Thomas Friedman, Foreign Affairs columnist for The New York Times, delivered a CIRS Distinguished Lecture on the subject of “The World is Flat 3.0.” The lecture was an extension of the themes in his 2005 book The World is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century. An audience of over 1,400 people attended the event held at the Four Season hotel in Doha.

Friedman began by clarifying what he meant by saying that “the world is flat.” He recounted that he came across this metaphor when he traveled to Bangalore and realized the extent to which “outsourcing,” as a business strategy, was being conducted in India. Through telecommunication technologies and the internet, India was able to connect to and service hundreds of companies around the world. Friedman recalled that this was where he heard the phrase “the global economic playing field is being leveled,” for the first time. This phrase, he said, was the inspiration for his book.

Friedman noted that three different types of globalizations have occurred throughout history. The first was “Globalization 1.0,” which lasted from 1492 to the 1800s. Transportation technologies, colonial projects, and geographic know-how “shrunk the world” in terms of geographical reach, paving the way for sustained international trade. During this period, according to Friedman, “the main agent of globalization was the nation-state globalizing for Empire, or for resources, or for power.”

The second phase of globalization was what he labeled “Globalization 2.0,” which began in the 1800s and ended around the turn of the twenty-first century. “That era of globalization,” Friedman argued, “was spearheaded by companies globalizing for markets, for labor, and for resources.” The activi...
Greetings from all of us at CIRS! As the Georgetown campus in Qatar and CIRS enter into the fifth year of operations, we begin to slowly welcome a new phase in our institutional evolution. This is reflected both in our organization—al set-up and also in our priorities and objectives as we continue with this year’s public affairs programming and research initiatives.

Organizationally, CIRS has enhanced its research capacity with the addition of an Associate Director of Research, Dr. John Crist, who will take the lead in coordinating our research initiatives and our collaborative projects with partner institutions.

We are currently in the midst of work on one of these research initiatives, namely the study of migrant labor in the Gulf region. Despite the pervasiveness of the phenomenon of migrant labor in the GCC countries, and the social and political weight that local policymakers often attach to the issue, little systematic work has been done on the composition of the migrant labor force in the Gulf, the transnational networks they establish with the communities they left behind, their changing values and priorities, and the policies that host governments adopt in relation to them. In its multi-year, multi-disciplinary study of the subject, CIRS hopes to fill a glaring vacuum in the scholarship on the Gulf region.

For the coming year, we have two additional research initiatives planned. In January 2010, we began work on a comprehensive study of the political economy of the Gulf, looking at topics such as the role of sovereign wealth funds, the rise (and fall?) of the so-called “Dubai model,” regional patterns of economic development, the political economy of rentierism, food security, knowledge-based economies, international banking, and efforts at a GCC monetary union. Each of the participants, a number of whom were drawn from Georgetown’s Doha and DC campuses, was asked to work on an original, empirically-grounded paper that will form an eventual chapter in a book on the topic.

In the coming months, we plan on starting a research initiative on the nuclear question in the Middle East. The aim of this project is to look at both nuclear energy and weapons programs in the greater Middle East region from Israel all the way to Pakistan. The project’s focus will be on nuclear decision-making mechanisms and logics, dual-use technologies, and the environmental uses and consequences of nuclear energy. We anticipate the project will last approximately eighteen to twenty-four months.

Our public affairs programming, meanwhile, is speeding full steam ahead, with our next panel presentation focusing on the issue of collapsed – or collapsing – states and the increasing attention directed at open-sea piracy.

In the coming months, look for CIRS events outside of Doha, and also to our announcements for the post-doctoral and senior fellowship positions.

Along the way, I and the rest of the CIRS team look forward to hearing from you and hopefully to seeing you at our various venues.

Sincerely,

Mehran Kamrava
Director of CIRS
Interim Dean
Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar

About CIRS

The Center for International and Regional Studies at the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar is guided by the principles of academic excellence, forward vision, and community engagement.

The Center’s mission revolves around five principal goals:
• To provide a forum for scholarship and research on international and regional affairs;
• To encourage in-depth examination and exchange of ideas;
• To foster thoughtful dialogue among students, scholars, and practitioners of international affairs;
• To facilitate the free flow of ideas and knowledge through publishing the products of its research, sponsoring conferences and seminars, and holding workshops designed to explore the complexities of the twenty-first century;
• To engage in outreach activities with a wide range of local, regional, and international partners.

Director’s Welcome
Focused Discussion
President of Slovenia Visits Georgetown’s Qatar Campus

On January 10, the President of the Republic of Slovenia, Danilo Türk, spoke at the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar. The lecture, hosted by the Center for International and Regional Studies, drew students, staff and faculty from across Education City and focused on the state of democracy in our world.

President Türk began his discussion recalling his last visit to Qatar where he had met a group of students from GU-Qatar and had been impressed with the interest they showed in issues concerning democracy. The president noted that although there is certainly much more that needs to be done to strengthen democracy on a global level, it is clear that much progress has been made in the past three decades, particularly in Europe. “Through this progress,” Türk stated, “the world has learned some important lessons.”

First, Türk emphasized that democracy must come from within and cannot be imposed from abroad. However, he noted that democracy can and should be assisted internationally in a way that is respectful of international principles and standards, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In evaluating successful democratic transitions, Türk suggested that a democracy’s efficiency and legal quality should be examined. A democracy that does not adequately and efficiently address the electorate’s expectations poses a threat to the success of that process.

Furthermore, “[democracy and rule of law] go hand in hand and a democracy cannot flourish without respect for the rule of law,” Türk said. First, Türk described human rights as part of the legal fabric of democracy. “Human rights will continue to represent the foundation of democracy,” he said. To this end, Türk asserted that human rights need to be ensured in all democracies albeit in a way that is compatible with different political traditions and culture. Türk then recounted Indonesia’s successful democratic transition as an example of a process that worked for Indonesia since it came from within. “The model of Indonesia worked because it was Indonesian, and cannot be replicated exactly elsewhere,” Türk stated.

“We now have to ask how to make democracy more effective and more prevalent in the world.”

The president maintained that other parts of the world had to find their own solutions and that the process of democratization is ongoing, even in mature democracies. “Europe has seen democracy for quite some time, people think that it is irreversible but it is not,” he said. Türk called specific attention to the challenges many democratic European countries were now facing with regards to integrating immigrant communities, particularly those from Muslim countries. He then suggested two key guidelines to help facilitate this process. First, he said, one has to ensure that immigrant communities have access to education and employment. Second, according to Türk, immigrants must be ensured the opportunity for upward social mobility.

Although President Türk acknowledged that there have been setbacks and periods where democracy has suffered, he concluded on an optimistic note. Such setbacks, he said, “should not detract us from the progress that has been made. We now have to ask how to make democracy more effective and more prevalent in the world.”

Mehran Kamrava, interim dean at Georgetown University in Qatar lauded President Türk’s insights and said, “our students are fortunate to have the opportunity to learn from a scholar on democracy and human rights who has engaged in diplomacy at the United Nations and ultimately became the political leader of his country. I hope that Georgetown University in Qatar students are inspired to pursue their full potential.”
Qatar National Research Fund (QNRF) has awarded more than $124,000 to the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar to study Qatar’s role in regional conflict resolution. Mehran Kamrava, the Director for the Center for International and Regional Studies, and Katja Niethammer, interim Director of the Institute for Islamic Studies at Hamburg University and former post-doctoral fellow at CIRS, will collaborate to examine Saudi Arabian and Qatari foreign policy in their project titled, “Conflict Resolution by Qatar and Saudi Arabia: New Roles in Regional Diplomacy.”

Starting in the summer of 2009, this research will expand over two years and shed light on the two countries’ diplomatic efforts in regional politics. Although Saudi Arabia has always had a role in regional affairs, given its size and historical prominence, the engagement of a small country like Qatar in conflict resolution efforts is rather unique. “Qatar has been playing an increasingly influential role in the international relations of the Middle East as an honest broker in regional conflicts,” noted Kamrava.

However, the literature on Qatar’s foreign policy is extremely limited, and this research will help to fill this gap. “Most scholars of international relations have overlooked the role and influence of small states in the international politics of the Middle East,” said Kamrava. “Within Middle Eastern studies, scholars have traditionally focused on larger states,” Kamrava continued.

“Very little empirically grounded research has been done on Qatar’s foreign policies in general, and even less so on Qatar’s conflict resolution efforts,” Niethammer said. This research will aim to assess Qatar’s institutional capacities in regional conflict mediation, sustainability of its efforts, and opportunities for cooperation with external actors, such as the USA and EU.

Kamrava and Niethammer will conduct their research through a mix of case studies, literature review and qualitative interviews. “We will first have to do sound empirical groundwork, and then we will embed our findings in the wider theoretical debates in International Relations,” commented Niethammer.

The case studies will involve examining Saudi Arabia’s policies on the TAIF efforts of 1989 and Mecca Accords of 2007, along with Qatar’s strategy with the Doha Agreement of 2008 and its role between Huthy rebels and the Yemeni government. Along with extensive literature review in relation to these mediation efforts, the researchers will also interview officials who have been directly involved in these negotiations, including ruling government representatives, intellectuals shaping foreign policy, journalists, and other decision-makers in Palestine, Lebanon, Qatar and Saudi Arabia.

The research findings are expected to be circulated through various avenues. The researchers plan on broadly disseminating the results by producing at least two journal articles on the topic of Qatar and Saudi conflict mediation. Additionally, CIRS will publish an occasional paper on the topic. Researchers also plan to conduct a series of seminars in Doha and Riyadh to share their research findings with policy makers, academics, and other interested parties.

“This innovative study on Qatar’s regional role and regional policy mirrors GU-Qatar’s commitment to enhance knowledge of local politics, an area which is remarkably understudied. We also intend to offer workshops to GU-Qatar and other Education City students. This, we hope, will directly benefit our research environment,” said Niethammer.

Katja Niethammer completed her Ph.D. in Islamic Studies at the Free University of Berlin in 2007. After having completed her fellowship at CIRS, Niethammer became interim Director of the Institute for Islamic Studies at Hamburg University, where she is also a professor specializing in Islamic Studies. Niethammer’s forthcoming book, Political Reform in Bahrain: Institutional Transformation, Identity Conflict and Democracy, is to be published by Routledge.

Dr. Mehran Kamrava is Interim Dean of the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar and Director of CIRS. He is the author of a number of journal articles and books, including, most recently, Iran’s Intellectual Revolution (Cambridge University Press, 2008) and The Modern Middle East: A Political History Since the First World War (University of California Press, 2005). He has also edited The New Voices of Islam: Rethinking Politics and Modernity (University of California Press, 2006), and, with Manoochehr Dorraj, Iran Today: An Encyclopedia of Life in the Islamic Republic (Greenwood Press, 2008).
ties related to this phase further broke down the barriers of international borders, trade, and cross-cultural connections.

The third and current phase of globalization began around the year 2000. Friedman noted that “what’s really new, really exciting, and really terrifying about this era of globalization is that it is built around individuals. What is really new about this era is that we now have individuals who can compete, connect, and collaborate globally as individuals.” This, he said, provides equal opportunity for everyone to take part.

“...everyone is a potential paparazzi, columnist, reporter, and filmmaker, everyone else is a public figure.”

Friedman described several “flatteners” that made this current globalization platform possible. The first of these was the invention of the personal computer, which “allowed individuals, for the first time in history to author their own content” in digital form. The second flattener occurred on August 9, 1995, when the Netscape browser went public ushering in what has become known as the dot com boom. This, Friedman said, ignited the dot com bubble, which funded the necessary infrastructure for global internet access.

A further flattener was a revolution in connectivity. When computers became a popular technology, they were operated by a variety of different software types that were incompatible, which debilitated work-flow. However, when transmission protocols became streamlined, “that made everyone’s computer and software interoperable,” and allowed people to collaborate globally on the same projects without hindrance.

When all of these “flatteners” are combined, Friedman explained, the digital revolution’s power becomes apparent: an individual can create digital content, upload it to the internet, and have other people from other countries collaborate on it. Production is not hierarchical; individuals now have the ability to create and collaborate in vast decentralized networks. To “horizontalize” is to move away from stocks of knowledge towards more flexible flows by tapping into more brain power and collaborative networks worldwide. What happens in a flat world is “we all have to learn how to horizontalize, and take advantage of this platform” in order to become the most productive. Friedman proclaimed that this shift, from vertical to horizontal, “is the most fundamental transformation in human interaction since Gutenberg invented the printing press.”

Citing several survival skills for succeeding in a flat world, Friedman noted that the first of these is to adhere to the motto “whatever can be done, will be done,” and will be done more efficiently. The second is to understand that “when the world is flat, the most important competition, going forward, is between you and your own imagination.” Further, Friedman explained, “one of the great survival skills in the flat world, maybe the most important for a student, is the ability to learn how to learn.”

In a digitized world, Friedman concluded, information about anything or anyone can be shared with everyone. He argued that “in a world where everyone is a potential paparazzi, columnist, reporter and filmmaker, everyone else is a public figure,” meaning that “how” a person acts becomes important as there will be digital records of every action.

“...out of date so much faster, so it’s actually not what you learn, but your ability to learn how to learn.”

During the question and answer session, an audience member asked how it was possible for everyone to take part in this flat world when only a small percentage of the world’s population is privileged enough to have access to the internet. Friedman addressed this point by saying that a flat world does not mean an equal world, but does go some way in leveling the economic playing field for those who do take part.

Earlier in the day, Friedman visited Georgetown’s Qatar campus where he spoke informally to students, faculty, and staff.
John T. Crist, Associate Director of Research at the Center for International and Regional Studies and an expert on social movements and peace and conflict studies, delivered his lecture, “From Gandhi to Twitter: Global Trends in Protest,” before a packed house of students, faculty, staff, and community members on November 10, 2009, as part of the CIRS Monthly Dialogue series.

Crist focused on the changing nature of social protest movements in the face of rapid globalization. He pointed to the shift away from activism directed at specific states towards movements and protests that transcend national boundaries. Using the iconic anti-colonial protests led by Mahatma Gandhi on the Indian subcontinent during the early twentieth century as an example, Crist outlined the traditional state-targeted methods of social activism as a precedent for today’s increasingly borderless transnational protest movements. Contrary to popular perception, Gandhi’s emphasis on nonviolent civil disobedience delivered only partial success, according to Crist. However, nonviolent tactics were invaluable in creating broad popular support for the Indian National Congress. The group was, according to Crist, “the main vehicle that Gandhi and the Gandhians used to disseminate their ideas and their tactics of nonviolent action.” The Indian National Congress came to be recognized as the de-facto opposition government in colonized India, wielding great leverage because of its power as a social movement that mobilized millions against British rule across many constituencies.

Protest trends in the twenty-first century, Crist posited, have reflected the seismic influence of globalization, with interest groups from around the globe banding together to coordinate action. “The most important trend in social movements is the move away from the state as the principal target for protest activity,” Crist said. “This, of course, is the result of the power of globalization.”

The increased availability of funding sources, ease of travel, low cost of communication through technologies like the internet, and high-profile transnational forums such as the United Nations, have enabled groups to bring their protests to the international stage. Crist noted that an unprecedented number of transnational coalitions that work to promote their coordinated initiatives and messages in multiple countries are currently being formed. A prime example of the new protest mold is the 350 Campaign, which is an environmental initiative that calls itself “a global grassroots campaign to stop the climate crisis.” According to Crist, on October 24, 2009, the group held concurrent events in 181 countries around the world, including in Qatar, to promote climate change advocacy.

Crist touched on the power that new technologies such as SMS-messaging and Twitter have had on grassroots activism. He pointed to the role that Twitter and texting played in orchestrating protests following the Iranian elections of June 2009. Through “tweets,” Iranians were able to send out instantaneous updates about unfolding events to help bolster their struggle, as well as to communicate with the international media outlets that had been barred by the Iranian government.

Ending the lecture, Crist pointed out that not all modern grassroots protests facilitated by these new technologies are successful. Recent political protests in Moldova organized through the social networking site Facebook and through text messaging turned violent. In the absence of strong leadership with a clear message or strategy, Crist said, grassroots protests facilitated by communication technologies can easily become counterproductive or even destructive.
In the first instance, is not fully addressed. But the core issue itself, why the violence arose as each side has a victim narrative, he argued. Human rights literature advocates punishing as a means of ending cycles of violence, as the historical events that took place during the apartheid era in South Africa, the genocide in Rwanda, and, more recently, in Darfur. In order to contextualize these events during his research, he noted that he began by examining various human rights organizations and their writings and, he said, became increasingly skeptical about the data and the means of presenting these findings to the international community.

"...if you look at conflict situations in the African context, you are confronted by a cycle of violence." Over the years, Mamdani said, many of the most respected human rights organizations have developed formulaic patterns of research, the purpose of which is to identify the perpetrator, first and foremost, and then the victim. At the heart of this approach, he said, is a demand for punishment and for these atrocities to be treated as crimes. Mamdani explained that if you look at conflict situations in the African context, you confront a cycle of violence—an ongoing cycle of violence. When the Rwandan genocide was placed in this context, the victim and perpetrator trade places as each side has a victim narrative, he argued. Human rights literature advocates punishing as a means of ending cycles of violence, but the core issue itself, why the violence arose in the first instance, is not fully addressed.

There are two ways of approaching the core issues of any conflict situation, Mamdani said. One way is to blame the perpetrator as an explanation of the violence and to point to the psychology, identity, or culture of the perpetrator as being the reason for conflict. He argued that "the tendency to define victim and perpetrator in absolute terms has lent itself to a demonization process and, ironically, one of the worst tendencies in the human rights movement, which drives it to demonize perpetrators, undercuts it." He argued that "the framing in terms of crime and punishment, basically says that the only solution to violence; ours is the violence meant to stop violence." The second assumption "is that every individual and state official must take full responsibility for what they have done." He added that "the Nuremberg model was based on two assumptions: one assumption was that the conflict has ended – there is a victor and, therefore, crimes can be defined, identified, and punished under the rule of the victor." The second assumption "is that perpetrators and victims will not have to live together." But in the case of South African apartheid, neither of these assumptions held true; "there was no victor" and "there was no Israel for the victims" as both oppressor and oppressed had to live alongside each other after the cessation of apartheid. In this instance, there was a need to "decriminalize" the oppressors and their policies, and "treat them as political adversaries.

South African apartheid was a problem of "the definition of political society." Indeed, "in this context," he argued, "part of the challenge was the founding of a new political society; a foundation which would lay the basis for the rule of law." Therefore "part of the trade-off was that there would be no criminal trials." Mamdani said that "the focus was on political justice, not criminal justice" and that is why "the South African model is more relevant to the kind of post-colonial conflict in African situations, which is actually about the foundation of a new political order.

Concluding with his thoughts on the situation in Darfur, Mamdani argued that through modern movements such as the Save Darfur campaign, there has been a tendency to "commoditize" the conflict through celebrity publicity, a dramatization of events, and an emotional appeal to the international community, rather than addressing the political problems and explaining the issues.
Robert Lieber, Professor of Government and International Affairs at Georgetown University in Washington, DC, delivered a CIRS Monthly Dialogue on the topic of “Why the Declinists are Wrong About America” on January 8, 2010.

Lieber examined the recurring nature of comments regarding America’s decline, both at home and abroad, and argued that criticisms have been predicting the fall of the United States for decades. The current financial crisis and its impact on American economic and geopolitical power has again stoked these criticisms, but, he said, the United States has been through far worse in its history, and has managed to overcome even greater obstacles.

Reviewing the history of the various setbacks that the United States has experienced, Lieber noted that “declinists’ proclamations about America have appeared ever since America’s founding.” Further down the line, in the 1930s, America experienced its worst financial crisis and a total economic collapse. During these years, a quarter of the American work-force was unemployed and there was a significant drop in the GNP. This, he said, was a profound crisis that prompted many public intellectuals to wonder whether the “liberal democratic model” could survive.

The power of the United States as a world leader was again questioned in the 1950s after the Soviets successfully launched the Sputnik satellite, “which was the first man-made object in the history of humanity to leave Earth’s orbit.” This act showed that the Soviets had mastered rocket propulsion and “had the capacity to launch intercontinental ballistic missiles,” triggering a concern that “had the capacity to launch intercontinental ballistic missiles,” triggering a concern that America had become stagnant and was falling behind in terms of scientific prowess.

“since the early 1970s, the U.S. has represented somewhere between a quarter and a fifth of world economic activity.”

Similarly, the leadership of the United States was condemned in the 1970s after the withdrawal from Vietnam, the Soviet incursion into Afghanistan, and the seizure of the U.S. embassy in Tehran. In the 1980s and 1990s, the United States was often compared to Japan, which was revered internationally as a model of economic development and success. Lieber argued that “it can be instructive to compare current arguments and prescriptions of the new declinism with the ideas of earlier eras.” Current declinist statements, Lieber explained, are the product of exaggerated and ahistorical claims. In particular, they reveal “a lack of appreciation for the robustness and staying-power of the United States.”

Examining current declinist pronounce-
m ents, Lieber explained that there are two propositions that are widely asserted. The first is that the United States – as a society, in terms of its economics, political power, and its ethos – is in decline domestically. The second proposition is that due to globalization in the context of a multi-polar world, a counterbalancing of power is taking place and America’s world role has diminished and it is becoming “one among equals.”

During the Bush administration, the United States was regarded as having lost not only its hegemony, but also its legitimacy. The weakening of the United States has been attributed to “military overstretch,” and its involvement in two costly wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Lieber responded to these criticisms regarding exorbitant military costs by arguing that “the total cost of the American defense bud-
get today is somewhere around 4.5% of Gross Domestic Product – a GDP of 14 trillion dollars. In absolute terms, it is an enormous amount of money,” but, he said, “in relative terms, by historical standards, it is modest.”

Lieber concluded by arguing that “Améri-
cal’s problems are real, and it would be absurd not to recognize these, but I would also add that we’ve always had problems.” The United States has overcome them, he continued, by fostering an exceptional environment for entrepre-
neurialism. “America’s competitiveness, its scientific research infrastructure, its uni-
versities, its commitment to competition and free markets, and its efficient capital markets are all important factors.”

In order to assert that declinist proclama-
tions are exaggerated and hyperbolic, Lieber noted that “since the early 1970s, the U.S. has represented somewhere between a quarter and a fifth of world economic activity,” and its economic growth has far outpaced the rest of the world.

Lieber was asked by an audience member whether America’s unilateralism and pre-
emption, which in the Bush era led to a de-
cline of America’s stature around the world, a noticeable rise in anti-Americanism, and an erosion of American soft power globally, suited America’s interests. He responded by asserting that “internationally, the U.S. plays a role that no other country can, or will, do in meeting the world’s most urgent and deadly problems.” The principal problem to avoiding America decline at home and abroad, Lieber said, is less a material one, than it is one of political institutions and political will.
On January 9-10, 2010, CIRS convened the second of three planned working group meetings on “Migrant Labor in the Gulf.” International scholars assembled in Doha to discuss particular aspects of migrant labor. Among the participants were CIRS grant recipients: Andrew Gardner of Qatar University, Arland Thornton and Mansoor Moaddel of the University of Michigan, Mary Breeding of Georgetown University, and David Mednicoff of the University of Massachusetts-Amherst. The CIRS initiative and grants program expand the depth and breadth of original scholarly research on migrant labor in the Gulf.

The working group participants hailed from a variety of disciplines including, anthropology, political science, legal studies, public policy, and statistical demography. The scholars analyzed the broad historic, post-colonial, and diasporic origins of migrant labor to the Gulf. They examined issues related to the host and sending countries; questions of citizenship, identity, and gender politics; demography and migratory processes; policy regulations; economics and remittances, and nationalization of local labor markets, among larger issues of long-term social change.

The participants reported on empirical research they had conducted among migrant populations in Kuwait, Qatar, and the UAE, as well as in Nepal, a key country of origin for labor migrants in the Gulf. While there are some common elements of the experience of migrants across the Gulf, the group emphasized the need for case-based research because of striking differences across migrant labor communities. They highlighted differences between domestic and industrial labor; high income and low income workers; physical and linguistic boundaries; the reconstruction of social identities and senses of place; as well as the cultural and social practices of local and migrant communities.

The group rejected characterizations that “exceptionalize” the Gulf, i.e., that assume its labor migrants are unlike those in all other societies. On the contrary, the group believed that the concerns of migrant laborers are chronic to labor systems all over the world. During the discussions, the participants narrowed down the overall themes of the initiative and outlined the missing areas of scholarship that need to be addressed during the project. Many noted the lack of consensus about terminology in current scholarship on migrant labor. Throughout their discussions, they parsed the socio-political implications of terms like “migrant labor,” “foreign worker,” “guest worker,” and “non-citizens.” Some scholars argued that “temporary labor” in the Gulf does not actually refer to transience, as many of these workers have lived in the Gulf for years, and even generations. The notion of transience is therefore better conceived as a matter of ease of turn-over, rather than duration of work assignment.

The meeting also involved assigning specific paper topics to all the discussants, which will become the bases of an edited volume to be published after the project’s conclusion.

Participants and Discussants include:

Rogaia Abusharaf, Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar
Attiya Ahmad, Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar
Zahra Babar, Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar
Mary Breeding, Georgetown University, Washington, DC
Jane Bristol-Rhys, Zayed University
John T. Crist, Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar
Andrew Gardner, Qatar University
Jennifer Heeg, Texas A&M University in Qatar
Mehran Kamareh, Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar
Patih Mahdavi, Pomona College
David Mednicoff, University of Massachusetts-Amherst
Sari Murgia, Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar
Mansoor Moaddel, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Mahmoud Mostashari, San Francisco State University
Caroline Osella, SOAS, University of London
Filippo Osella, University of Sussex
Kasim Randeree, Oxford University
Uday Rosario, Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar
Rodney Sharkey, Weill Cornell Medical College in Qatar
Hélène Thiollet, Sciences Po
Arland Thornton, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Kai-Henrik Barth, Visiting Assistant Professor at the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar, delivered a CIRS Monthly Dialogue talk on December 6, 2009 about “Nuclear Ambitions in the Gulf.” He focused on nuclear proliferation concerns associated with ambitious goals to introduce nuclear power in the Gulf states, with an emphasis on the United Arab Emirates.

Barth’s presentation was divided into five parts. First, he emphasized the “puzzle” at the heart of the debate: why would Gulf Cooperation Council states, with their massive oil and gas reserves, seek to develop nuclear power? Second, he assessed the proliferation risks of nuclear power; third, he highlighted the Gulf’s strategic context, emphasizing GCC’s concerns about Iran’s nuclear program; fourth, he analyzed the UAE’s nuclear effort; and, finally, he concluded with some policy recommendations.

Looking at nuclear power developments throughout the world, Barth said that “there are thirty states that have nuclear power stations and, in total, there are 436 nuclear reactors in operation. In the last couple of years, more than forty other states have requested assistance from the IAEA to develop new programs. Barth said that “in the short time period from February 2006 to January 2007, thirteen countries in the region announced plans to use nuclear power.” These are countries in the greater Middle East and include all Gulf states with the exception of Iraq.

Barth argued that “investment in nuclear energy in the Gulf appears to be motivated by security rather than economic reasons.” The timing of the 2006 GCC nuclear policy announcement is significant because it suggests that nuclear ambitions in the Gulf are a response to three developments: a growing concern about a weakening role of the United States in the region, especially after the 2003 Iraq war; the rise of Shia confidence after the Israeli-Lebanese conflict of 2006; and, in particular, concerns about Iran’s nuclear program. Barth maintained that the Gulf’s nuclear projects can be explained as “being primarily about security and driven by a concern about Iran’s nuclear program.”

“In the short time period from February 2006 to January 2007, thirteen countries in the region announced plans to use nuclear power.”

In terms of the dangers of nuclear proliferation, Barth noted that regardless of the stated peaceful intentions of civilian projects, there always remains the possibility of a nuclear weapons option down the line. Uranium enrichment facilities, for example, can be used to enrich uranium for civilian purposes, but also for nuclear weapons. Equally, the chemical reprocessing of spent nuclear reactor fuel separates plutonium, which can be used for nuclear weapons. Barth argued that “the history of many nuclear weapons programs highlights the close relationship between civilian and military applications of nuclear power: military programs often benefitted from technology acquisition and expertise gained in civilian counterparts.” Although International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards are put in place to prevent this from happening, the threat is always present, Barth said.

Emphasizing the strategic context of nuclear programs in the Middle East, Barth noted that the threat of Iranian nuclear ambitions dominates the region. He said that “the Gulf states and the greater Middle East have enough reasons to be concerned.” The UAE government maintains “it is concerned about energy security and needs energy diversification.” Further, because water and electricity in the UAE are subsidized, “energy consumption rates in the Emirates are exceedingly high.” The UAE calculates that energy supplies will fall short of the growing demands over the next few decades. Indeed, according to official UAE estimates, “by 2030, the UAE will need 20 gigawatts of additional electricity production capabilities.” The UAE claims that nuclear energy is one competitive option to produce electricity. According to an official UAE energy policy document, the UAE had considered and rejected coal, primarily because of CO2 emissions; equally, while the UAE is pursuing alternative energies such as wind and solar power, officials concluded that their base-load energy production capabilities are limited. Barth argued, however, that the suggested economic advantages of nuclear power in the UAE are doubtful at best: high capital costs and the uncertainty of oil and gas prices make pursuing a nuclear power option in the Gulf economically very risky.

According to Barth, optimistic assumptions about cheap electricity through nuclear power in the Gulf are questionable. He argued that while the UAE has legitimate energy and security concerns vis-à-vis Iran, this raises questions about the UAE’s long term plans.

In conclusion, Barth relayed some policy recommendations that “provide energy security for GCC countries without provoking a nuclear proliferation cascade.” He proposed that nuclear supplier states should not sell nuclear power reactors to any country without stringent IAEA safeguards. He favored a worldwide moratorium on enrichment and reprocessing capabilities, in the Middle East in particular. Finally, Barth argued that ultimately, “nuclear power still has major problems and its relationship with nuclear weapons has not been erased and I do not see any future where it will be erased.”
Christian-Peter Hanelt, Senior Expert on Europe and the Middle East at the Bertelsmann Stiftung, was invited by CIRS to give a lunchtime Focused Discussion entitled “Europe and the Gulf Region: Towards a New Horizon” to Georgetown University faculty and staff on November 4, 2009.

Hanelt focused on the current relations between Europe and the Gulf region. He maintained that the GCC was an important political partner, energy supplier, and, in its efforts to diversify, a crucial investor in the European Union. “The EU and the Gulf,” he said, “are islands of stability” that are surrounded by economic and political turbulence.

Advocating for the importance of strengthening ties within the European Union, Hanelt noted that those countries that are party to the Euro currency were significantly less affected by the recent global economic crisis than those that maintained their own currencies. The current reforms proposed by the Lisbon Treaty, Hanelt said, will undoubtedly affect the ways in which the European Union is structured, its future expansion, and its relationships with its neighbors as well as with the larger international community. The issues of Turkey’s inclusion in the European Union will be of particular significance in the years to come and will have direct consequences on its relationships with the Middle East and the Gulf.

Currently, the EU works with Middle East and North Africa (MENA) countries in various state-building and soft power initiatives. Qatar’s prolific conflict resolution plans, he said, are of particular importance to its rapport with the European Union.

In terms of possible future collaborative projects between the EU and the Gulf, Hanelt predicted that the most important areas of synergy will be on issues of sustainability and the setting up of mutually beneficial agricultural, solar, and energy plans. Hanelt said that “both the GCC and the EU depend on functioning global markets and there is a need for more cooperation and dialogue on how to work together in the G20.”

Looking at the future of EU-GCC relations, Hanelt suggested that the EU and the GCC could collaborate on a variety of free trade agreements such as those that have been negotiated between the GCC and the United States. Other areas of accord could involve higher education initiatives, research, and dialogue on issues of regional security challenges.

In January, 2010, John T. Crist became Associate Director of Research at CIRS. Crist will supervise all academic operations, including the initiation of research projects, overseeing publications, and managing the fellowship and grant programs.

Crist received his Ph.D. in interdisciplinary social science from the Program on the Analysis and Resolution of Conflicts (PARC) in the Maxwell School at Syracuse University in 1998. He returned to the Maxwell School in spring 2008 as a visiting fellow at the PARC program.

Crist has extensive experience in the Washington think-tank community. He was program officer (1995-99), senior program officer (2000-2006), and acting associate vice president (2006-07) of the Jennings Randolph Program for International Peace at the U.S. Institute of Peace (USIP), a think-tank established and funded by the U.S. Congress to promote the prevention and resolution of violent international conflicts.

Crist’s research interests include nonviolent social movements and conflict analysis and resolution. He has taught courses in these and related subjects at the M.A. in Conflict Resolution Program on Georgetown University’s main campus, the School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University, the Maxwell School at Syracuse University, the Peace Studies Program at Colgate University, and the Department of Sociology at the Catholic University of America.
On November 11, 2009, Justin Dargin, a Research Fellow with The Dubai Initiative at Harvard University and a Fulbright Scholar of the Middle East, was invited by CIRS to deliver a lecture on “Gulf Gas Development: A Rational Development Strategy” to faculty and staff at Georgetown University Qatar campus. The lecture focused on the basics of the Gulf gas/power sector and how the countries of the GCC are facing energy challenges.

Dargin maintained that “the Gulf region is home to some of the largest natural gas reserves: 23% of global total.” Because Qatar accounts for “only 8% of global production,” there is great future potential to tap into these reserves to facilitate increased production. Qatar, he said, is the world’s number one Liquid Natural Gas (LNG) exporter since 2006. “With the exception of Qatar,” Dargin noted, “every GCC member is facing a gas shortage.” By developing its natural gas sector, Qatar’s industrial development program rivals the traditional oil production projects of its neighbors.

Over the last few decades, the Gulf states have experienced a tremendous injection of wealth to their local economies. This has had major effects on the infrastructure and population of the countries and all the related demands that these expansions entail. Currently, there is a “demographic explosion” of imported labor that far outstrips local populations and a major push for industrialization combined with a “need for desalination projects.” Because the GCC is growing at an unprecedented pace, various developments are needed to sustain the future of GCC infrastructure and economies. In this respect, Dargin argued that “the GCC will need to add 60 gigawatts (GW) of additional power between 2009 and 2015, which represents 80% of current capacity.”

Dargin pointed out how the “gas crunch” has affected Gulf countries’ individual economies. Saudi Arabia is experiencing future problems because “recent OPEC quotas prevented it from supplying additional gas to the domestic sector, thus increasing the reliance on liquid fuels,” and in Kuwait, the UAE and Oman, “there will not be enough gas to meet the demand increase,” Dargin explained.

The ramifications, Dargin noted, is that the domestic price paid for gas and electricity is too low, which “distorts investment and consumption decisions. It dampened interest in regional trading in favor of global LNG export.” He further added that “the main obstacle between the two regional suppliers, Iran and Qatar, and the regional consumers, Kuwait, UAE and Bahrain, has been pricing issues.”

Concluding the lecture with the future prospects of the energy sector in the GCC, Dargin said that there are, currently in the initiation phase, various ambitious projects being set up to exploit natural resources and to stimulate domestic production. Some of these initiatives include establishing domestic gas production facilities and investment in renewable and alternative energy plans such as “the GCC Nuclear plan, various solar and wind initiatives, and the Masdar Initiative.”

Dargin is a specialist in international law and energy law, and is an author on energy affairs. He is the author of a book entitled Desert Dreams: The Quest for Gulf Integration from the Arab Revolt to the Gulf Cooperation Council (forthcoming 2010).
CIRS held the first of its "Political Economy of the Gulf" working group meetings on January 23-24, 2010. The research initiative examines key aspects of the Gulf’s contemporary economic and political situations and the region’s long-term transition from an oil-based economy to a knowledge-based one. Ten prominent Gulf specialists with expertise in the Gulf’s political economy participated.

One of the most significant aspects of the Gulf’s political economy is the prominence of so-called rentier states. The participants considered the relationship between rentier economies and the development of democratic models of governance. In extreme cases, rentierism reduces political participation, but leads to regime stabilization.

The role of Sovereign Wealth Funds (SWF) in Gulf economies has received much attention. Data regarding the size of SWFs in the GCC is insufficient, unreliable, and speculative. Gulf states’ SWFs are used for long-term investments that follow international indexes; for smaller investments into specific projects such as bauxite mines and technology companies; or for developing local industries.

The group also considered Islamic banking systems and how they fit within contemporary Gulf states’ financial infrastructures and capital markets. The differences between Sunni and Shi’a Islamic banking principles in the GCC states and Iran were examined.

One presenter assessed the prospects of a monetary union among GCC states. Some economic consequences of such a merger include the removal of exchange rates, increased trade among members, and improved international credibility for GCC financial markets. A successful monetary union would also enhance the Gulf’s international bargaining power. However, the group questioned the viability of a GCC monetary union in light of external forces.

A general theme running throughout the meeting was the diversification of Gulf state economies, with a special emphasis on the move away from oil and gas toward knowledge-based economies with thriving financial centers based on management of assets. Educational institutions and intellectual property industries are of importance to this new economic philosophy and infrastructure.

Also under examination was the rise and fall of the “Dubai Model” of diversification, and how this differed from past strategies that the state has employed. Despite the recent problems the UAE has experienced, the general understanding, both locally and internationally, is that this is a temporary hiccup in Dubai’s life cycle. Although devoid of oil wells, Dubai has managed to attract oil wealth and carve out a niche for itself as a fully-functional financial hub.

Participants identified demographic and economic circumstances that will likely affect the Gulf’s political economy. Drawing from trade statistics and market data, the participants assessed the prospects of trade integration among the states of the GCC and how this will affect relations with the rest of the world. Free Trade Zones within Gulf economies were considered significant in this regard.

The project is expected to run for a year with at least one more meeting taking place in 2010 at which the participants will submit papers to be published as an edited volume.

Participants and Discussants include:

Alessio Antoniades, Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar
Attiya Ahmad, Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar
Zahra Babaei, Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar
Kai-Henrik Barth, Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar
Mary Breeding, Georgetown University, Washington, DC
John T. Crist, Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar
Christopher Davidson, Durham University
Nada Elsaa, Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar
Steffen Hering, Sciences Po
Mehran Kamrava, Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar
Massoud Karshenas, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London
Suzi Mirgani, Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar
Hamid Naficy, Northwestern University in Qatar
Djavad Salehi-Isfahani, Virginia Tech
Nicola Zambonini, Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar
A team of researchers from the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar and from Georgetown University’s Washington, DC, campus was recently awarded a grant by the Qatar National Research Fund to study Arabic language instruction in Qatari schools. The team consists of Lead Principal Investigators Abbas Al-Tonsi and co-Principal Investigators Amira El-Zein, Yehia Mohamed, and Hana Zabarah. Al-Tonsi, El-Zein, and Mohamed are on faculty at the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar, and Zabarah is with the Department of Arabic and Islamic Studies at Georgetown University in Washington, DC.

Their study explores the ways in which the demand for English education is affecting the Arabic language skills of Qatar’s youth, and address the challenge of maintaining strong linguistic skills in native Arabic speakers who spend many of their formative school years in English language schools. The research focuses on addressing the needs of heritage learners, native Arab students raised in Arab countries who lack formal instruction of Modern Standard Arabic (MSA).

As parents in the Arab world seek bilingual education for their children, they are increasingly opting for schools that educate them in languages such as English or French. This has resulted in an increase of Arab students who are fluent in their regional dialect and not challenging enough, or for students who have studied in Arabic all their lives, and is therefore too difficult.

The team has been working to identify the deficiencies and help in developing a specialized course of study, complete with textbooks that specifically targets heritage learners.

According to researchers, the increase of native Arab students lacking proper education in MSA has been particularly prevalent in the Gulf region due to the dominance of English, not only in schools, but in society as well. “While in parts of the Arab world like Egypt or Lebanon, you find similar problems among students who attend English language schools, it is evident primarily among the wealthy elite. In the Gulf, however, the problem is more widespread since English is so pervasive. Even the opportunities to practice the regional dialect are very few outside the home. This is why good Arabic instruction in schools is necessary,” Al-Tonsi said.

Al-Tonsi argues that the current Arabic language instruction in Qatar’s schools is not challenging enough for heritage learners.

A 2007 study by the SEC revealed that only one percent to 13 percent of students meet the country’s Arabic language standards ranged from one percent to 13 percent. What is missing, Al-Tonsi argues, is a specialized curriculum that understands the students’ socio-cultural context and takes into consideration the ways through which individuals learn a language.

Al-Tonsi asserts that the current Arabic language curriculum does not fit the profile of many heritage learners and has made learning unexciting. The material currently used to teach them is either designed for foreigners, and not challenging enough, or for students who have studied in Arabic all their lives, and is therefore too difficult.

The content of textbooks leaves much to be desired by heritage learners, featuring stale subject matter and an authoritative tone that pales in comparison to the dynamism of foreign language books. “It’s very easy for children to become excited about English when they see the textbooks full of games and activities whereas in their Arabic classes, they are told to sit and listen,” says Al-Tonsi.

Much of the material used for teaching Arabic lacks intellectual ideas and tends to encourage memorization rather than engagement and debate. This has bred a mentality that English is a superior language causing them to lend it more importance. When they are introduced to articles in Arabic that discuss deep ideas, they become very eager to learn more,” he adds.

In many instances, Arabic language teachers resort to photocopying chapters from various textbooks originating from across the Arab world. The result is a series of handouts that lack cohesion and do not allow the students to build upon what they have learned.

After studying current Arabic-language instruction in Qatar’s schools and designing and testing a curriculum for heritage learners, the team will develop a textbook geared towards heritage learners that speaks to their particular cultural context and provides them a forum to engage ideas in their native language. Al-Tonsi, who has already authored and co-authored several Arabic course books, including the Al-Kitaab series, which is widely used in most American and European universities, expects this textbook would return Arabic to the forefront of Gulf schools.
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Call for Occasional Papers

The Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar’s (GU-Q) Center for International and Regional Studies (CIRS) is pleased to announce a call for contributions to its Occasional Paper series. CIRS publishes original research in a broad range of issues related to the Gulf region in the areas of international relations, political science, economics, and Islamic studies. Other topics of current significance also will be considered.

Papers should be a maximum of 10,000 words and cannot have been previously published or under consideration for publication elsewhere. Citations must appear at the end of the paper using the format of the International Journal of Middle East Studies. All submissions are subject to a double-blind review process. Any copyright concerns are the full responsibility of the author. Please submit to cirsresearch@georgetown.edu.

Inquiries about the Occasional Paper series or other related questions may be directed to Suzi Mirgani, CIRS Publications Coordinator, at sm623@georgetown.edu.

Post-Doctoral Fellowship

The Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar’s (GU-Q) Center for International and Regional Studies (CIRS) awards Post-Doctoral Fellowships. The fellowship supports a recent PhD recipient in any discipline working on the area of the Middle East with priority to those working on the Gulf. The Fellowship is for a period of one academic year, with a possibility of renewal for one additional year. Compensation, benefits and other terms of employment are highly competitive.

Interested candidates should visit the website for more information: http://cirs.georgetown.edu/research/positions/

Senior Fellowship

The Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar’s (GU-Q) Center for International and Regional Studies (CIRS) awards non-residential Visiting Scholar Fellowship. The position is open to scholars in all disciplines working on any area of the Middle East, with priority given to those working on the Gulf. This position is ideal for mid- and senior-level academics. Compensation, benefits and other terms of employment are highly competitive.

Interested candidates should visit the website for more information: http://cirs.georgetown.edu/research/positions/