKOVA (lix)</i> : <u>Post-Communist City on its Way from Grey to Colourful: The Case Study from Slovakia</u>
KNOW	17.2003	<i>Billy E. VAUGHN and Katarina MLEKOV (lix)</i> : <u>A Stage Model of Developing an Inclusive Community</u>
KNOW	18.2003	<i>Selma van LONDEN and Arie de RUIJTER (lix)</i> : <u>Managing Diversity in a Globalizing World</u>
Coalition Theory Network	19.2003	<i>Sergio CURRARINI</i> : <u>On the Stability of Hierarchies in Games with Externalities</u>
PRIV	20.2003	<i>Giacomo CALZOLARI and Alessandro PAVAN (lx)</i> : <u>Monopoly with Resale</u>
PRIV	21.2003	<i>Claudio MEZZETTI (lx)</i> : <u>Auction Design with Interdependent Valuations: The Generalized Revelation Principle, Efficiency, Full Surplus Extraction and Information Acquisition</u>
PRIV	22.2003	<i>Marco LiCalzi and Alessandro PAVAN (lx)</i> : <u>Tilting the Supply Schedule to Enhance Competition in Uniform-Price Auctions</u>
PRIV	23.2003	<i>David ETTINGER (lx)</i> : <u>Bidding among Friends and Enemies</u>
PRIV	24.2003	<i>Hannu VARTAINEN (lx)</i> : <u>Auction Design without Commitment</u>
PRIV	25.2003	<i>Matti KELOHARJU, Kjell G. NYBORG and Kristian RYDQVIST (lx)</i> : <u>Strategic Behavior and Underpricing in Uniform Price Auctions: Evidence from Finnish Treasury Auctions</u>
PRIV	26.2003	<i>Christine A. PARLOUR and Uday RAJAN (lx)</i> : <u>Rationing in IPOs</u>
PRIV	27.2003	<i>Kjell G. NYBORG and Ilya A. STREBULAEV (lx)</i> : <u>Multiple Unit Auctions and Short Squeezes</u>
PRIV	28.2003	<i>Anders LUNANDER and Jan-Eric NILSSON (lx)</i> : <u>Taking the Lab to the Field: Experimental Tests of Alternative Mechanisms to Procure Multiple Contracts</u>
PRIV	29.2003	<i>TangaMcDANIEL and Karsten NEUHOFF (lx)</i> : <u>Use of Long-term Auctions for Network Investment</u>
PRIV	30.2003	<i>Emiel MAASLAND and Sander ONDERSTAL (lx)</i> : <u>Auctions with Financial Externalities</u>
ETA	31.2003	<i>Michael FINUS and Bianca RUNDSHAGEN</i> : <u>A Non-cooperative Foundation of Core-Stability in Positive Externality NTU-Coalition Games</u>
KNOW	32.2003	<i>Michele MORETTO</i> : <u>Competition and Irreversible Investments under Uncertainty</u>
PRIV	33.2003	<i>Philippe QUIRION</i> : <u>Relative Quotas: Correct Answer to Uncertainty or Case of Regulatory Capture?</u>
KNOW	34.2003	<i>Giuseppe MEDA, Claudio PIGA and Donald SIEGEL</i> : <u>On the Relationship between R&amp;D and Productivity: A Treatment Effect Analysis</u>
ETA	35.2003	<i>Alessandra DEL BOCA, Marzio GALEOTTI and Paola ROTA</i> : <u>Non-convexities in the Adjustment of Different Capital Inputs: A Firm-level Investigation</u>

GG	36.2003	<i>Matthieu GLACHANT</i> : <u>Voluntary Agreements under Endogenous Legislative Threats</u>
PRIV	37.2003	<i>Narjess BOUBAKRI, Jean-Claude COSSET and Omrane GUEDHAM</i> : <u>Postprivatization Corporate Governance: the Role of Ownership Structure and Investor Protection</u>
CLIM	38.2003	<i>Rolf GOLOMBEK and Michael HOEL</i> : <u>Climate Policy under Technology Spillovers</u>
KNOW	39.2003	<i>Slim BEN YOUSSEF</i> : <u>Transboundary Pollution, R&amp;D Spillovers and International Trade</u>
CTN	40.2003	<i>Carlo CARRARO and Carmen MARCHIORI</i> : <u>Endogenous Strategic Issue Linkage in International Negotiations</u>
KNOW	41.2003	<i>Sonia OREFFICE</i> : <u>Abortion and Female Power in the Household: Evidence from Labor Supply</u>
KNOW	42.2003	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Timothy SWANSON</i> : <u>On Biology and Technology: The Economics of Managing Biotechnologies</u>
ETA	43.2003	<i>Giorgio Busetti and Matteo MANERA</i> : <u>STAR-GARCH Models for Stock Market Interactions in the Pacific Basin Region, Japan and US</u>
CLIM	44.2003	<i>Katrin MILLOCK and Céline NAUGES</i> : <u>The French Tax on Air Pollution: Some Preliminary Results on its Effectiveness</u>
PRIV	45.2003	<i>Bernardo BORTOLOTTI and Paolo PINOTTI</i> : <u>The Political Economy of Privatization</u>
SIEV	46.2003	<i>Elbert DIJKGRAAF and Herman R.J. VOLLEBERGH</i> : <u>Burn or Bury? A Social Cost Comparison of Final Waste Disposal Methods</u>
ETA	47.2003	<i>Jens HORBACH</i> : <u>Employment and Innovations in the Environmental Sector: Determinants and Econometrical Results for Germany</u>
CLIM	48.2003	<i>Lori SNYDER, Nolan MILLER and Robert STAVINS</i> : <u>The Effects of Environmental Regulation on Technology Diffusion: The Case of Chlorine Manufacturing</u>
CLIM	49.2003	<i>Lori SNYDER, Robert STAVINS and Alexander F. WAGNER</i> : <u>Private Options to Use Public Goods. Exploiting Revealed Preferences to Estimate Environmental Benefits</u>
CTN	50.2003	<i>László Á. KÓCZY and Luc LAUWERS (Ixi)</i> : <u>The Minimal Dominant Set is a Non-Empty Core-Extension</u>
CTN	51.2003	<i>Matthew O. JACKSON (Ixi)</i> : <u>Allocation Rules for Network Games</u>
CTN	52.2003	<i>Ana MAULEON and Vincent VANNEBELBOSCH (Ixi)</i> : <u>Farsightedness and Cautiousness in Coalition Formation</u>
CTN	53.2003	<i>Fernando VEGA-REDONDO (Ixi)</i> : <u>Building Up Social Capital in a Changing World: a network approach</u>
CTN	54.2003	<i>Matthew HAAG and Roger LAGUNOFF (Ixi)</i> : <u>On the Size and Structure of Group Cooperation</u>
CTN	55.2003	<i>Taiji FURUSAWA and Hideo KONISHI (Ixi)</i> : <u>Free Trade Networks</u>
CTN	56.2003	<i>Halis Murat YILDIZ (Ixi)</i> : <u>National Versus International Mergers and Trade Liberalization</u>
CTN	57.2003	<i>Santiago RUBIO and Alistair ULPH (Ixi)</i> : <u>An Infinite-Horizon Model of Dynamic Membership of International Environmental Agreements</u>
KNOW	58.2003	<i>Carole MAIGNAN, Dino PINELLI and Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO</i> : <u>ICT, Clusters and Regional Cohesion: A Summary of Theoretical and Empirical Research</u>
KNOW	59.2003	<i>Giorgio BELLETTINI and Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO</i> : <u>Special Interests and Technological Change</u>
ETA	60.2003	<i>Ronnie SCHÖB</i> : <u>The Double Dividend Hypothesis of Environmental Taxes: A Survey</u>
CLIM	61.2003	<i>Michael FINUS, Ekko van IERLAND and Robert DELLINK</i> : <u>Stability of Climate Coalitions in a Cartel Formation Game</u>
GG	62.2003	<i>Michael FINUS and Bianca RUNDSHAGEN</i> : <u>How the Rules of Coalition Formation Affect Stability of International Environmental Agreements</u>
SIEV	63.2003	<i>Alberto PETRUCCI</i> : <u>Taxing Land Rent in an Open Economy</u>
CLIM	64.2003	<i>Joseph E. ALDY, Scott BARRETT and Robert N. STAVINS</i> : <u>Thirteen Plus One: A Comparison of Global Climate Policy Architectures</u>
SIEV	65.2003	<i>Edi DEFRANCESCO</i> : <u>The Beginning of Organic Fish Farming in Italy</u>
SIEV	66.2003	<i>Klaus CONRAD</i> : <u>Price Competition and Product Differentiation when Consumers Care for the Environment</u>
SIEV	67.2003	<i>Paulo A.L.D. NUNES, Luca ROSSETTO, Arianne DE BLAEIJ</i> : <u>Monetary Value Assessment of Clam Fishing Management Practices in the Venice Lagoon: Results from a Stated Choice Exercise</u>
CLIM	68.2003	<i>ZhongXiang ZHANG</i> : <u>Open Trade with the U.S. Without Compromising Canada's Ability to Comply with its Kyoto Target</u>
KNOW	69.2003	<i>David FRANTZ (Iix)</i> : <u>Lorenzo Market between Diversity and Mutation</u>
KNOW	70.2003	<i>Ercole SORI (Iix)</i> : <u>Mapping Diversity in Social History</u>
KNOW	71.2003	<i>Ljiljana DERU SIMIC (Iixii)</i> : <u>What is Specific about Art/Cultural Projects?</u>
KNOW	72.2003	<i>Natalya V. TARANOVA (Iixii)</i> : <u>The Role of the City in Fostering Intergroup Communication in a Multicultural Environment: Saint-Petersburg's Case</u>
KNOW	73.2003	<i>Kristine CRANE (Iixii)</i> : <u>The City as an Arena for the Expression of Multiple Identities in the Age of Globalisation and Migration</u>
KNOW	74.2003	<i>Kazuma MATOBA (Iixii)</i> : <u>Glocal Dialogue- Transformation through Transcultural Communication</u>
KNOW	75.2003	<i>Catarina REIS OLIVEIRA (Iixii)</i> : <u>Immigrants' Entrepreneurial Opportunities: The Case of the Chinese in Portugal</u>
KNOW	76.2003	<i>Sandra WALLMAN (Iixii)</i> : <u>The Diversity of Diversity - towards a typology of urban systems</u>

KNOW	77.2003	<i>Richard PEARCE</i> (Ixii): <u>A Biologist's View of Individual Cultural Identity for the Study of Cities</u>
KNOW	78.2003	<i>Vincent MERK</i> (Ixii): <u>Communication Across Cultures: from Cultural Awareness to Reconciliation of the Dilemmas</u>
KNOW	79.2003	<i>Giorgio BELLETTINI, Carlotta BERTI CERONI and Gianmarco I.P.OTTAVIANO</i> : <u>Child Labor and Resistance to Change</u>
ETA	80.2003	<i>Michele MORETTO, Paolo M. PANTEGHINI and Carlo SCARPA</i> : <u>Investment Size and Firm's Value under Profit Sharing Regulation</u>
IEM	81.2003	<i>Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA and Massimo GIOVANNINI</i> : <u>Oil and Product Dynamics in International Petroleum Markets</u>
CLIM	82.2003	<i>Y. Hossein FARZIN and Jinhua ZHAO</i> : <u>Pollution Abatement Investment When Firms Lobby Against Environmental Regulation</u>
CLIM	83.2003	<i>Giuseppe DI VITA</i> : <u>Is the Discount Rate Relevant in Explaining the Environmental Kuznets Curve?</u>
CLIM	84.2003	<i>Reyer GERLAGH and Wietze LISE</i> : <u>Induced Technological Change Under Carbon Taxes</u>
NRM	85.2003	<i>Rinaldo BRAU, Alessandro LANZA and Francesco PIGLIARU</i> : <u>How Fast are the Tourism Countries Growing? The cross-country evidence</u>
KNOW	86.2003	<i>Elena BELLINI, Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO and Dino PINELLI</i> : <u>The ICT Revolution: opportunities and risks for the Mezzogiorno</u>
SIEV	87.2003	<i>Lucas BRETSCHGER and Sjak SMULDERS</i> : <u>Sustainability and Substitution of Exhaustible Natural Resources. How resource prices affect long-term R&amp;D investments</u>
CLIM	88.2003	<i>Johan EYCKMANS and Michael FINUS</i> : <u>New Roads to International Environmental Agreements: The Case of Global Warming</u>
CLIM	89.2003	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI</i> : <u>Economic Development and Environmental Protection</u>
CLIM	90.2003	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI</i> : <u>Environment and Economic Growth: Is Technical Change the Key to Decoupling?</u>
CLIM	91.2003	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI and Barbara BUCHNER</i> : <u>Climate Policy and Economic Growth in Developing Countries</u>
IEM	92.2003	<i>A. MARKANDYA, A. GOLUB and E. STRUKOVA</i> : <u>The Influence of Climate Change Considerations on Energy Policy: The Case of Russia</u>
ETA	93.2003	<i>Andrea BELTRATTI</i> : <u>Socially Responsible Investment in General Equilibrium</u>
CTN	94.2003	<i>Parkash CHANDER</i> : <u>The <math>\gamma</math>-Core and Coalition Formation</u>
IEM	95.2003	<i>Matteo MANERA and Angelo MARZULLO</i> : <u>Modelling the Load Curve of Aggregate Electricity Consumption Using Principal Components</u>
IEM	96.2003	<i>Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA, Margherita GRASSO and Massimo GIOVANNINI</i> : <u>Long-run Models of Oil Stock Prices</u>
CTN	97.2003	<i>Steven J. BRAMS, Michael A. JONES, and D. Marc KILGOUR</i> : <u>Forming Stable Coalitions: The Process Matters</u>
KNOW	98.2003	<i>John CROWLEY, Marie-Cecile NAVES</i> (Ixiii): <u>Anti-Racist Policies in France. From Ideological and Historical Schemes to Socio-Political Realities</u>
KNOW	99.2003	<i>Richard THOMPSON FORD</i> (Ixiii): <u>Cultural Rights and Civic Virtue</u>
	<b>1000</b>	<b>Carlo CARRARO, Alessandro LANZA and Valeria PAPPONETTI: <u>One Thousand Working Papers</u></b>

- (l) This paper was presented at the Workshop “Growth, Environmental Policies and Sustainability” organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice, June 1, 2001
- (li) This paper was presented at the Fourth Toulouse Conference on Environment and Resource Economics on “Property Rights, Institutions and Management of Environmental and Natural Resources”, organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, IDEI and INRA and sponsored by MATE, Toulouse, May 3-4, 2001
- (lii) This paper was presented at the International Conference on “Economic Valuation of Environmental Goods”, organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei in cooperation with CORILA, Venice, May 11, 2001
- (liii) This paper was circulated at the International Conference on “Climate Policy – Do We Need a New Approach?”, jointly organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Stanford University and Venice International University, Isola di San Servolo, Venice, September 6-8, 2001
- (liv) This paper was presented at the Seventh Meeting of the Coalition Theory Network organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and the CORE, Université Catholique de Louvain, Venice, Italy, January 11-12, 2002
- (lv) This paper was presented at the First Workshop of the Concerted Action on Tradable Emission Permits (CATEP) organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice, Italy, December 3-4, 2001
- (lvi) This paper was presented at the ESF EURESCO Conference on Environmental Policy in a Global Economy “The International Dimension of Environmental Policy”, organised with the collaboration of the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Acquafredda di Maratea, October 6-11, 2001
- (lvii) This paper was presented at the First Workshop of “CFEWE – Carbon Flows between Eastern and Western Europe”, organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and Zentrum für Europäische Integrationsforschung (ZEI), Milan, July 5-6, 2001
- (lviii) This paper was presented at the Workshop on “Game Practice and the Environment”, jointly organised by Università del Piemonte Orientale and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Alessandria, April 12-13, 2002
- (lix) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Mapping Diversity”, Leuven, May 16-17, 2002
- (lx) This paper was presented at the EuroConference on “Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications”, organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan, September 26-28, 2002
- (lxi) This paper was presented at the Eighth Meeting of the Coalition Theory Network organised by the GREQAM, Aix-en-Provence, France, January 24-25, 2003
- (lxii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Communication across Cultures in Multicultural Cities”, The Hague, November 7-8, 2002
- (lxiii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Social dynamics and conflicts in multicultural cities”, Milan, March 20-21, 2003

## 2002 SERIES

<b>CLIM</b>	<i>Climate Change Modelling and Policy</i> (Editor: Marzio Galeotti )
<b>VOL</b>	<i>Voluntary and International Agreements</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
<b>SUST</b>	<i>Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Valuation</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
<b>NRM</b>	<i>Natural Resources Management</i> (Editor: Carlo Giupponi)
<b>KNOW</b>	<i>Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital</i> (Editor: Dino Pinelli)
<b>MGMT</b>	<i>Corporate Sustainable Management</i> (Editor: Andrea Marsanich)
<b>PRIV</b>	<i>Privatisation, Regulation, Antitrust</i> (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)
<b>ETA</b>	<i>Economic Theory and Applications</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)

## 2003 SERIES

<b>CLIM</b>	<i>Climate Change Modelling and Policy</i> (Editor: Marzio Galeotti )
<b>GG</b>	<i>Global Governance</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
<b>SIEV</b>	<i>Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Valuation</i> (Editor: Anna Alberini)
<b>NRM</b>	<i>Natural Resources Management</i> (Editor: Carlo Giupponi)
<b>KNOW</b>	<i>Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital</i> (Editor: Gianmarco Ottaviano)
<b>IEM</b>	<i>International Energy Markets</i> (Editor: Anil Markandya)
<b>CSRM</b>	<i>Corporate Social Responsibility and Management</i> (Editor: Sabina Ratti)
<b>PRIV</b>	<i>Privatisation, Regulation, Antitrust</i> (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)
<b>ETA</b>	<i>Economic Theory and Applications</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
<b>CTN</b>	<i>Coalition Theory Network</i>