

PRINCETON-HUMBOLDT INITIATIVE
FOR THE STUDY OF LAW IN CONTEXT (PHISLIC)

Kim Lane Scheppelle
Princeton University
Woodrow Wilson School of Public and
International Policy

Florian Meinel
Humboldt University
Juristische Fakultät, Lehrstuhl für Öffentliches Recht
und Finanzrecht

1. Institutional Context

Both Humboldt University and Princeton University have created novel initiatives in the study of law and the Strategic Partnership enables us to link these programs in complementary ways. We propose a series of joint seminars over two years in which a member of the Humboldt law faculty travels each year to Princeton with a group of graduate students to teach a seminar engaging the faculty and graduate students in Princeton and in which a member of the Princeton faculty travels with graduate students each year to teach a seminar engaging faculty and graduate students at Humboldt. In addition, we plan annual workshops in each site that will include a larger number of colleagues in the project. Through this cooperation, Humboldt Law School can participate in a broader interdisciplinary network and Princeton can collaborate with a comparative and international law faculty. We aim to develop complementary programs of graduate education that will provide graduate students in each of our institutions with a broader array of perspectives than they would get in either location separately. The collaboration also aims to enrich a series of faculty books and dissertations that reflect our joint emerging view of the relationship between law and its neighboring disciplines.

At first, this may seem an unlikely partnership. Princeton has no law faculty and German law schools have historically been quite resistant to the interdisciplinary study of law. But Princeton's Program in Law and Public Affairs has coordinated an interdisciplinary faculty engaged in the study of law within the social sciences and humanities and has brought together a diverse array of graduate students, many with JD degrees, who plan to go into law school teaching or into law-related specializations in their disciplines. As a result, Princeton has an unusual law program that is not based around the professional training that a JD provides, but that is instead rooted in neighboring disciplines and their contributions to the study of law. The Humboldt law faculty, through its comprehensive remodeling over the last 20 years, has become the flagship German law faculty that integrates into its research and teaching program perspectives from other disciplines. At Humboldt, faculty and graduate students routinely use insights from political theory, comparative politics, legal history, sociology of law and legal anthropology in their work. The Berlin-based "Law in Context" project in which Humboldt University participates through its Rechtskulturen postdoctoral program is one indicator of that development.

The match between Princeton and Humboldt, then, is really extraordinary. Humboldt's law faculty is already open to conversations with the disciplines in which Princeton excels, and Princeton's law program has engaged precisely the topics in constitutional and international law for which Humboldt's faculty is justly famous. Both faculties have built their research and their graduate training around the same sets of topics, seen from different and yet complementary angles. Our proposed partnership rests not on each side seeing itself in the mirror in another country, but instead on complementary strengths that can create something that neither institution could accomplish alone.

Given the dedication of both institutions to undergraduate education, a word may be in order about why we pitch our collaboration at the faculty and graduate level. In Germany, the first undergraduate law degree trains primarily legal practitioners. Graduate education in law in Germany is therefore qualitatively different from undergraduate education. In the United States, undergraduate law programs are unusual and often looked down upon as "pre-law" training, since practitioner training in the US comes first with the graduate law degree, or JD. In both Germany and the US, undergraduates have a more tenuous relationship to the research and scholarly agendas of legal studies as an academic field than is true for other disciplines. On both sides of our collaboration,

we would be open to including advanced undergraduates who have scholarly rather than practitioner-based understandings of law. But since such an orientation is likely to be quite unusual, we propose considering undergraduates on a case-by-case basis rather than building a structural undergraduate dimension into the program from the start.

2. The (Inter) Disciplinary Context of Legal Studies in Germany and the US

In the German and American traditions, law professors have been implicated in legal practice by taking as their primary obligation the task of improving the law. Both traditions share the fact that scholarship until recently has been primarily “doctrinal,” taking the elaboration and critique of legal sources as its primary focus. Of course, some fields like legal philosophy and legal history have also been part of legal education and scholarship on both sides of the Atlantic, though often as peripheral rather than central activities of the legal academy.

Since the 1960s in the US and in the last 20 years in Germany, doctrinal legal scholarship has been gradually giving way to scholarship more similar to that in neighboring disciplines like philosophy, history, political science, sociology and anthropology. Legal scholars have developed new theories and methods judged no longer for their immediate usefulness to legal practice but instead for their theoretical contribution in studying other aspects of law, like law’s effects, legal pluralism, law’s relationship to politics, its role in historical development and its normative attractiveness. Unfortunately, graduate education in both countries has lagged behind the demand for such scholarship in the legal academy.

In the US, the “teaching degree” for American law professors has traditionally been the JD, which is not a research degree. Until recently, new law professors, armed with only the JD, would learn research “on the job” as assistant professors. But now, beginning law professors in the US are expected to have a track record of academic publications *before* they are hired, which has created a demand for research training beyond the JD. The primary source of such training has been non-law PhD programs of the sort that Princeton runs. Princeton has therefore seen a rise in the number of such joint JD/PhD students who aim to go into law school teaching. And Princeton has had a great deal of success in such training, at least as measured by the placement of its JD/PhD students in the last few years on the law faculties of Chicago, Yale, Virginia,

NYU, Berkeley, UCLA and Penn, with many more students in the pipeline. In addition to these students, Princeton has many more who are working in the law-related part of their own academic field without getting the JD. As a result, we have a number of students who specialize in public law in political science, sociology of law, anthropology of law, legal philosophy, political theory, legal history and more. All told, Princeton now has about 80 PhD students affiliated with LAPA whose scholarship touches non-trivially on the law.

In Germany, training for academic positions in law has more closely followed the pattern of other disciplines with a doctorate followed by a habilitation degree under the direction of supervisors whose work the student has closely tracked. But the increasing openness to new ideas and the move away from purely doctrinal scholarship at the top law schools in Germany, Humboldt lead among them, has meant that both professors and their students have been drawn toward increasingly interdisciplinary work. In this effort, younger colleagues often lead their elders along. The “Law in Context” project in which Humboldt has played a leading role through hosting the Rechtskulturen postdoctoral program whose postdoctoral fellows in recent years have focused on questions of legal pluralism across multiple legal sites, which is a topic that was very nearly missing in the legal scholarship of a generation ago in German law schools. With the establishment of the DFG funded research training group on “Multilevel Constitutionalism - European Experiences and Global Perspectives,” the Humboldt graduate program has developed a unique orientation towards comparative and international legal research. The group has attracted excellent PhD students from other disciplines such as political science and philosophy.

Against this backdrop, both Princeton and Humboldt have been in the forefront of their respective national environments in developing graduate programs that prepare their students for the new world of legal scholarship in which interdisciplinarily honed talents are increasingly important. To make its graduate program even more robust, Princeton could benefit from association with a top international law school in addition to the American law schools with which it already cooperates. To increase its interdisciplinary profile, Humboldt could benefit from association with a top interdisciplinary and academic (rather than practitioner-based) program in law. In short, the Princeton and Humboldt programs supplement each other in ways that strengthen graduate education at each.

3. Our Substantive Vision: The Study of Liberal Constitutional Orders in Context

The interdisciplinary study of law covers a huge terrain and we propose to focus by concentrating on the comparative study of liberal constitutional orders, their international environments, their normative justification and the challenges posed to them by legal pluralism and systemic violence.

Liberal constitutional orders have become the norm in Europe and North America and beyond. But liberal constitutional orders are more fragile than they look, as we see from examples ranging from the lapses in constitutional judgment in the early years of the “war on terror” to the ongoing constitutional gridlock in the United States to the systematic undermining of constitutional democracy in places like Hungary to the financial crisis management and repeated institutional revolutions that have gripped the European Union over the last five years with Germany playing a leading role in the institutional elaboration of Europe. In our first two years of collaboration, we propose a series of seminars and workshops that explore why liberal constitutional orders are so challenging to maintain and how to understand the repeated crises to which they are subject, with a special focus on comparisons between Europe and the United States. This topic is not easily confined to one discipline, which is why we propose a series of interdisciplinary explorations of this theme.

We propose to offer four short courses, two taught by Princeton faculty at Humboldt and two taught by Humboldt University faculty at Princeton, as follows:

3.1. Princeton Faculty at Humboldt

Both courses will be part of the following elective fields of study at Humboldt law faculty: “Contemporary legal history” (SP1), “Legislation and legal policy” (SP2) and “International and European law” (SP6) and open for fourth year students (graduate equivalent). On the Princeton side, Müller’s course will be listed in Politics and Scheppele’s course will be listed in Sociology.

3.1.1. Protecting Democracy: Europe and the US Compared (Jan-Werner Müller)

As is well known, a number of European countries – Germany first and foremost -- have a tradition of ‘militant democracy,’ the idea being that to protect democracy from anti-

democratic actors and associations, sometimes democratic rights have to be restricted. Germany has acted on this idea, banning extremist parties and criminalizing speech that incites racial hatred, for example. The US is commonly said to have no such tradition, confirming a general impression that freedom of speech and freedom of association, etc. are construed in a much more libertarian fashion in the US than elsewhere. But when the US has a security challenge, as it did during “McCarthyism,” it has acted in much the same way. The course is situated at the intersection of comparative constitutional law, comparative politics, sociology, history, and, not least, normative political theory. In it we intend to accomplish three goals:

First, we will re-visit the general theoretical challenges associated with democracy-protection, especially the ‘democratic paradox’ (bearing in mind the possibility that there might not be general theoretical solutions here at all; John Rawls once spoke of a “practical dilemma which philosophy alone cannot resolve”).

Second, we will briefly trace the history of militant democracy, which, as it happens, is a very American-German story: it was a Weimar exile, Karl Loewenstein, who first put forward the idea in a series of ground-breaking articles in the *American Political Science Review* in the mid-1930s; it was in Germany itself that a constitutional court first adopted the doctrine.

Third, we will compare how somewhat similar challenges to democracy are addressed in the US and Europe. We will go beyond some of the obvious and large questions such as ‘can parties be banned/criminalized?’ and, for instance, look at the protection of individual voting rights (very much a controversial issue in the US until this day) as well as the limits to how suspects in cases of political extremism can be investigated by the state (very much a contested issue in Germany right now). We shall also examine whether supranational organization such as the EU ought to have a role in democracy protection.

3.1.2. Constitutional Cultures (Kim Lane Scheppele)

Constitutions are not just legal documents. When successful, they create and hold a national imagination by either building or borrowing a constitutional culture. In this seminar and associated workshop, we will consider how constitutional cultures are created and destroyed, maintained and changed.

First, we will examine how new constitutions are related to constitutional histories. In some cases, new constitutions repudiate what went before them; in other cases, constitutions build on a national history. In many cases, they do a bit both. But constitutions never work from a clean historical slate. In our first section of the seminar, we will consider the ways that pasts are rejected, selected, altered and highlighted in the course of setting up and entrenching new constitutions.

Then, we will examine how constitutions are linked to political cultures. If constitutions remain merely legal documents, they are doomed to fail. Instead, successful constitutions generally have some constitutional aura that goes beyond their purely legal effect, whether conveyed by the idea of constitutional patriotism, constitutional faith or constitutional identity. In this second section of the seminar, we will examine the ways that constitutions spread beyond legality to do other cultural work.

Finally, if constitutions are culturally successful, they often become contested. In the last section of the seminar, we will examine constitutional strife – where different interpretations of a constitution are backed by different social groups (Tea Party; Hungarian Crown defenders). Constitutions can become sites of social struggle, as different visions of history, culture and identity come to be played out through disputes over constitutional meaning.

3.2. Humboldt Faculty at Princeton

Both courses will be listed as graduate seminars through the University Center for Human Values jointly with Sociology for Meinel's seminar and (tentatively) Politics for von Achenbach's seminar.

3.2.1. Constitutionalism, Welfare States and Social Rights in Comparative Perspective (Florian Meinel)

Welfare state and social rights issues are not among the “classical” subjects of comparative constitutionalism. Comparative studies of U.S. and European constitutional law have focused on questions where constitutional jurisprudence runs in parallel tracks, with topics like civil rights, constitutional review, state and religion, or federalism. But when it comes to the constitutional basis and constraints of welfare state politics and social rights, the evolution of the European “model” of the welfare state since the second half of the 19th century seems so different from the American experience since the New

Deal, that comparative study would necessarily end up in a mere account of these differences. Any comparison however must aim at a mutual learning process. In this respect, the preconditions of the study of welfare state constitutionalism have changed considerably in recent times.

Even before the recent American struggles for welfare reform, there has been a new attentiveness to these problems in American legal scholarship. In addition, constraints on national social programs arising from international law as well as the widely discussed crisis of the “European social model” have opened the European discussion on social issues in constitutional law to foreign experiences.

In this context, the seminar will discuss the development of the German and European constitutional framework of welfare politics using classical legal texts from the mid 19th century until the present. The discussion will focus upon two key themes.

The first explores the consequences of the changing nature of the welfare for constitutional interpretation. How in particular is the scope of judicial review determined in the field of welfare politics compared to other fields? And how does the welfare state transform the relation between constitutional law, statutory law, and administrative regulation?

The second explores emerging paradigm of “social rights.” In the 19th and early 20th century, theories of the welfare state conceptualized its associated legal framework from a top-down perspective as technical instruments of politics addressed exclusively to the administration, while individual rights were limited to the “classical” liberties not including social rights. Beginning in the interwar period, however the transformation of the legal and in particular the constitutional framework of the welfare state can be interpreted as the juridification of the welfare state by the incremental implementation of the idea of individual social rights. Even now, there is an intense academic controversy both in the U.S. and in Europe about the legal nature and functioning of these categories of rights.

3.2.2. Parliamentary Oversight of the Executive in Comparative Perspective (Jelena von Achenbach)

Both in the US and in Germany, parliamentary oversight of the executive is crucial to the democratic separation of powers, contributing to the democratic legitimacy as well as to the legality of the government’s actions. Parliamentary inquiry makes transparent to the

public how its government is performing, thus strengthening the accountability of the executive. Furthermore, by means of its authority to oversee the executive, the democratic legislature can monitor the legality of the exercise of executive powers and sanction illegal conduct. In addition, parliamentary oversight serves as means for parliaments to gather the information they need to fulfill their legislative function.

Yet there are constitutional limitations to oversight that mainly result from the doctrine of separation of powers. Most importantly, there is the idea that the legislature must not interfere with the executive branch within the executive's own assigned constitutional duties. While this doctrine is generally accepted in practice, its invocation is often highly controversial, for example when there is a demand for access to documents from a ministry or a *subpoena* issued by a parliamentary committee conducting an investigation. At the moment in Germany, there are several proceedings pending before the Constitutional Court brought by members of the opposition requesting information which the government refuses to disclose invoking the German equivalent of the American *executive privilege* doctrine.

The seminar will be dedicated to developing a conceptual understanding of parliamentary oversight as based on, and in the same time restricted by, the concept of a democratic separation of powers. It will explore parliamentary oversight, its functions, and its scope from an interdisciplinary perspective, engaging democratic theory and practice in the US and Germany.

By discussing classical as well as contemporary texts on parliamentarism, the separation of powers, and checks and balances, we will in the first part of the seminar go into the normative foundation of the idea that the legislature monitors and controls the government. We will then take a comparative look at the understanding of parliamentary oversight of the executive branch in the US and in Germany, taking into account the respective constitutions and statutes as well as the case-law of the US courts and of the German *Federal Constitutional Court*. The seminar will compare in particular how the separation of powers is conceptualized as a constitutional limitation to oversight. Although presidential and parliamentary systems of government may differ in their concept of oversight, a functional analysis of oversight and its limitations in both political systems will show that the differences are fewer than one might imagine.

3.3. Workshops

We will organize four workshops on questions of mutual interest that allow to bring together members of both faculties and that will explore the perspectives for further cooperation in research.

The first workshop will take place in Princeton in March 2014. Based on Florian Meinel's seminar it will address the "constitutionalization of the welfare state in comparative perspective". Contributions will be asked from the following faculty members: Susanne Baer (social rights, judge at German Federal Constitutional Court), Christian Waldhoff (law of finance), Martin Eifert (regulation), and Anna-Bettina Kaiser (history of administrative law) at Humboldt and Paul Starr (sociology and WWS), Charles Beitz (politics and UCHV), Paul Frymer (politics), Anthony Appiah (philosophy and UCHV), Carol Greenhouse (anthropology).

The second workshop, concluding Jan Werner Müller's seminar will focus on the constitutional issues of "militant democracy" (Berlin, June 2014). Berlin faculty who are doing research on relevant questions include Christoph Möllers (constitutional theory of democracy), Mattias Kumm (legal philosophy), and Anna-Bettina Kaiser (emergency powers) and relevant Princeton faculty include Anson Rabinbach (history), Rahul Sager (politics), Paul Starr (sociology), and Mirjam Kunkler (near eastern studies).

The third workshop will follow Jelena von Achenbach's Seminar and will question the "the legal design of democratic institutions" (March 2015). Participating Humboldt faculty can include Georg Nolte (international law), Ingolf Pernice (European constitutional law), Christoph Möllers and Christian Waldhoff (constitutional law) and on the Princeton side Stephen Macedo (politics and UCHV), Alan Patten (politics), Jennifer Widner (politics), Carol Greenhouse (anthropology), Stanley Katz (WWS), Andrew Moravcsik (politics and WWS), Sophie Meunier (WWS) and Ezra Suleiman (politics).

The fourth workshop (June 2015 in Berlin) on "constitutional cultures" will bring together German scholars like Sabine Müller-Mall (legal philosophy, cultural study of law), Dieter Grimm (comparative constitutional law), Nora Markard (social issues in international law) or Alexandra Kemmerer (history of European and international law) with Princeton faculty Mirjam Kunkler (new eastern studies), Lawrence Rosen (anthropology), Anson Rabinbach (history), Peter Brooks (comparative literature and UCHV), Paul Starr (sociology), Carol Greenhouse (anthropology) and Rahul Sager (politics).

A number of excellent PhD students will be included in the workshops based on a competitive selection process and we anticipate that at least five PhD students from each institution will travel to the other institution to participate in each workshop.

4. Work schedule

October - December 2013	Preparation of the program.
February - April 2014	Seminar Florian Meinel in Princeton
May-June 2014	Seminar Jan-Werner Müller in Berlin
March 2014	Workshop “The Constitutionalization of the Welfare State in Comparative Perspective” in Princeton
June 2014	Workshop “Militant democracy” in Berlin
February - April 2015	Seminar Jelena von Achenbach in Princeton
May-June 2015	Seminar Kim Lane Scheppele in Berlin
March 2015	Workshop “The Legal Design of Democratic Institutions” in Princeton
June 2015	Workshop on “Constitutional Cultures” in Berlin

5. Additional funding

The Humboldt side commits itself to gain additional funding to set the program on a broader financial basis and in particular to make sure the initiative is to be continued after the two years. In addition to the initial funding, the Humboldt organizers will encourage faculty members to apply for short-term travel subsidies at the Thyssen Foundation. If the cooperation’s success meets our mutual expectations we will apply for a “strategic partnership” funding at the DAAD which would give the program a mid-term institutional perspective.

On the Princeton side, LAPA has already contributed funds toward this collaboration by bringing two members of the Humboldt law faculty to Princeton as LAPA fellows: Ingolf Pernice in 2008-2009 and Georg Nolte in 2013-2014. We have also invited for 2014-2015 Humboldt law professor and German Federal Constitutional Court judge Susanne Baer to give the prestigious Harlan Lecture delivered each year at Princeton by a

sitting judge. LAPA and the University Center for Human Values have agreed to contribute funding to the two Princeton-based workshops, covering hotels and meals for all participants. Given that internationalization of our graduate law program continues to be a top priority, LAPA plans to contribute to the ongoing maintenance of such a collaboration.

Beyond that, we plan to apply to the US National Science Foundation Law and Social Sciences Division for a series of workshops to keep the collaboration going after the end of the strategic partnership.

6. Conclusion

The Program in Law and Public Affairs at Princeton has been preparing to launch a graduate certificate in legal studies (that is, a PhD “minor”) for Princeton students who plan to go into law-related teaching, whether in law schools, legal studies departments or the legal specialization within their own disciplinary fields. Princeton doesn’t have a law school, but it does have ongoing cooperative relationships with a number of US law faculties. As more and more of our students and faculty engage in the international and comparative study of law, the need for a first-rate international partner becomes ever clearer. And Humboldt is that perfect partner.

This holds true also the other way round. The lack of interdisciplinary cooperation in research and teaching between law faculties and history, political science, and philosophy departments is a widely discussed deficiency in German legal scholarship. In its recent recommendations on "Perspectives of Legal Studies" the German Research Council has pointed out the necessity to broaden the international and interdisciplinary scope of legal education and research. These recommendations meet with efforts taken by Humboldt law faculty over the last years to strengthen its orientation towards the theory, history and sociology of law. The cooperation with Princeton University’s and in particular the LAPA’s excellence in law-related research from a wide variety of academic backgrounds will pioneer Humboldt’s way to global exchange in legal scholarship.

Princeton-Humboldt Initiative for the Study of Law in Context (PHISLIC)
Supplement to Grant Application Form 2013: Questions 7-11

Question 7: How will the initiative contribute to the internationalization and long term programming of your department, center or program?

Princeton is an unusual research university in the United States because it is one of the very few without a law school. The Program in Law and Public Affairs (LAPA) was created at Princeton in 1999 to connect disciplines at Princeton to this missing law-school world. The Humboldt Law Faculty is unusual because it is strongly committed to interdisciplinary work. Together, we complement each other.

The Princeton doctoral program includes a substantial number of JD/PhD students in addition to PhD students with a focus on law in their disciplines. Comparative and international law subjects attract a growing number of these students, not least because an increasing number of Princeton's law-related faculty are also doing international work. While LAPA has cooperative arrangements with a number of American law schools, it has no regular international partner. Humboldt is already important international partner because Princeton has had two Humboldt-affiliated fellows. Humboldt university's law faculty has already developed a distinct focus in international legal scholarship with for instance the DFG funded graduate school on multilevel constitutionalism and the *Rechtskulturen/Recht im Kontext* program. Princeton's LAPA is the perfect partner to institutionalize these ambitions.

Question 8: How will the initiative engage Princeton/HU scholars and students in the partnership?

Because the "law degree" (a JD) is a graduate degree in the United States, we propose to engage each other primarily at the faculty and graduate student level, with the possibility of including particularly advanced undergraduates on a case-by-case basis. In each of the two partnership years, a member of the Humboldt Law Faculty will come to Princeton to teach a short graduate seminar to a group of joint Princeton and Humboldt graduate students. A member of the Princeton faculty will go to Humboldt to do the same. Each of these four seminars over two years will be capped with a workshop

where students and faculty who have been involved in the course will present their research in the company of a larger group from both institutions working on related issues.

As of now, there are about 10 faculty on either side of this collaboration who anticipate traveling at some point over the next two years to engage in the joint conversation, with another 10 or so faculty participating when the workshops are at “home.” While the number of PhD students who are involved in the courses and workshops will depend on the timing of the seminars relative to their own work, Princeton has already received strong expressions of interest in the collaboration from about 15 graduate students, not counting those admitted for fall 2013. For each seminar, faculty of Princeton and Humboldt will bring several graduate students with them to participate in the program. Humboldt expects to include a small number of doctoral and post-doctoral students in our joint collaborative project as well.

Question 9: What is the detailed plan for the operation and activities of the initiative?

As we explained above, the collaboration will be built around four jointly offered graduate seminars, one in each location each year taught by a faculty member from the “other” side of the collaboration, culminating in a workshop involving a wider range of faculty and students on each side. We anticipate that faculty and graduate students will pursue their own work in common conversation rather than engage primarily in collaborative projects because the students will be writing their dissertations and habilitations for which solo authorship is key.

Question 10: Explanation of the profile and interests of sponsoring departments or units and why and how they complement each other.

LAPA is a working partner with Princeton’s University Center for Human Values, which provides about 1/3rd of LAPA’s budget. Together, UCHV and LAPA work at the intersection of normative work and law, particularly in political theory, normatively inflected legal history and work on legal norms in the sociology and anthropology of law. The Project in the History of Political Thought is also funded by UCHV and has worked collaboratively

with LAPA over the last several years, hosting a number of joint conferences on topics of mutual concern.

The fields of research at Humboldt's law faculty have a clear focus in the philosophy, history, and sociology of law. The graduate school on multilevel constitutionalism (including fellows from history and philosophy departments) as well as the Rechtskulturen program are part of the faculty. Rechtskulturen brings together scholars from non-European legal cultures working on law-related projects from a wider range of disciplinary backgrounds. In this respect, LAPA perfectly complements Humboldt's ambitions beyond the core curriculum of a law faculty.

Question 11: Describe the funding contributions from sponsoring units and a strategy for longer-term support for the initiative's sustainability.

LAPA brings law professors to campus as LAPA fellows. Next year, a member of the Humboldt Law Faculty, **Georg Nolte**, will be with us as a LAPA fellow for the year. LAPA is funding Nolte without asking for support from the Strategic Partnership. In fact, Nolte is our second fellow from Humboldt; **Ingolf Pernice** was a LAPA-funded fellow in 2008-2009. In addition, LAPA has invited at our expense Humboldt Law Faculty member and German Federal Constitutional Judge **Susanne Baer** to be our distinguished Harlan Lecturer in 2014-2015. We have already and plan to continue to use LAPA programming resources to develop this international collaboration. UCHV and LAPA will jointly pay hotel costs, meals and other expenses for the Princeton-based workshop both years of the partnership, with the exception of airfares for those coming from Humboldt. Longer term, LAPA plans to apply to the American National Science Foundation's Law and Social Sciences Program for support for interdisciplinary workshops that could carry on this work beyond the two-year research partnership. We have also discussed with the Mellon Foundation continuing to support LAPA's work in the humanities.

Humboldt brings the existing funding of the Rechtskulturen program that might be able to host workshops in Berlin. The faculty provides office desk and all necessary infrastructure for Princeton faculty members during their stay in Berlin. We are committed to seek co-funding by the Thyssen foundation for the workshops and mid-term funding for the partnership by the DAAS as described in the proposal.