Siria Maniam Globetrots for Social Good

Many roads lead to IPED, but few are as circuitous as the one Siria Maniam traveled. Born and raised in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, she moved to Idaho to study business administration at Lewis-Clark State College. After graduating, she headed to Cambridge, Mass. and worked in banking before pursuing an MBA at Washington State University.

Maniam jumped at the chance to return to Kuala Lumpur and join a new United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) station as an operations assistant. After 18 months learning the ins and outs of project administration and management, she was ready to work as a program officer and began looking for graduate programs to gain additional competencies. This led her to IPED, where she studied as an Arrupe Fellow.

“The unique feature of the IPED program is that it provided both the political science and economics background as the foundation for peace and security in the world,” says Maniam.

After graduating, Maniam obtained the prestigious International Peace and Development (IPD) Travel Scholarship with Catholic Relief Services (CRS) in Zimbabwe. The six-month fellowship ended with her being recruited to serve as a program manager with CRS’s Justice and Peace department for an additional two and a half years.

Since her time in Zimbabwe, Maniam has globetrotted to a variety of development and peacekeeping posts. She worked again with UNOPS in Afghanistan, where she collaborated on post-conflict reconstruction. Then, she joined the UN’s Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO), where she served as a humanitarian affairs officer and oversaw the quick impact projects program in the DRC’s peacekeeping operations.

Now, Maniam works as a strategic planning officer with the UN-African Union Mission in Darfur (UNAMID). She ensures the mission’s stakeholders adhere to the UN Security Council’s mandate and prepares and coordinates performance reports, work plans, strategic reviews, and assessments. Currently, she is stationed at UN headquarters in New York, in the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, Sudan Desk, where she studies the relationship between in-the-field deliverables and member states’ contributions.

Maniam’s career has involved a dizzying array of global development and peacekeeping programs, but she credits much of what she has achieved to her time with IPED.

“It was IPED and the Peace and Development fellowship that really opened the doors to me on the career trajectory that I undertook since 2001.”

Maniam encourages current and prospective students to look closely at job announcements in the field they hope to enter, determine the specific skills they will need to develop to succeed, and work on those areas while in school.

“Be brave,” she says. “Follow your passion and not the paycheck to be earned.”
The Climate Change-Migration Nexus in Pacific Small Island Developing States: Ideological Misalignment and Media Framing

BY TESS HART

With sea levels rising and weather patterns changing, Pacific region countries and territories face shrinking land areas, natural resource degradation, and disappearing livelihoods. Though Pacific Small Island Developing States (PSIDS) contribute less than one percent of global greenhouse gas emissions, they are particularly vulnerable to deterritorialization: from submersion of land due to sea level rise, uninhabitability from disasters, or food and water insecurity (IPCC 2014). Climate adaptation has become the major policy response, and both internal and external migration is already occurring.

The multi-dimensional nature of migration decisions makes it difficult to pinpoint climate change’s effect. Problematic terminology, such as application of the word “refugee,” clouds political, legal, and funding frameworks. Some Pacific islands enjoy migration agreements with former colonial powers, while others have no visa-free entry options. Moreover, no country or territory has an explicit climate migration agreement, meaning current pathways would likely not sustain a wave of forced or induced migration. Further hindering progress is the media’s framing of the debate, which marginalizes the voices of citizens of PSIDS, who are directly affected by climate change.

Climate change and migration are cross-cutting global issues facing a highly contentious geopolitical landscape. Though these issues have been at the forefront of multilateral meetings like the United Nations 2015 Climate Change Conference in Paris, such meetings have yielded little cohesive policy implementation. World leaders are either unable or unwilling to come to a consensus on climate change liability, failing to live up to agreed upon adaptation measures. Meanwhile, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) noted that “human influence on climate is clear” and “warming of the climate is unequivocal,” with the atmosphere and oceans warming, snow and ice melting, and sea levels rising (IPCC 2014).

PSIDS have advocated for a rights-based approach at international conventions but remain skeptical of outside policies that could infringe on their governments’ sovereignty or their citizens’ rights. Rights-based approaches driven by local communities and affected nations are rarely part of the discussion. The global north’s de-politicization of the issue (Jacovella 2015) and the media’s silencing of voices from the Pacific and other climate vulnerable regions (Dreher & Voyer 2015) have framed climate change and migration away from climate justice. The international media has failed to place human rights at the forefront of climate change dialogue by utilizing PSIDS as de facto canaries in the coal mine to prove climate change, applying words like “victims” and “refugees” — which strip PSIDS citizens of their self-determination — and promoting islands as travel destinations available for a limited time.

The process of clearing ambiguous definitions and rhetoric must be streamlined, and the media must frame the debate through a rights-based justice lens. The power of government action and public pressure is bottlenecked by the information asymmetry surrounding climate change, migration, and the nexus of the two in the mainstream media. The proposed study would employ a multidimensional methodology, utilizing three research techniques (media analysis, expert interviews, and formal surveys) to explore the current media framing of climate-induced migration, public understanding and awareness in both PSIDS and destination countries, and the spaces to grow for policy creation.

I hypothesize that an analysis of media sources in the last five years from both PSIDS and destination countries would demonstrate that the media frequently fails to address climate-induced migration from a climate justice, rights-based perspective. I expect that expert interviews would corroborate the effect of such media framing on policy, and a quantitative analysis of survey answers from destination countries and PSIDS would show that representation of the climate-migration nexus affects bargaining power of PSIDS, ideologies concerning the issue, and public pressure in destination countries. Until an ideological shift occurs and PSIDS citizens are given a voice in determining their futures, PSIDS will continue to struggle to leverage international agreements. More research is required to further understand linkages between migration and climate change and the role that media framing plays in acting as a bottleneck or catalyst for comprehensive, innovative policy formation.
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The topic of whether countries should move from using a local currency to adopting a foreign currency like the American greenback or Euro has been widely debated in policy circles. Dollarization, or currency substitution, refers to the use of a foreign currency as legal tender in exchange for or in addition to local currency. Benefits of dollarization include but are not limited to anti-inflationary pressures, elimination of sudden currency depreciations, and greater financial integration. While dollarization has many benefits, it also has costs. Fully dollarized countries, for instance, lose their monetary and exchange rate policy tools — the ultimate sacrifice of monetary sovereignty (Ozsoz and Rengifo, 2016).

“What explains the decision of countries to dollarize?” Most discussions on the topic focus on the welfare effects of dollarization — whether it is good or bad for the economy. The tradeoff on the costs and benefits of dollarization is at the forefront of countries’ decision-making process when considering whether to pursue dollarization policies. My paper seeks to go beyond this debate. Because of a lack of emphasis on the determinants of dollarization policy choices in a political economy context, I am building on a framework that considers the distributional effects of certain policies and how these effects shape domestic interest groups’ preferences over outcomes.

The special-interest approach — how the political influence of specific interest groups or key constituencies in society impact exchange rate regime choice — is a product of the salient dissonance between what policy analysis presents as welfare effects and the actual policy choice. According to Frieden, the “social welfare implications of economic policies are poor predictors of the probability of their adoption” (Frieden 2002). Even if people are aware of dollarization’s pros and cons, this knowledge seems to be irrelevant in the actualization of policy choices. Hence, there must be another underlying factor that accounts for the actual policy choice to dollarize. The political influence of key domestic interests should be taken into account.

Extending Frieden’s political economy analysis on dollarization by situating it in Ehrlich’s access point theory complements the specific interest group explanation. As different kinds of institutions, processes, and policies profit or hurt different sectors of society, these affected sectors then organize to participate in public policymaking. In the context of dollarization, I posit that some sectors benefit from a policy of dollarization and would therefore lobby through “access points” to seize any potential gains. I argue that people in the cross-border economic activity sector (exporters, tradable-input users, MNCs, etc.) have contact with more “access points” and can conduct more lobbying than the import and export-competing sector and consumers. This gives them the advantage in pushing for dollarization. Access points are the places to which pressure groups go to exert influence; they demonstrate where real power lies in a political system.

For this proposal, I argue that more access points lead to a greater likelihood of dollarization and construct a quantitative test in the form of a binary logistic regression. If the causal mechanism of dollarization falls under the key domestic constituency case and access points allow for greater lobbying, then we expect the quantity of access points to have the biggest impact on dollarization. The more access points there are, the cheaper lobbying will be for groups who prefer dollarization as an exchange rate policy. Consequently, more lobbying will ensue. Finally, the more access points there are, the more biased policy is toward dollarization if proponents of dollarization have the lobbying advantage.

A country’s choice to dollarize plays a role in determining responses to changes in global market forces. The decision to abandon a local currency in favor of adopting a foreign one is an inquiry that has numerous implications that go beyond the economic and political realm. Thus, it is imperative that the determinants of such a policy be identified and analyzed. The potential importance of the distributional impacts of dollarization on certain groups must not be neglected; these impacts can conceivably dictate the future of national exchange rate policies.
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Faculty Feature: Dr. John Entelis

It was curiosity that first led Fordham University political scientist Dr. John Entelis to Cairo. He grew up in New York and studied at Ohio Wesleyan University. Like many in his generation, Dr. Entelis was captivated by news from the Middle East, so he began studying the region while pursuing advanced degrees in political science at New York University. Eager for an authentic perspective on events taking place across the world, he accepted an offer to study Arabic in Egypt.

What followed is a remarkable career dedicated to the Middle East and North Africa. He has taught at academic institutions around the world, including Stanford and the University of Tunis; published six books; obtained a long list of prestigious fellowships, including Fulbright Awards and National Endowment for the Humanities grants; shared his expertise with think tanks and governmental bodies like the U.S. Department of State and RAND Corporation; and seen his students rise to the highest levels of their fields, including former CIA Director John Brennan.

Through it all, Dr. Entelis has insisted that those interested in studying the Middle East do so not with defensive mistrust of the region and its inhabitants but with the inquisitiveness that first inspired him.

“We are presenting it in an objective, academic way,” he explains, “so that whatever may have been the initial motivation … we like to think they come out better informed citizens about the Middle East.”

Recent IPED students may best know Dr. Entelis for his courses in political risk analysis, comparative politics, and political economy in the Middle East, but he is actually one of IPED’s founders. In the early 1980s, he and Dr. Eugene Diulio approached the U.S. Department of Education to fund an MA program with interdisciplinary training in political science, economics, and sociology.

IPED has changed in many ways since its early days, shifting from a permanent rather than rotating directorship held by representatives in its composite departments. Dr. Entelis is proud of how IPED has grown and of graduates who have gone on to important work in academia, the public sector, and private NGOs and charitable organizations. He is humble, however, about his role in its success.

“The program does provide a wide range of skills and opportunities that enable people to choose any number of these pathways. It seems to have worked.”
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