Many years ago, Jeremy Knowles, the late dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, offered this advice to the Center’s leadership: “You are not a think tank. You are a university-based research center.” By that he meant for us always to be inclusive of every generation of scholar, from the unfledged 18-year-old just arrived on campus to the emeritus professor as engaged as ever in scholarly inquiry. Peering into offices, walking the halls, and entering seminar rooms of the Weatherhead Center, you will see that we continue to take Dean Knowles’s words to heart. No scholarly space on campus—or, for that matter, anywhere else I have been—invites a more eclectic mix of scholars of all ages working together.

Students of Harvard College command our attention in many ways. Our Undergraduate Associates (see page 10 for their recent “Dispatches”) are thesis-writing seniors who have benefited from Weatherhead Center grants to pursue field research. Once they accept their grants, we warn them that they are irrevocably in our fold. We expect them to come for our counsel, our community, and our ongoing conversation about international affairs. Our resident faculty and our Graduate Student Associates, of course, teach undergraduates in large numbers, so undergraduates flow in and out of faculty and graduate-student offices in a constant stream to engage in person with ideas, their authors, and their interpreters. With the aid of Center funding, faculty also hire undergraduates as research assistants, providing unique energy toward the University’s newly reinvigorated goal to introduce undergraduates at an early stage to analytical research.

Continued page 2
Less obvious perhaps is the fact that the WCFIA is deeply involved in freshman advising. At last count no less than 25 members of the Class of 2014 are being formally advised by our faculty and staff. Leaders of student organizations, from the International Relations Council to the many model UN groups to the Harvard Project for Sustainable Development, receive our guidance on a frequent basis. These undergraduates regularly draw on the services of an institution that is increasingly gathering a reputation for accessibility, dynamism, and influence.

The Center’s Graduate Student Associates (GSAs), fellows and affiliates of our National Security Studies Program, and fellows of the Project on Justice, Welfare, and Economics occupy extremely important niches in the Center community. With dissertation research and writing occupying the core of their very busy lives, our graduate students still manage to congregate and benefit from their interdisciplinary communities. A hallmark of these gatherings is the weekly seminar of the GSAs in which one young scholar will test her or his research in progress before an audience of peers that is both critical and sympathetic. The hothouse atmosphere of experimentation and practice is one of the great features of the Center that students recall years after their affiliations with us. The mentorship and seminar chairing of our director of graduate student programs, now Professor Erez Manela, ensures the vibrancy of their experience.

Junior faculty certainly have their own adjustments to make as they learn the rhythms of teaching and book writing in the pressure cooker of Harvard’s tenure track. Assistant and associate professors have long lauded the ways in which the Center funds and nurtures emerging careers with the provision of grants for sabbaticals, bookmanuscript workshops, conferences, and field research. Through the years, countless associate professors have spoken of the Center’s support for their work as a key to their scholarly success. A disproportionate amount of Center research support sustains the generation of research in the rising careers of our junior faculty.

Senior faculty are the backbone of the Center’s community. Currently, six of us have offices in the midst of the Center, but many more are hardly far, up or down a stairway, or across a street or two. In addition to the scholarship they produce and share, senior faculty from all over the University make up our Executive and Steering Committees, which provide the governance we need to support the best possible interdisciplinary and intergenerational research.

Finally, we count on our professors emeriti to set examples of hard work and collaboration as they continue their scholarly careers. Our most notable far-from-retiree is Herbert Kelman, Richard Clarke Cabot Professor of Social Ethics, emeritus, from the Department of Psychology. Herb has called the Center his scholarly home for decades, contributing his highly productive life to this institution. I wish to recognize him for his design and implementation of interactive problem-solving workshops, action research focusing on the analysis and resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict, and especially its Israeli-Palestinian component. Today, not one but two seminars have his regular engagement, the appropriately named Herbert C. Kelman Seminar on International Conflict Analysis and Resolution, chaired by Donna Hicks, and the Middle East Seminar, chaired by Lenore Martin, Sarah Roy, and Herb himself. Attend either of these series, and you will find participants from eighteen to 80 years old discussing the intersection of scholarship and contemporary international affairs.

Some ten years ago, when architect Harry Cobb began to sketch out the contours of what would become the Center for Government and International Studies, many of us emphasized how the building’s design should enhance our intellectual interaction. Spaces both public and private, both formal and casual, were to make people meet. We all knew that Harry was taking his real marching orders from Jeremy Knowles whose central aim always was to enhance the culture of our faculty and the University for all of its members.

Every day I am at the Center, I am pleased to see how active we are, working intergenerationally beyond expectations, well in accord with the dean’s vision planted so many years ago.

Beth A. Simmons, Center Director
Weatherhead Center Associate Elected into National Academy of Sciences

Gary King, Albert J. Weatherhead III University Professor, has been elected as one of 72 new members to the National Academy of Sciences in recognition of his distinguished and continuing achievements in original research. Professor King’s studies focus on political methodology and scientific inference in qualitative research. Gary King was also presented the Career Achievement Award by the Society for Political Methodology.

Weatherhead Center Associate Wins 2010 Prize for Outstanding Scholarly Contributions to Cuban Studies

Former Center Director, Jorge I. Domínguez, is the 2010 winner of the Award for Academic Excellence in Studies about Cuba, LASA Cuba Section.

Dominguez’s innovative contributions to the study of Cuban politics and society may be seen in the books that he has published, several of which have become classic texts in Cuban studies. A member of the award committee noted that Professor Dominguez’s studies “have the virtue and originality to combine economic and social as well as specifically political dimensions, thus providing an integrative account of his research cases.”

Weatherhead Center Affiliate Receives Lifetime Achievement Award

Robert D. Putnam, former Center Director, will be receiving the The Lifetime Achievement Award from the Conference Group on Italian Politics and Society for his work in political science, and in particular, on Italian politics at this year’s American Political Science Association 2010 convention.

Weatherhead Center Director Recognized by American Political Science Association (APSA)

Beth A. Simmons, director of the Weatherhead Center and Clarence Dillon Professor of International Affairs in the Department of Government, has won APSA’s Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award for her interdisciplinary book, Mobilizing for Human Rights: International Law in Domestic Politics. The award is given annually by APSA for the best book published in the United States during the previous calendar year on government, politics, or international affairs.

Simmons’ book, which argues that international human-rights law has made a positive contribution to the realization of human rights in much of the world, also won the American Society for International Law’s 2010 certificate of merit for a preeminent contribution to creative scholarship.

Weatherhead Center Affiliate Awarded Elaine Bennett Research Prize

Associate Professor, Erica Field, of the Department of Economics has been awarded the Elaine Bennett Research Prize, which is presented every other year to recognize, support, and encourage outstanding contributions by young women in the economics profession.

Field’s interests include development and labor economics. Her research topics have focused on the effect of property rights and credit availability on economic development, the nature of marriage contracts in Bangladesh, and the importance of the micronutrient iodine for public health and women’s educational achievement.

Former Harvard Academy Scholar Wins Heinz I. Eulau Award

Elizabeth Levy Paluck, assistant professor of psychology and public affairs at Princeton University, and Academy Scholar (2007–2009), was the recipient of the Heinz I. Eulau Award for the best journal article published in American Political Science Review during the previous year. With Donald P. Green of Yale University, Paluck co-authored the article “Deference, Dissent, and Dispute Resolution: An Experimental Intervention Using Mass Media to Change Norms and Behavior in Rwanda.”

Committee on African Studies Receives Grant

The Committee on African Studies, chaired by Faculty Associate, Caroline Elkins, earned $2.5 million dollars and gained national recognition when the Department of Education designated the committee as a National Resource Center in July 2010. The designation and its accompanying Title 6 grant were allotted to ten universities around the country for a four-year term, recognizing those universities’ engagement with African studies. With the new funds, Harvard’s committee will expand its study-abroad options, revamp courses, and broaden its language offerings.

Weatherhead Center Affiliate Receives Science of Generosity Grant

Rohini Pande, Mohammed Kamal Professor of Public Policy at the Harvard Kennedy School, received a grant of $149,000 from the Science of Generosity, an initiative at the University of Notre Dame. Launched in 2009, the initiative supports and conducts research on the sources, origins, and causes of generosity, the manifestations and expressions of generosity, and the consequences of generosity for both donors and recipients.
One Country, Two Societies: Rural-Urban Inequality in Contemporary China
Edited by Martin K. Whyte

This timely and important collection of original essays analyzes China’s foremost social cleavage: the rural-urban gap. It is now clear that the Chinese Communist revolution, though professing dedication to an egalitarian society, in practice created a rural order akin to serfdom, in which 80 percent of the population was effectively bound to the land. China is still struggling with that legacy. The reforms of 1978 changed basic aspects of economic and social life in China’s villages and cities and altered the nature of the rural-urban relationship. But some important institutions and practices have changed only marginally or not at all, and China is still sharply divided into rural and urban castes with different rights and opportunities in life, resulting in growing social tensions.

The contributors, many of whom conducted extensive fieldwork, examine the historical background of rural-urban relations; the size and trend in the income gap between rural and urban residents in recent years; aspects of inequality apart from income (access to education and medical care, the digital divide, housing quality and location); experiences of discrimination, particularly among urban migrants; and conceptual and policy debates in China regarding the status and treatment of rural residents and urban migrants.

(Harvard University Press, 2010)

Weatherhead Center Faculty Associate, Martin K. Whyte, is a professor of sociology.

Constructing the International Economy
Edited by Rawi Abdelal, Mark Blyth, and Craig Parsons

Focusing empirically on how political and economic forces are always mediated and interpreted by agents, both in individual countries and in the international sphere, Constructing the International Economy sets out what such constructions and what various forms of constructivism mean, both as ways of understanding the world and as sets of varying methods for achieving that understanding. It rejects the assumption that material interests either linearly or simply determine economic outcomes and demands that analysts consider, as a plausible hypothesis, that economics might vary substantially for nonmaterial reasons that affect both institutions and agents’ interests.

Constructing the International Economy portrays the diversity of models and approaches that exist among constructivists writing on the international political economy. The authors outline and relate several different arguments for why scholars might attend to social construction, inviting the widest possible array of scholars to engage with such approaches. They examine points of terminological or theoretical confusion that create unnecessary barriers to engagement between constructivists and non-constructivist work and among different types of constructivism. This book provides a tool kit that both constructivists and their critics can use to debate how much and when social construction matters in this deeply important realm.

(Cornell University Press, 2010)

Weatherhead Center Faculty Associate, Rawi Abdelal, is a professor of business administration at the Harvard Business School. Mark M. Blyth is an associate professor in the Department of Political Science at The Johns Hopkins University. Craig Parsons is an associate professor in the Department of Economics at the University of Oregon.

Development as a Human Right: Legal, Political and Economic Dimensions
Edited by Bård A. Andreassen and Stephen Marks

The relationship between the processes of economic development and international human-rights standards has been one of parallel and rarely intersecting tracks of international action. In the last decade of the twentieth century, development thinking shifted from a growth-oriented model to the concept of human development as a process of enhancing human capabilities, and the intrinsic links between development and human rights began to be more readily acknowledged. Specifically, it has been proposed that if strategies of development and policies to implement human rights are united, they reinforce one another in processes of synergy and improvement of the human condition. Such is the premise of the Declaration on the Right to Development, adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1986.

This book explores the meaning and practical implications of the right to development and the related term of human rights-based approaches to development and questions what these conceptions may add to our understanding and thinking about human and global development. Opening with an essay by Nobel Laureate in Economic Science and Weatherhead Center Faculty Associate, Amartya Sen, on human rights and development, the book contains a score of chapters on the conceptual underpinnings of development as a human right, the national dimensions of this right, and the role of international institutions. The authors reflect the disciplines of philosophy, economics, international law, and international relations.

(Intersentia, 2010)

Weatherhead Center Faculty Associate, Stephen Marks, is the François-Xavier Bagnoud Professor of Health and Human Rights in the Department of Global Health and Population at the Harvard School of Public Health.
The Age of Revolutions in Global Context, c. 1760–1840
Edited by David Armitage and Sanjay Subrahmanyam

Distinguished historians provide uniquely broad coverage of the dynamics of global and regional change in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The Age of Revolutions in Global Context sheds new light on the American, French, and Haitian revolutions, alongside ground-breaking treatments of Africa’s place in world history and Asia’s age of revolutions. The volume also presents ground-breaking treatments of world history from an African perspective, of South Asia’s age of revolutions, and of stability and instability in China. The first truly global account of the causes and consequences of the transformative ‘Age of Revolutions,’ this collection presents a strikingly novel and comprehensive view of the revolutionary era as well as rich examples of global history in practice.

(Palgrave Macmillan, 2010)

Weatherhead Center Faculty Associate, David Armitage, is the Lloyd C. Blankfein Professor of History. Sanjay Subrahmanyam is a professor of history and the Navin and Pratima Doshi Chair of Indian History at the University of California, Los Angeles.

Laws, Outlaws, and Terrorists: Lessons from the War on Terrorism
By Gabriella Blum and Philip B. Heymann

In an age of global terrorism, can the pursuit of security be reconciled with liberal democratic values and legal principles? During its “global war on terrorism,” the Bush administration argued that the United States was in a new kind of conflict, one in which peacetime domestic law was irrelevant and international law inapplicable. From 2001 to 2009, the United States thus waged war on terrorism in a “no-law zone.”

Gabriella Blum and Philip Heymann reject the argument that traditional American values embodied in domestic and international law can be ignored in any sustainable effort to keep the United States safe from terrorism. In Laws, Outlaws, and Terrorists, they demonstrate that the costs are great and the benefits slight from separating security and the rule of law.

Blum and Heymann argue that the harsh measures employed by the Bush administration were authorized too broadly, resulted in too much harm, and often proved to be counterproductive for security. The authors recognize that a severe terrorist attack might justify changing the balance between law and security, but they call for reasoned judgment instead of a wholesale abandonment of American values. They also argue that being open to negotiations and seeking to win the moral support of the communities from which the terrorists emerge are noncoercive strategies that must be included in any future efforts to reduce terrorism.

(MIT Press, 2010)

Weatherhead Center Faculty Associate, Philip Heymann, is the James Barr Ames Professor of Law and director of the International Center for Criminal Justice at the Harvard Law School. Gabriella Blum is an assistant professor at the Harvard Law School.

Women, Work, and Politics: The Political Economy of Gender Inequality
By Torben Iversen and Frances Rosenbluth

Looking at women’s power in the home, in the workplace, and in politics from a political economy perspective, Torben Iversen and Frances Rosenbluth demonstrate that equality is tied to demand for women’s labor outside the home, which is a function of structural, political, and institutional conditions. They go on to explain several anomalies of modern gender politics: why women vote differently from men; why women are better represented in the workforce in the United States than in other countries but less well represented in politics; why men share more of the household work in some countries than in others; and why some countries have such low fertility rates.

The first book to integrate the microlevel of families with the macrolevel of national institutions, Women, Work, and Politics presents an original and groundbreaking approach to the issue of gender inequality.

(Yale University Press, 2010)

Weatherhead Center Faculty Associate, Torben Iversen, is the Harold Hitchings Burbank Professor of Political Economy in the Department of Government. Frances Rosenbluth is a professor of political science at Yale University.
On November 30, 2006, Mahmoud al-Zahar, the foreign minister of an ill-fated, short-lived Hamas-led Palestinian government, was reported by Reuters to have smuggled a briefcase filled with $30 million in cash into Gaza through the Gaza-Egypt border. As the news spread, the details of the story grew wilder and stranger, with some newspapers claiming that the foreign minister had managed to smuggle over $120 million into Gaza over the past six months via the same cash-in-briefcase method.

While it was difficult to fathom how he had managed to pull this off—at the time, the Gaza-Egypt border was policed strictly by two layers of European and Israeli monitors—it was easier, for even the least observant of Palestine-watchers, to understand why a high ranking minister of the Palestinian Authority (PA) would have felt the need to resort to such a desperate, and seemingly un-ministerial, act.

In March 2006, a few weeks after Hamas’ surprise electoral victory in the Palestinian parliamentary elections, Israel, America, and the European Union, acting in concert, had imposed a ban on all money transfers into the West Bank and Gaza as part of a general ban on all fund-and-aid transfers to any areas controlled by the PA. Since Hamas was considered a terrorist group by America, Israel, and the European Union, the ban against funds transferred to any entity linked to it was in keeping with American and European anti-terrorism laws. The ban went into effect within two months of Hamas’ electoral victory, and all international and local banks operating in the Palestinian areas (international, Israeli, Arab, and Palestinian) complied with it promptly and without exception. The Bank of New York also took the unprecedented step of freezing all the assets of the Arab Bank (the largest independent Palestinian bank, which had no direct links to the Palestinian Authority) as well as the assets of the Palestinian Monetary Authority, the Palestinian Investment Fund, and the Palestinian Pension Fund in America. The Israeli government stopped all transfers of tax and customs revenues to the PA (which it was required, by the Oslo agreement, to remit monthly to the Palestinian government), and all foreign donations to Palestine, which constituted about half of the PA’s annual budget, were frozen.

The new Hamas-led Palestinian government was thus faced, within a few weeks of having taken office, with an extraordinary economic crisis. It was soon unable to pay the salaries of the large numbers of Palestinians who worked for the sprawling bureaucracy that comprised the PA, and, by the summer of 2006, the effects of the ban on cash coming into the Palestinian Territories were felt by Palestinians everywhere. The situation in Gaza, where a large percentage of the 1.3 million inhabitants were employees of the state, was particularly acute. As grim reports began to circulate about the inevitability of imminent bankruptcy, desperate Palestinians began hoard-
ing food, pawning jewels, racking up debts, selling land, and, for small daily transactions, resorting to simple bartering. And yet the banks and financial institutions, fearing American sanctions, resolutely continued to obey the freeze order, refusing to allow the PA to use their facilities to transfer funds from abroad into the country. (Not that there were very many willing sources for funds, even had the banks allowed them; apart from Iran and a few Gulf states, all countries obeyed the American freeze order.) By the end of the summer, the World Bank began to issue a flurry of reports announcing the collapse of the Palestinian economy. Given the context, al Zahar’s dash for cash across the border seemed less the impulsive act of a madman than the pragmatic solution of a politician who knew he needed a way to get money into the country, before the country was plunged into chaos, taking his new government with it.

I was living in the West Bank at the time and noted, with a mixture of alarm and fascination, the effects of the absence of cash on the local economy and on the society at large. I watched as ordinary people—public school teachers, road workers, electricity meter readers, garbage collectors, and my own landlord—went without salaries for months; as shopkeepers changed from being initially sympathetic towards their customers and willing to extend informal loans to being openly hostile towards anyone who was a PA employee; as public-sector employees scrambled madly to look for jobs in the private sector (there were none); as desperate and menacing crowds milled about the banks every morning; and as the banks themselves, having grown prudently nervous, ramped up their security and put up their shutters.

By January 2007, the Palestinian economy had, for all practical purposes, ceased to function. The shortage of cash affected everything: the relationship of the banks to the people; the relationship of the people to the government; the relationship of the government to the banks; and, of course, the relationship of the people to the people. As life in the cashless land grew increasingly surreal, I was reminded of something that Marx had written in his 1844 manuscripts: “If money is the bond binding me to human life, binding society to me, binding me and nature and man, is not money the bond of all bonds? Can it not dissolve and bind all ties? Is it not, therefore, the universal agent of divorce?” And I began to feel—as perhaps everyone else living in Palestine did as well—that Marx’s universal agent of divorce was, by its absence, tearing apart the fabric of the society in which I was living.

The Past:

And yet, for all its singularity, the situation in Palestine at that moment was oddly—and, for the few Palestinians old enough to remember it, frighteningly—reminiscent of one small aspect of the greatest trauma in modern Palestinian history: the Nakba of 1948. Between 1947 and 1948, once the British had announced their intention to withdraw from Palestine, a full-fledged war had broken out between the Arab armies and the Jewish army. In the course of the fighting, hundreds of thousands of Palestinians had fled their homes to seek refuge in neighboring countries. In May 1948, after having declared its independence, the new state of Israel passed an order decreeing all those Palestinian refugees to be “absentees,” and a newly created Israeli bureaucracy, titled “The Custodian of Absentee Property,” was ordered to seize all the property and assets that the fleeing refugees had left behind. Shortly thereafter, the Israeli government ordered every bank in the country to freeze the accounts of all Palestinian customers and to transfer all the balances that remained (and all the contents of their safe deposit boxes) to the Israeli Custodian. All the banks, with one exception (the Arab Bank), obeyed the Israeli order, and thus every Palestinian who had had a bank account in 1948 lost, overnight, all access to their money and savings. All Palestinian financial investments (mainly comprising British government-issued bearer bonds and share certificates of various companies) were similarly “frozen” by the Israeli government and transferred to the Israeli Custodian, as were all checks issued to Palestinians and Palestinian companies. It would take almost a decade of complicated legal wrangling and diplomatic maneuvering, brokered by the UN, before these sums, which represented almost the entirety of Palestinian financial life before 1948, were transferred back to their Palestinian owners. And, still today, there remain many refugees who have yet to receive the money that they—or their fathers, or their grandfathers—had left behind when fleeing Palestine. As perhaps the most final signifier of the financial loss that the termination of the British Mandate represented to the Palestinians, the currency of Mandate Palestine, called the Palestinian pound, was withdrawn from circulation by the end of

The Palestinian pound was the currency of British Mandate Palestine from 1927 to 1948. It was withdrawn from circulation in 1948 and was the last currency that the Palestinians have used that had the word “Palestine” on it. The Palestinian Authority is presently debarred, by the Oslo agreement, from issuing its own currency. Photo credit: Wikipedia. Though this image is subject to copyright, its use in the article is covered by the U.S. fair use laws, and the stricter requirements of Wikipedia’s non-free content policies, because: it is of much lower resolution than the original; and the photo is of an object of discussion in the article.
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Paul-Henri Spaak Lecture

Baroness Catherine Ashton
September 27, 2010

The Paul-Henri Spaak Lecture Series was established in 1981 thanks to the generosity of Frank Boas and the Frank Boas Foundation. After being suspended in 1999, the series was relaunched thanks to a donation by the Nicolas Janssen Family Fund of Brussels. The series brings European leaders to Harvard to speak on issues of importance to the United States and Europe. Former Spaak lecturers include the then former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Uffe Ellemann-Jensen, the then former Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Hellenic Republic, George Papandreou, and the European Commission President José Manuel Barroso.

On September 27, 2010, Baroness Catherine Ashton, the European Union high representative for foreign affairs and security policy, delivered the nineteenth Paul-Henri Spaak Lecture. Ashton's lecture, “The European Union Facing Global Challenges,” focused on the future of the European Union’s foreign policy amidst the international economic, political, and environmental dilemmas. The lecture was followed by a question and answer section through which students and scholars across the University lined up for the opportunity to press Baroness Ashton on a number of current issues.

Photo Credits: Megan Countey
In his lecture, "America's Bush/Cheney Foreign Policy: Why Hasn't It Changed?" journalist Seymour Hersh focused on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and President Obama's foreign policy plan. Hersh is a regular contributor to the New Yorker magazine on military and security matters. His work first gained worldwide recognition in 1969 for exposing the My Lai Massacre and its cover-up during the Vietnam War, for which he received the 1970 Pulitzer Prize for International Reporting.
Sixteen Harvard College juniors received summer travel grants from the Weatherhead Center to support their thesis research on topics related to international affairs. Since their return in September, the Weatherhead Center has encouraged these Undergraduate Associates to take advantage of the Center’s research environment. During the 2011 spring semester, the students will present their research in a conference (February 10-11) that is open to the Harvard community. Four Undergraduate Associates write of their experiences in the field:

When I began classes at Sciences Po for my junior spring in Paris, I mentioned to a few French students that I was interested in conducting research on Indian classical dance, specifically the style of Bharatanatyam. The responses I got were hesitant: “T’es sûre que ça existe ici?” I was adamant. Through my involvement with Harvard’s South Asian Dance Company over the past three years, I knew that the practice of Bharatanatyam was widespread in the Indian diaspora population. Surely, if I found Paris’s South Asian community, I would find dance.

Flash forward four months. Semester over, I was excited to stay in Paris for two months of focused research on Bharatanatyam. Notebook in hand, I arrived for my first day of observation at a class offered in a Presbyterian church in the 17th arrondissement. A graceful older woman, her hair tied back in a long braid, led a group of six middle-aged women—all dressed in traditional Indian kurtas—in the namaskaram ritual that began practice. And not one of the women in the room was of South Asian origin.

I was right, there was certainly Indian classical dance in Paris—just not exactly in the way I expected.

Over the next eight weeks, I followed the practice and performance of Bharatanatyam through every corner of the city. The diversity was astounding. Classes were held in dance complexes, home studios, Indian cultural organizations, and even a community center that doubled as a Hindu temple. Performances ranged from foreign soloists dancing on museum stages to groups of high school students at their local city hall.

My research revealed a multilayered Bharatanatyam community in Paris. There were the diasporic classes I had expected, where dancers were overwhelmingly South Asian in ethnicity and the instructors spoke French, English, and Tamil when interacting with pupils. Then there were the classes I had been surprised to find—offered by teachers of varying ethnicity to predominantly white French women who had become interested in Bharatanatyam for a variety of personal and situational reasons.

Supplementing my observations with one-on-one interviews, I was intrigued to hear a range of individual and community dance experiences. Though dancers were overwhelmingly female, their backgrounds and dance trajectories were incredibly diverse. I spoke with dance teachers who had immigrated from Sri Lanka, French women who had spent years studying classical dance in India, second-generation Indians whose parents enrolled them in their first class, and European-origin students who discovered Bharatanatyam thanks to Bollywood films.

My discoveries about Bharatanatyam’s personal and cultural significance continued to unfold in August when my research brought me to India for three weeks. While interviewing and observing in Delhi, Chennai, and Bangalore, I was astounded by the extent of transnational networks. Starting with contacts from my time in Paris, I was able to meet incredibly renowned dancers, gurus, and scholars in the field of Bharatanatyam. In a few cases, I even encountered again (intentionally or not) dancers from Paris. Informed by my prior experience, these interactions exposed me to the practice, philosophy, and societal place of Bharatanatyam in its Indian context.

Now back at Harvard, I am excited to be engaging with the final phase of my research in Brookline, where regular participation-observation at the Triveni School of Dance has introduced me to yet another wonderful dance community. Combining my tri-continental research findings is a challenge but a joy. Thanks to the Weatherhead Center, I have gained a profound appreciation of Bharatanatyam’s various manifestations as a transnational cultural conduit. Through my research on the lived experience of this beautiful cultural art, I have discovered a rich range of perspectives on the role of tradition, identity, community, and cultural exchange in Bharatanatyam, both within and beyond India’s borders—and I am excited to continue my understanding in the months to come.
Many Africans, furthermore, get trapped into thinking that they can find work in China. In Uganda, I came across three central issues in the relationship between locals and Chinese expatriates: the quality of Chinese goods, working conditions in Chinese–run businesses, and competition from Chinese traders. Ugandans often expressed very nuanced, at times contradictory, opinions about the Chinese. For example, on the one hand, they praise the Chinese for bringing investment and jobs and providing skills–training for Uganda’s poor. On the other hand, Ugandans complain bitterly about low remuneration, few benefits, dangerous working conditions, and harsh treatment by their Chinese employers. When I asked local business leaders and an official from the Ministry of Labor why the government did not have more strict regulations regarding labor conditions, they replied that it was basic economics: the supply of unskilled labor outpaced demand to such an extent that workers simply could not demand higher wages. They further argued that Uganda is so desperate for jobs and investment, that the government cannot afford to enforce regulations protecting workers’ rights for fear that the Chinese would simply leave—and take their investment dollars with them. Similarly, officials argue that Uganda cannot afford to adopt protectionist policies to support local businesses.

Many retailers in Kampala complain bitterly that the Chinese have an unfair advantage when it comes to selling the cheap goods Ugandan consumers crave. It is much easier for Chinese businesses to source cheap products from factories in southern China than it is for Ugandan traders. More importantly, the Chinese have much greater access to capital than Ugandans. A top Ugandan official I spoke with in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs expressed very little sympathy for struggling local businesses: “What are these people [Ugandan businesspersons] complaining about? They just need to work harder and be competitive.” It was not clear to me that the Chinese bear any blame for the plight of local businesses.

Few Chinese entrepreneurs in Kampala receive any kind of support from the Chinese government. They are just private individuals trying to make a profit. They are simply taking advantage of Uganda’s intentionally very liberal and open business environment.

Finally, nearly every Ugandan I spoke with in Kampala complained about the poor quality of Chinese goods. However, many Chinese and even some Ugandan traders explained that this is, again, simple economics: Ugandans demand cheap products. The market for cheap, low-quality goods is huge in Uganda. The market for more expensive, high-quality goods is miniscule. Chinese merchants and Ugandan importers are simply responding to market conditions. Consumer ignorance was an area of concern raised by an official at the Ugandan National Bureau of Standards. Not every Ugandan, particularly those from poor rural communities, can distinguish between goods of high and low quality. They in essence get tricked into paying for something they think will last for years, but will only last for weeks at best. This also poses a problem for Chinese who trade in higher-end goods.

Ultimately, I am fascinated by the interaction between Chinese and Africans because of what it tells us about the future of international relations and economic development. For all the problems and abuses in the Sino–African relationship, it nevertheless represents the emergence of new South–South partnerships that largely bypass the developed world. We are potentially entering a century in which the West will no longer dominate every corner of the globe. Rather, impoverished countries like those in Africa may start looking east for new partners. Understanding the implications of these developments is an essential task for academics and one I hope to contribute to further in graduate school.
This summer, the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs funded my thesis research on population growth and environmental degradation. I examined, from a variety of perspectives, why it is so hard to talk about overpopulation as an environmental issue, and, more specifically, as a contributor to climate change.

I began my research in Washington, DC, where I interned for a month at Population Connection, an NGO founded in 1968 (then called “Zero Population Growth” or ZPG) as the first population/environmental organization. At Population Connection, I read its archives of monthly newsletters since 1968. These newsletters proved to me that ZPG was far less radical in the past than its enemies claim, that the debate about population growth has addressed similar fears and goals throughout its existence, and that organizations were less politically correct, though not less politically aware, in the 1960s.

In DC I also attended meetings of the Population, Health and Environment (PHE) group. The PHE meetings and contacts taught me how much organizations were doing in the population realm, despite the lack of publicity about their work in the field. I learned, for example, that the Audubon Society, an environmental organization known for its protection of birds and bird habitats, has long worked in the population field. These meetings and the subsequent interviews showed me how these organizations frame their work internally and what concerns are at the forefront of their minds when presenting their population/environmental programs to funders. I learned that the women’s empowerment/women’s rights as a human-rights framework is the best device to connect population and the environmental. That framework fits within the individual-rights based model that the West cherishes, and appears the least imperialist.

The interviews in DC were the most valuable. I conducted about fifteen interviews, each one-to-two-hours long. I spoke with people from USAID, other population and/or environmental NGOs, and staffers in Senator Kerry’s and Congressman Markey’s offices. I attended the Women Deliver conference, which is hosted every four years for women’s-rights advocates. It is the largest conference of its kind. I made connections with people at organizations that oppose population stabilization, and have been invited to present my research on the opponents to the population stabilization movement at the Population Strategy meeting in Washington, DC.

I went next to Brighton, on the south coast of England, where I worked at the Social, Technological and Environmental Pathways to Sustainability (STEPS) Centre at the University of Sussex. There I split my time between research on biochar, a charcoal substance that sequesters carbon and improves soil fertility, and on population growth. Researching biochar exposed me to the STEPS framework, which focuses explicitly on the social implications of new technologies for the poorest members of society. I find this framework and focus a useful check on the prevailing approach in the population world to the developing world, in terms of considering the poorest, indigenous people as intelligent, rational decision makers, who lack resources more than knowledge.

My research on population growth was less direct in England than in DC (I did only four interviews), but fruitful in a more broad-minded way. Two sets of interviews were crucial. One was with the campaign director for the Green Party, the British party that includes population stabilization as part of their platform. The other was with officers of the Optimum Population Trust (OPT), a radical population stabilization organization infamous in England for its PopOffsets program, in which they suggested that people in the developed world purchase birth control for developing countries as carbon offsets. These two interviews clearly delineated both sides of the population debate in England. These sides tended to be similar to the sides in the United States, except that in England abortion and contraceptives are not as controversial, in large part because the Catholic Church holds little sway. The differences in the debate internationally helped me hone in on what is unique about the prevailing approach in the population world to the developing world, in terms of considering the poorest members of society. I find this framework and focus a useful check on the prevailing approach in the population world to the developing world, in terms of considering the poorest members of society.

The main questions I wish to answer are, why is it so hard to connect population growth with environmental degradation, especially global climate change? And what are the implications of making that connection? There are a few reasons this connection is so hard, some because of their history, and some because of their implications for the future.
In my final meeting with my thesis advisor, before heading to the airport, he reminded me, “Don’t forget to give back. Tell the people you are working with the outcomes of your research.” Nodding, I walked out wondering to myself what on earth those initial findings might be.

But I needn’t have worried—my research experience this summer in Kenya with the World Agroforestry Center (ICRAF) consistently exceeded even my wildest expectations. My research team was incredibly helpful and focused. Local farmers were almost always willing to share their experiences, hopes, and concerns with me. Of course, there were days things didn’t go my way, days that I was home, sick with giardia, or returned from the field with mild heat exhaustion, but reflecting back, even those instances contributed to my overall research experience as I learned how to navigate the Kenyan health care system.

My research goals were surpassed in all aspects, with over 125 households surveyed, seven community groups participating in interactive focus groups, and over fifteen informal interviews conducted.

While conducting interviews and surveys each day with local farmers I only began to comprehend the complex issues facing subsistence farmers in semi-arid regions of Kenya. Talking with my research team gave me insight on the political and ethnic tensions that impacted interactions on the ground. Calls home continued to remind me of the extreme contrasts between my life in America and my day-to-day experiences in the field.

At the end of my stay, remembering my advisor’s advice, I prepared a presentation of my initial research findings to provide to the communities with which I worked. We organized two community celebrations that allowed the researched groups to come together and share their successes and the problems they faced in their communities. I excitedly listened as collaborations on future development projects were being made over an extensive meal of ugali (a Kenyan staple of maize meal), roasted goat, and fish stew. Finally, I gave a short presentation on what I had learned from each of them during my stay. Upon finishing, the local chief rose and thanked me for returning to them with my findings, “So many people have come and asked questions of us, but only you have given back things that we can use to improve ourselves in the future. For that, we thank you.”

Returning home and beginning the long process of turning my experiences and notes into a thesis, I keep coming back to the memories of my time in the field. I remember the smell of roasting corn, the taste of fresh papaya, and the faith that each farmer placed in me to make a difference with the stories they empowered me with. With these stories etched in my mind, I am committed to continuing on to get my Ph.D. in international agriculture so I will some day be able to do more than just listen, but be able to make a tangible difference in the livelihoods of subsistence farmers around the world.

Tannis Thorlakson
Environmental Science and Public Policy
Rogers Family Research Fellow
Traveled to Kenya to explore agroforestry’s role in helping subsistence farmers reduce their vulnerability to climate change and variation.

With the support of the Weatherhead Center, I was able to spend two and a half months in western Kenya as a field researcher exploring agroforestry’s role in helping subsistence farmers reduce their vulnerability to climate change and variation. Agroforestry is the use of trees within a cropping system to improve farm productivity. Trees can help farmers by improving soil fertility, preventing soil erosion, improving access to fuel wood, and providing additional food and income through tree crops. The project I was evaluating had provided seedlings and training in agroforestry techniques to a small group of farmers in the Nyando District of western Kenya.

Tess Hellgren (page 10): Young Bharatanatyam dancers at a competition in Bangalore.

Eliza Lehner (page 12): Royal Pavilion in Brighton, UK where Lehner spent a month of her summer.

Tannis Thorlakson (this page): Working with community members in a focus-group discussion about the long-term constraints to farm productivity.
The Program on Transatlantic Relations was created at the end of 2007 as a result of an initiating donation by Pierre Keller, a former Fellow of the Center who is presently a member of the Center’s Advisory Committee. Working in close cooperation with the Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies and Harvard Kennedy School, the program endeavors to strengthen research and teaching on transatlantic issues within the University, focusing on European and North American social, economic, political, security, and environmental issues that are of particular relevance to the transatlantic relationship.

The program supports visiting scholars and public servants who have distinguished themselves in the field of transatlantic relations. In spring 2009, the first Pierre Keller Visiting Professor, Dominique Moïsi, senior adviser of the French Institute for International Relations, taught two courses in the Department of Government. He was followed by Markus Jachtenfuchs of the Hertie School of Governance in Berlin and Michael Landesmann of the Vienna Institute of International Economic Studies and Linz University. Both taught courses in the Harvard Kennedy School and the Department of Government. The program also facilitates research appointments for Europeans at the University (including Fritz Thyssen Fellows and Schumpeter Fellows), supports research on transatlantic issues by Harvard faculty and students and visits of European Union representatives within the Challenges of the Twenty-First Century Seminar Series. The program organizes the Weatherhead Center’s Transatlantic Relations Seminar.

Special events organized by the program include the Paul-Henri Spaak Lecture Series. The 2010 speaker is European Union Foreign Minister, Baroness Catherine Ashton. European Commission President José Manuel Barroso was the speaker in September 2008. The program also supports the Study Group on the Future of the European Union, co-sponsored with the Center for European Studies, in collaboration with experts from the greater Boston community, and the Weatherhead Center’s annual June conference in Talloires, France.

The Transatlantic Relations Seminar, the Challenges of the Twenty-First Century Seminar Series, and the Paul-Henri Spaak Lecture Series are generously supported by the Nicolas Janssen Family Fund of Brussels.

Fritz Thyssen Fellows

Simon Koschut, a former Fulbright Scholar, has been teaching international relations and U.S. foreign policy as an assistant professor at the Free University Berlin.

Why do states abandon a state of stable peace? When and why do nations prefer a state of uncertainty to mutual trust and dependable expectations of peaceful behavior? How and under what conditions do mutual trust and the absence of violent conflict in international relations deteriorate into mutual suspicion or even war? As part of my research here at the Weatherhead Center, I explore the disintegration of pluralistic security communities and the subsequent breakdown of stable peace among nations. According to Karl Deutsch, a security community is considered to be “a group which has become integrated, where integration is defined as the attainment of a sense of community, accompanied by formal or informal institutions or practices, sufficiently strong and widespread to assure peaceful change among members of a group with ‘reasonable’ certainty over a ‘long’ period of time.” Based on a constructivist reading of international relations, I argue that norms and ideas about the intersubjective relationship among nations primarily constitute a pluralistic security community. Hence, changing norms and ideas about the intra-group relationship may disrupt a political community from within and thus serve as the primary causal explanation for the disintegration of pluralistic security communities.
Felix Heiduk is a research fellow at the German Institute for International and Security Affairs. He received a doctorate from Free University Berlin. His recent monograph examines the role of the Indonesian armed forces in the Aceh conflict. He has lectured on international relations and security studies at various German universities.

My research project deals with differences between European and U.S. strategic cultures. The differences between the strategic cultures of Europe and the United States seemed to have been most apparent on a macrolevel with regard to the European “no” to the Iraq invasion in 2003. Yet they also seem to become distinct when comparing EU and U.S. strategic cultures on a microlevel in the context of security sector reform. I chose to analyze the “transatlantic divide” against the case-study of EU and U.S. police assistance in Afghanistan. The case study of Afghanistan can be considered an “ideal” case for this as both actors, the EU and United States, have been involved in reforming the ANP (Afghan National Police) simultaneously. Yet, according to a variety of reports, the aims and approaches to police assistance differed substantially from each other. I try to inquire, utilizing the debate on strategic culture as a conceptual framework, to which degree the “transatlantic divide” is actually reflected in contemporary discourses, policies, and practices of police assistance in Afghanistan. My main research question asks, if the approaches to, and practices of, police assistance in Afghanistan differ so substantially, then could one state, with reference to Robert Kagan’s famous book, that the United States is policing “Mars” and Europe is policing “Venus”?

Joseph A. Schumpeter Fellow

Antonia Kupfer is an assistant professor of sociology at Johannes Kepler University, Linz. She specializes in sociology of education, social theory, and gender.

My research project examines the social construction of recognition and value with respect to workers in the retail trade in the United States, England, and Germany. More specifically, the project examines their sense of worth in work in relation to their education and training, and how they value their work as part of their self-esteem relative to other relationships that they have in the family and civil society. The interview sample will be conducted according to age cohorts and gender. The findings will illuminate a comparative understanding of how worth, value, and recognition are socially constructed. It may also tell us more about the role of education, training, and work in the creation of social cohesion.

Pierre Keller Visiting Professor

Michael A Landesmann is the scientific director of the Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies (www.wiiw.ac.at). He is also a professor of economics at the Johannes Kepler University in Austria.

While at the Weatherhead Center, I have completed a major joint report with the Brussels-based Bruegel think tank on “Whither Growth in Central and Eastern Europe?—Policy Lessons from the Crisis for an Integrated Europe” which was presented in Brussels and the World Bank at the end of November 2010. I am also currently coordinating the final stages of a large four-year cross-European research project MICRO-DYN (http://micro-dyn.eu/) comprising seventeen European research institutes and about 80 researchers that conducted pioneering research on issues of industrial dynamics, innovation and internationalization using pooled enterprise data-sets across the European economies. While at Harvard, I am teaching a course on “Cohesion and Competitiveness of the Enlarged European Union” at the Harvard Kennedy School (cross-registered with the Government Department) and also conducting a series of workshops for graduate students under the title “Where is Europe Now and Where is it Going?”. I was also a participant in the panel discussion at the Center for European Studies on “The Future of the Euro.”
News report from the Daily Star, Lebanon, May 1954, of the verdict passed by the Jordanian courts requiring British banks to return the frozen assets of their Palestinian customers in contravention of the Israeli “Absentee Property” law, which ordered the banks to confiscate all Palestinians’ accounts in 1948.

Photo credit: Sreemati Mitter, with thanks to Fuad Shehadeh.

My Research:
While I hope to avoid drawing too simple and straight a line in my dissertation from the past to the present crises in Palestine, I am exploring how these traumatic episodes have affected the economic and monetary behavior of Palestinians. The broader question I try to address in my work is the relationship between money and sovereignty. The primary goal of the project is to present a history of money and monetary usage in Palestine over time, and to tell the story of how the Palestinians have reacted to and navigated the various currencies and monetary policies imposed on them by the different regimes that have governed them since the beginning of the century. Through this historical narrative, I explore how the absence of a Palestinian state has affected the economic behavior of the Palestinian people, and, more specifically, how the sustained absence of political sovereignty has affected their economic agency.

The end of the British Mandate and the transition, in 1948, to Israeli statehood, will occupy a significant portion of my dissertation because a secondary goal of my project is to assist the Palestinians in their desire to evaluate and seek compensation for the financial losses they suffered in 1948. A third goal is policy oriented, as I hope that my dissertation will provide the officials of the Palestinian Monetary Authority with an understanding of the monetary behavior and practices of Palestinians as shaped by their history, and thus contribute to the debate on the suitability of establishing, at some future stage, a sovereign Palestinian currency.

The Center’s web address is: http://www.wcfia.harvard.edu © 2010 President and Fellows of Harvard College
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1948 and replaced by the Israeli shekel. With its disappearance, the only currency that Palestinians have ever known as their own, and that had the name “Palestine” on it, vanished from their lives.

1948 and replaced by the Israeli shekel.