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‘There is no heritage in Qatar’: Orientalism, colonialism and other problematic histories

Karen Exell and Trinidad Rico

Abstract

This article discusses the construction of Qatari heritage in the context of pre-conceived ideas of ‘cultural heritage’ predominant in the global and regional spheres that operate in this country. It considers the location of Qatar within Middle Eastern heritage discourses and debates, and identifies productive similarities as well as unique avenues for further discussion. The authors identify the challenge of formulating methodologies that are able to recognize, accommodate, encompass and reflect local heritage dialogues and practices that exist in Qatar, which may aid in further researching the wider Arabian Peninsula, its histories and heritages.
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Introduction

‘There is no heritage in Qatar’ is a statement often made of the tiny Gulf State, primarily by highly educated Westerners, based, it seems, on a pre-existing idea of ‘cultural heritage’ and an expectation of what ‘Qatari heritage’ should look like. A claim such as this cannot be taken lightly in the context of post-colonial heritage debates, raising as it does a series of fascinating questions for the theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of cultural heritage in Qatar. This statement also frames a problem that is endemic to post-colonial societies: whose interpretation of cultural heritage predominates, and how is this interpretation mobilized? It highlights the significance of the study of the construction of heritage as a category at the local
level, but also of the institutions that enable a stewardship of specific forms of cultural heritage within their jurisdiction. Approaching the construction and management of heritage in these societies as largely influenced by colonial processes does not mean that debates surrounding cultural heritage need to be situated within a polarized view of rehearsed ‘local’ vs. ‘global’ constructs, a distinction that is challenged throughout this discussion (for discussions and definitions of this debate in a Gulf States context, see Fibiger [2011, 281]; Mejcher-Atassi and Schwartz [2012, 3]; Wakefield [2012]). Rather, the complexity of this context deserves an examination of existing practices of heritage construction and identity mediation set within the multi-scalar engagements of a cosmopolitan framework, one that resists the enforcement of basic dualisms such as national/international and domestic/foreign (Meskell 2009a, 2009b). This framework proposes instead the establishment of conversations across boundaries (Appiah 2006), as we recognize that the local and its material culture exist in the context of – and interaction with – the global sphere, and identity categories are blurred and in flux (Insoll 2007).

Qatar’s rapid urbanization and emergence on to the international stage present an example of just such a complex context for heritage and identity construction. In Qatar numerous large-scale heritage projects are under way – such as the construction of a new National Museum – whose role it is to encapsulate and present Qatari cultural identity and heritage to the world. The broad-brush nature of these high-profile projects, shaped by Western heritage discourse and foreign expertise, conceals the intricate and multi-layered nature of heritages and identities in the State. These are tied to lineage, social structures and traditions which persist beneath the ‘modern’ surface, and are to all intents and purposes invisible – to the non-Qatari visitor or resident (Fromherz 2012, 4–6, 20).

This article forms an introductory element of a study of the construction of contemporary Qatari heritage and identity, problematizing state-level heritage construction and seeking to locate and identify locally constructed and branded Qatari heritage conceptions and practices. The aim of this article is to address the heritage discourse of Qatar in its contemporary socio-political context, in order to identify the challenges of debating the construction, management and role of heritage in the nation. It begins by tracing the nature of the heritage discourse in the wider region, considering the relevance of the heritage debates centering on the Middle East, the construction and deconstruction of monolithic ‘Gulf’ or ‘Arab’ heritage identities and the cultural processes taking place in the Arabian Peninsula. The discourse of Qatari heritage is then set in its historical trajectory, considering the emergence of the familiar spheres of archaeology and museums and their institutions, and also touching on other less debated constructions of heritage that reflect the complexity of this nation’s identity, such as the negotiation of a strong oral tradition in the performance of past and present identity. At the core, this review also questions what the coherent ‘unit of heritage’, if any, should be for Qatar in cultural debates, as the authors wish to avoid delimiting strict boundaries for the development and growth of the emergent locally particular discourse. Finally, this article briefly proposes methodological and theoretical obstacles that should be considered for the study of cultural heritage in this particular context, as the starting point and incentive for more developed research in this area. Research into heritage practices in the Gulf is still in its infancy, and this article aims to define the challenges, outline the debate and propose avenues of enquiry, rather than offer immediate solutions. The complexity of the heritage landscape also allows only a summary presentation of it within the space of this contribution.
The location of Qatari heritage discourses

Academic writing on heritage in the Middle East has tended to exclude the Arabian Peninsula due to limited Western heritage research in this region or to impose publication restraints that exclude the Gulf region (e.g. Pollock and Bernbeck 2005). The omission is rarely referred to or explained, with the result that the Arabian Peninsula has become absorbed by implication into the much broader ‘Middle East’ heritage debates, despite the distinct historical, geographical, cultural and ethnographic differences that exist across this huge region. Qatar is one of seven states located on the Arabian Peninsula (see Fig. 1) along with Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, the United Arab Emirates, Oman and Yemen. These states are also part of the Gulf, a territory that physically surrounds the Arabian or Persian Gulf (see Abdi 2007) including Iran. To the north of the Peninsula are Iraq, Jordan and Syria, which are not traditionally (in academic writing) designated as part of the Gulf, but form part of the broader (and blurred) cultural and geographical entity, the ‘Middle East’. The Middle East can refer in its broadest sense to the vast territory stretching from North Africa to Iran, Turkey and even Afghanistan, and including the Arabian Gulf States, but in academic writing tends to be limited to North Africa, the Eastern Mediterranean, Iraq (see, for example, Pollock and Bernbeck 2005), and sometimes Iran (see, for example, Goode 2007). The cultural debates of the Arabian Peninsula nation-states have also been located within the ethnically framed regionalism of the Arab World and the imagined religious boundaries of the Islamic World, although these regional definitions feature less prominently in publications relevant to heritage. It is evident that, within each of these overlapping regions, the heritage discourse has been characterized in a number of different ways, which we review next, citing a selection of typical publications.

Figure 1 Map showing the location of Qatar in the Middle East.
The Middle East

The Middle East in its narrow definition has been the focus of intense Western interest since Napoleon’s mission to Egypt at the end of the eighteenth century, triggering waves of ‘Egyptomania’ in Europe (Brier 1992; Cole 2007); subsequently, colonial rule facilitated the work of predominantly European archaeological missions in the region. In this legacy, the Middle Eastern heritage discourse is one of colonial archaeological practice and Orientalism (Said 1978; Steiner 2010), with a significant preference for cultural-historical approaches (Bernbeck and Pollock 2005a), resulting in a failure to partake fully in contemporary theorizing in archaeology and heritage. Several authors have raised awareness of colonially enforced boundaries within this wide region, as they impose cartographies on issues of heritage, contested identities, nationalism and politics (Meskell 1998a). These mapping practices have prevailed, for example, with the enforcement of ‘Mesopotamia’ as one such discursive formation left over from the colonial production of knowledge (Bahrani 1998). Other regional definitions of the Middle East that respond to longstanding academic queries have constructed sub-regions which further complicate the issue of locating a heritage discourse in abstract chronological time: the Near East, the Fertile Crescent, the Levant, ‘Biblical’, etc. (Bernbeck and Pollock 2005b). As Scham has argued, we have to consider that these ‘pasts’ are radically different versions of the same archaeological record adjusted for different audiences (Scham 2009, 172). The matter of choosing a working geographical scale is evidently more complex than it initially appears. It can be argued that the heritage discourse in the Middle East has created its own cartography, as specific heritage issues influence the assimilation of nations into clusters of a perceived similar nature.

The contemporary heritage discourse of this narrowly defined Middle East focuses on the role of cultural heritage in conflict and nationalism in a post-colonial context, a focus that is derived primarily from a history and contemporary reality of conflict that at times appears to be endemic to the region. For example, Meskell’s edited volume Archaeology under Fire: Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East (1998b) addresses this region as one of the most politically charged yet formative ones for the emergence of archaeology. Pollock and Bernbeck’s Archaeologies of the Middle East: Critical Perspectives (2005) recognizes this region as one that is home to continuing violent conflicts, conditions which shape how archaeological knowledge is produced and used. Archaeology, politics and nation-building form another key theme in the academic ‘Middle Eastern’ heritage discourse, focusing primarily on Iraq, Iran, Turkey and Egypt (see, for example, Bernhardsson 2005; Boytner, Dodd and Parker 2010; Goode 2007).

The history and structuring of archaeological practice in the Middle East has become a recent area of reflection, focusing on ethical concerns such as asymmetric working relations rooted in a colonial past (see, for example, Quirke [2010] on colonial archaeological practice in Egypt), the operation of archaeological salvage in the face of economic development projects and the navigation of repressive regimes (Steele 2005). Both Goode (2007) and Steele (2005) have raised important points on the epistemology of local heritage discourses for the Middle Eastern region, considering the ease with which Western expert opinion is accepted and incorporated into the heritage structures of these nations (Steele 2005, 59), and the associated issue of the marginalized education and training of local archaeologists (Goode 2007, 9), a practice not encouraged in the early institutionalization of archaeology as a locally relevant discipline, and that should be considered an influencing force that shapes authority today.
The foci that bind together existing regional debates may not apply to the context of the Arabian Peninsula, which has traditionally had less relevance to the themes of violence, conflict and post-colonial contestation that underlie much of the literature, though politics and nation-building are, since the formation of the Gulf States in 1971, directly relevant. However, the First Gulf War (1990) drew one of the Arabian Peninsula States, Kuwait, into the rhetoric of heritage and conflict, but the emphasis in the heritage discourse surrounding this event remains on the archaeology of Iraq as the ‘cradle of civilization’. A global focus on the potential and actual impact of the war on archaeological remains and the centrality of archaeology in the media in general suggests that ‘media stories about the place of archaeology in the Gulf drew on a more general cultural climate of thought about the past, [and] the Arab’ (Pollock and Lutz 1994, 266), strategically drawing ancestral ties between Iraq’s archaeology and ‘our’ civilization, and a presupposed world-wide scale of value that sees both oil and archaeological artifacts as international commodities. This overarching regional discourse effectively engulfed the Arabian Peninsula in a monolithic moral concern with the fate of what can be perceived to be the cradle of civilization (Pollock and Lutz 1994).

In searching for the emergence of a distinct Arabian Peninsula heritage discourse, it has been suggested that cultural tourism was not a recognized driving force of the heritage industry in the region, as it has been in other parts of the world, due to an earlier feeling that these countries were lacking in cultural attractions (Ritter 1986), a claim that still lingers today in some imaginations of the region. This could be considered one of the reasons why heritage as a resource has taken some time to be debated, as tourism focused instead on the consumption and production of modern attractions in these emerging cities (El Amrousi and Biln 2010; Daher and Dallen 2009; Stephenson and Ali-Knight 2010). In addition, it is only in recent decades that these heritage debates have featured in the English-language international literature. Discussions unanimously identify a turning point in the trajectory of a heritage awareness and awakening of tradition associated with the advent of modernization brought about by the oil revolution and a sedentarization of the nomadic tribes (Cole 2003; Khalaf 2000) from the 1960s. The shape of the early heritage discourse became associated with debates firmly attached to two cultural resources: an emphasized and imagined intangibility of Bedouin material culture as it is increasingly commoditized (Wooten 1996) and the array of archaeological Islamic and pre-Islamic heritage that is produced in excavations across the region (Milwright 2010; Potts 1998).

Ethnographies of memory have begun to document the contemporary experience of the unstable present and the idealization of a pre-oil ‘flattened past’ (Limbert 2010, 11). A national heritage industry has emerged as a result of a need to perform uniquely Arabian cultural expressions, performances presented in the emerging academic literature as forming part of ‘invented traditions’ (Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983) aimed at embedding authenticity in the modern nation-state (Khalaf 2002). Ethnographically informed work has focused, for example, on the revival of authentic regional practices such as camel racing and poetry (Khalaf 2000), falconry (Wakefield 2012) and pearl-diving (Khalaf 2008), as well as performances of dance, music and storytelling (Picton 2010). ‘The Bedouin’ is a key interlocutor in the heritage imaginations of the region, as they represent the marginalization of a pre-existing ecology and livelihood, the stakeholders of legitimate ancestries and an authentic cosmology that need to be performed (Peutz 2011), though the heritage representation of the ‘Bedouin’ as a single group
from the past ignores complex tribal and ethnic differences (Daher and Dallen 2009, 154). It has been argued that the greatest challenge faced by these nations is the adequate institutionalization of a culture, tradition and heritage that are strongly rooted in oral transmission and intangible practices (Picton 2010, 82).

The nation-states of the Arabian Peninsula are now becoming openly and aggressively involved in the preservation, representation and invention of their own individual and distinct tangible national culture and heritage. The heritage emphasis in the region is on architectural restoration projects (Boussaa 2006; Picton 2010), re-imaginings of indigenous architectural styles (Alraouf 2010a; El Amrousi and Biln 2010; Boussaa 2006; Steiner 2010) and the proliferation of large-scale museums such as Abu Dhabi’s Guggenheim and Louvre projects (Doherty 2012; Elsheshtawy 2011, 288–98). Early museums in the region focused on archaeology and ethnography – the first museums in Bahrain (1971), Saudi Arabia (1974) and Qatar (1975) were national museums that recorded the ancient and recent past side by side, and expressed, for example, the ‘essential, historical character of the region...to provide a national framework for the history of Saudi Arabia’ (Rice 1994, 58). Although often designed and populated by Western archaeologists and ethnographers (though in Qatar, a committee of Qatari nationals was appointed to create the first National Museum’s ethnographic collection), these museums were determinedly local in their agenda of capturing and presenting traditional life-ways and archaeology (Al-Far n.d.). The recent development of large-scale and national museum projects in these same states has taken a very different course, and the new museums are now regarded as representing a ‘regime of globalisation’ (Fibiger 2011, 189) and a form of secular modernity that excludes the singularity of the local – which can include religious heritage, as discussed by Fibiger in relation to the protests surrounding the approach to Bahrain’s heritage in the Bahrain National Museum (opened in 1988). In essence, the heritage discourse in relation to museums on the Arabian Peninsula has developed from one that presents heritage as a balance to the threat of globalization to one that embraces global and transnational forms. For example, the Louvre Abu Dhabi, part of the Saadiyet Island culture and leisure complex that also includes the Guggenheim and the Zayed National Museum, the latter in development with the British Museum, defines its approach as ‘universal’ (Louvre Birth of a Museum website; Des Cars 2013), with a number of commentators suggesting that such an approach may be at the expense of local heritage conceptions (Batty 2012; Ouroussoff 2010).

More recent research is dedicated to disassembling/deconstructing a monolithic ‘Gulf identity’, and to further complicating the negotiation of each national identity and heritage in itself, uncovering the cultural dynamics that exist within each one, in order to construct the presented national ethos (Fibiger 2011; Limbert 2010). This is particularly relevant where national identity faces the challenge of negotiating historical allegiances to a tribal structure, and a coherent national unity, as has been discussed in relation to the United Arab Emirates (Heard-Bey 2005). The social landscape behind heritage revival interests in these states includes a recognized and, in terms of numbers, dominant expatriate community as both an agent in decision-making roles and a presence against which authentically local cultures aim to define themselves (Khalaf 2005).

There is a noted shortage of contributions in the academic heritage literature that focus specifically on Qatar – most recent writings dedicated to heritage construction in the Arabian Peninsula focus on the UAE, Bahrain and, to a lesser degree, Oman. The fact of these discrepancies has been addressed by Potts (1998), who has discussed comparatively the
different archaeological legacies of the Middle Eastern region, outlining the key role that
different colonial histories have had in the development of scholarly traditions for individual
nations. He explains how the trajectory of archaeological and heritage resources was established
in association with foreign scholarly interventions associated with the mandates of the Ottoman
Empire, the British and French, resulting in the relative lateness of such developments in states
such as Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Kuwait. The noted lack of Western-led research and academic
literature does not therefore equate to a lack of heritage in Qatar but rather to the broader geo-
political context; in addition, the role of the media should be acknowledged in shaping public
knowledge and opinion in relation to archaeology and heritage, defining and promoting local
and global views (Pollock 2005). This is a context that gains increasing relevance in the Gulf as
contemporary relationships between the West and Islamic nations vary in intensity, a mediated
representation of constructed opposites (Said 1981) that should be seen as having noticeable
effects on cosmopolitan negotiations of identity in the region and the inclusion of the Gulf
region into global heritage networks (see Rico forthcoming).

The construction of heritage in Qatar

Qatar became an independent sovereign state in 1971 with the withdrawal of the British, who
had administered Qatar as one of its protectorates since 1916, and Qatar’s declaration of
independence from the federation of seven emirates that now comprises the United Arab
Emirates. Development as a result of natural gas and oil revenues was – and still is – fast-
paced, creating a form of urban modernity which brought with it a vast influx of immigrant
workers at all levels to manage Qatar’s oil, gas and other commercial industries and infra-
structure. This led to an almost immediate desire to preserve a way of life and a cultural identity,
or identities, that were changing fast. In Qatar, as in other newly wealthy Gulf States, a single
generation separates two distinct lifestyles, resulting in feelings of anxiety and a desire for
preservation of ‘the past’ on the part of the older generation and a lack of knowledge of this
earlier lifestyle on the part of the younger generation – for example, in interviews, Sheikh Faisal
Bin Qassim Al Thani, the owner of the eponymous private museum in Qatar, speaks openly
about his desire to hold on to the past through the collecting of objects, with the further aim of
educating the younger generation through these objects about Qatar’s history (see Exell forth-
coming). As a result of such rapid development, the 1970s saw the emergence of the concept of
framing, and fixing, this earlier cultural identity as ‘heritage’. In Qatar and the surrounding Gulf
States early state-level heritage practice took a similar form, with, as noted above, the construc-
tion of national museums that presented local archaeology and ethnography.

Qatar’s national museum was opened in 1975 in an old royal palace, and included a display
of archaeology, Bedouin ethnographic material and material relating to the pearling industry,
complete with a lagoon with dhows, and an aquarium. As with the national museums in Bahrain
(1971) and Saudi Arabia (1974), the material had been gathered by foreign archaeologists who
had been working in the region since the 1950s (Rice 1994), and who had begun to bring
ethnographers with their teams (Fibiger 2011, 190; Rice 1994, 56–8). In the 1960s, the Qatari
government invited Beatrice de Cardi, a British archaeologist with experience in the region, to
gather material for the proposed national museum that would tell the story of Qatar from the
start of the Neolithic (c. 6000–5000 BC)1 to the present day. The new national museums served
two purposes: to construct a distinct national identity linked to the past and to preserve a changing lifestyle; both these purposes were deemed necessary as the new nation-states differentiated themselves from one another and strove for unique national identities while simultaneously struggling to pin down a cultural identity that was evolving out of all recognition. The concept of creating a linear narrative that linked the current rulers to a long history of progress and technological evolution, and of displaying existing lifeways as ‘heritage’, are established heritage paradigms that were rapidly deployed without consideration of alternative paradigms of heritage representation more closely aligned to local cultural practices. As a result, the museum as the place of representation with its single authoritative narrative went unchallenged as a model of heritage representation in Qatar and the surrounding Gulf States. In retrospect, and forty years on, it seems that the museum effected a conceptual change on methods of presenting and validating local identity. The living culture, under the anthropological gaze induced by the museum setting, became automatically situated in a past timeframe and homogenized through the presentation of ‘typical’ and ‘authentic’ artifacts that synthesized local culture as heritage (see Lionnet [2006, 93–4] on a similar situation in African ethnographic museums).

In 1980 the Qatar National Museum won the Agha Khan award for restoration and rehabilitation of Islamic architecture (Alraouf 2010b), which sparked a wave of restorations of examples of what have become known as ‘heritage buildings’ in Doha, buildings dating from the late nineteenth–mid-twentieth century which reflect a local architectural style and use, such as pearl merchants’ houses and the main souq, Souq Waqif. From the late 1980s the Restoration Department (which now forms part of the Qatar Museums Authority) restored a number of mosques and other buildings in coordination with the Ministry of Awqaf (endowments) and Islamic Affairs ‘according to the artistic standards of building’s restoration’ (Qatar Museums Authority 2011). As with cultural identity, the vernacular architecture of Qatar was deemed under threat from rapid urban development and the reshaping of the city. During the 1970s plans for reshaping Doha were produced by Llewelyn Davies Weeks (the ring roads) and William Pereira (the corniche); the crescent-shaped corniche now connects the Museum of Islamic Art and the new high-rise business and residential district of West Bay. In 2004 the newly-restored Souq Waqif opened as a downtown hub of restaurants, cafes and shops. Its partially adapted reuse has been successful in terms of visitor numbers and mixed Qatari and expatriate use, while the nature of the restoration, which followed a number of different architectural styles and mixed modern with original materials, has been contested in some heritage debates in Doha (Boussaa, per. comm., 18 April 2012).

Alongside restorations of ‘heritage’ buildings dating to the pre-1950s there has been a recent interest in the creation of what has been called a ‘new architectural language… created to counteract the depletion of Qatar’s unique cultural and architectural heritage’ (Msheireb Properties 2012a) as part of the 31-hectare downtown redevelopment of the area next to Souq Waqif, the ‘Heart of Doha’ project, by Msheireb Properties, a real-estate company and subsidiary of the Qatar Foundation for Education, Science and Community Development (otherwise known as Qatar Foundation or QF), a private, chartered non-profit organization founded in 1995 by decree of his Highness Sheikh Hamad bin Khalifa al-Thani. The Msheireb Properties website describes the architectural style as follows: ‘The new language will be used to create buildings of a shared DNA, reviving local heritage and culture through a unified architectural idiom’ (Msheireb Properties 2012b). The ‘new architectural language’ project is led by Timothy...
Makower, a British architect with an interest in heritage architecture; his project in Doha can be seen as a version of the work of the architects Makiya Associates and John Harris in Muscat which aimed at creating a ‘new “Arab” architecture’ (El Amrousi and Biln 2010, 256–7) which presented a homogenized version of the complex Islamic histories of the city. In Dubai, adaptive re-use of the Bastakia area has been unsuccessful in attracting Emirates to live in the area – their contemporary domestic needs are not met by the design of the restored heritage houses (Boussaa 2006). While many Qatars support the concept of heritage preservation, this is over-shadowed by a more generic Western sentimentality about the preservation of the built environment, which fails to recognize or value Qatar’s current global and urban agenda. Heritage preservation forms a part of the 2030 Qatar National Vision, a government framework for economic, cultural and social development drafted in 2008; in the Vision document, heritage preservation is balanced against the need for progress, a local necessity for economic development and sustainability (General Secretariat for Development Planning 2008, 3), listing the first of five key balancing challenges as ‘[m]odernization and preservation of traditions’ (see El Amrousi and Biln 2010, 256).

In 1995 Sheikh Hamad bin Khalifa Al Thani became Emir when he seized power from his father, Khalifa bin Hamad Al Thani, in a peaceful coup d’état. The remaining decade and the 2000s saw an increased focus on heritage developments within the context of the development of a globally recognizable national identity, which sought to present Qatar as the heart of Islamic culture and to develop Qatar as a tourist destination. In 1998 the Supreme Council of Culture, Arts and Heritage was formed, followed by the establishment of the Qatar Tourist Authority in 2000. Qatar Museums Authority was established in 2005, and in 2008 the Museum of Islamic Art opened, housed in a building designed by the architect I. M. Pei based on the ninth-century AD Ibn Tulun mosque in Cairo. In December 2010 Mathaf: Arab Museum of Modern Art opened, housed in a refurbished school building on the outskirts of the campus of Hamad Bin Khalifa University, the location of most foreign universities in Doha. These museums, and the new National Museum due to open in 2016 in a building designed by the architect Jean Nouvel (which encloses within its design the original National Museum building), are part of the ‘regime of globalization’ which sees heritage as a transnational rather than local phenomenon, emphasizing global Islam and the Arab world as a homogeneous whole: where the original national museum documented and preserved something that once was, the new museums construct something that will be.

Archaeological activity in Qatar reflects the trajectory from preservation of the local (for example, De Cardi’s work in the 1960s and 1970s) to the creation of the global. Qatar has few well-known archaeological sites other than the eighteenth-century pearling town of Zubara, located on Qatar’s north coast. In the 1980s this was excavated by a Qatari team (Al-Kholafi 1987) and again in 2002–3. In 2008 the site was added to the UNESCO World Heritage Tentative List, alongside the Khor Al-Adaid Nature Reserve. In 2009 the Qatar Islamic Archaeology and Heritage Project (QIAH), a joint QMA/University of Copenhagen ten-year research, conservation and heritage project was initiated, to investigate the archaeological site, preserve its remains and work towards the presentation of the site to the public. In 2012 an application by QMA to UNESCO to inscribe Zubara on the World Heritage List was referred, and will be resubmitted in due course. Through its association with the ruling Al-Thani family, Zubara as an archaeological site has made the transition from representing Qatar’s local heritage to validating the lineage of the current ruling family, and finally as a desired World Heritage site.
has become a symbolic authorization of Qatar’s presence on the world heritage stage. Today additional archaeological projects are under way in Qatar, driven by Western interest and funded by Qatari heritage agendas, which recognize the global interest in the archaeological past. For example, in 2012 UCL Qatar received funding from the Qatar National Research Fund (QNRF) Qatar National Research Priorities stream for a three-year project to excavate areas of downtown Doha, and Birmingham University (UK) is working with QMA on a five-year project to survey and record land and marine territories to the south of Doha (the Qatar National Historical Environment Record project – QNHER).

Documenting Qatar’s heritage is currently the focus of a number of academic research projects. In 2010 the Qatar Foundation signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the British Library for a four-year project to digitize and translate documents dating back to the eighteenth century. The same year, the Qatar Unified Imaging project, based at Virginia Commonwealth University in Qatar (VCUQ), which aims to document and digitize Qatari histories (including corporate and personal archives and oral histories) received funding under the QNRF Qatar National Research Priorities funding stream. In 2011 another QNRP heritage-focused project, Visualizing Qatar’s Past, received funding to build up a visual record of Qatar’s archaeological and heritage sites, again based at VCUQ. These recording projects follow established Western methodologies of documenting, classifying and ordering, which, though necessary, can lead to the replacement of one set of culturally specific meanings with new meanings through re-contextualization. In addition, while the documenting of archives, sites and oral histories creates an essential resource for further research in certain areas, it does not create a representative archive of the entirety of heritage practice and conceptions in Qatar, whose forms may elude such methods of documentation.

**Conclusion: discussing heritage as modernity (and modernity as heritage)**

‘Every culture...has a certain point in history beyond which the past is simply the past....In most cultures, that point is located several centuries before the present: in Qatar more or less anything that happened before 1950 belongs to legend’ (Raban [1979] 1987, 83). Writing in 1979, Jonathan Raban also records a visit to the first National Museum in Doha where he observed Qatari nationals looking at mannequins in traditional Qatari costume:

Did these women come each week to look in the mirror of the museum to reassure themselves that they really existed? The city outside had a quality of terrifying volatility; but the waxworks remained comfortably the same, the only genuinely stable figures in a world that was speeding too fast and too far.

(Raban [1979] 1987, 82)

These quotes suggest two avenues of enquiry in the study and further discussion of Qatari heritage. On one hand, the historical and contemporary context of rapid change in Qatar can be said to lead to an uncertainty about heritage identity exacerbated by the perception of some pasts as ‘legend’. However, this perception has to be put in context of the dominant heritage discourse that continues to be firmly attached to a tangible, often monumental, and historical past, and less
able to assimilate and validate the authenticity of oral histories and living practices (Smith 2006, 2009). In addition, a homogeneous, timeless, ‘legendary’ past serves to conceal potentially contradictory and politically awkward tribal histories which might conflict with the Al-Thani right to rule (Fromherz 2012, 2). On the other hand, it demands that the emergence and operation of a national heritage discourse is framed beyond simply a nationalist construction of heritage, and located instead in a framework that considers heritage as interacting with an intense process of modernity – not in opposition to it, but considering modernization as part of the legitimate heritage assemblage. In short, the Qatari heritage developments present a unique opportunity to ask, how is the heritage associated with the rapid change of intense modernization conceptualized and embedded culturally and transformed into different forms of authentic tradition, rather than simply placed as heritage ‘at risk’ due to the rapidly shifting contexts within and around it?

Heritage in Qatar has gone through a number of conceptual changes since the 1970s, which saw the initial creation of a state-specific ‘national heritage’, in the face of fast-paced economic development and urbanization, in the form of a national museum which presented the recent past as frozen ethnography. The ‘regime of globalization’ evident in Qatar’s heritage activities over the last twenty years and active today is evident in the increased involvement with international heritage bodies such as UNESCO and ICOM. In November 2011 Qatar was elected to the World Heritage Committee of UNESCO at the 18th General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, and in May 2012 Qatar rejoined ICOM. In 2010 Doha was chosen as Arab Capital of Culture, an initiative undertaken by UNESCO, under the Cultural Capitals Program to promote and celebrate Arab culture and so encourage cooperation in the Arab region. This stimulated a huge number of cultural projects, including the development of Katara, the cultural village which hosts art galleries, an opera house and restaurants, and was the location of the first Doha-Tribeca Film Festival in October 2011, Katara’s soft opening, prior to the site’s formal opening.

Preliminary investigation for this project suggests that, as has been observed in other nations of the wider Middle Eastern region, the conception of heritage in Qatar is negotiated at multiple levels of agency and imagined constructions, somewhere between the tangible and intangible realms of narrative. Such a complex discursive terrain presents unique challenges to the study and discussion of heritage issues, and has to be charted using a combination of methods that transcend the government-sponsored discourses about Qatari heritage that currently predominate. Ethnographic work has been successfully used elsewhere to navigate these challenges, for example, the documentation of discourses and practices of turath in Jordan (Jacobs and Porter 2009), where the mechanics of heritage result in unevenly distributed discourses across social landscapes (Jacobs and Porter 2009, 84). This approach aims to resist the formulaic view that assumes that state-sponsored heritage discourses will become a totalizing discourse across passive constituents, giving special significance, for example, to familiar research grounds, such as personal collection, as an articulation of ‘tradition’ that embodies practiced heritage relations.

In September–October 2012 the exhibition Mal Lawal curated by QMA at the Al-Riwaq exhibition hall in downtown Doha displayed a large number of private collections alongside an extensive royal collection, in an exhibition designed to reflect the concept of the majlis, the traditional gendered receiving room in a Qatari house, with seating areas in traditional designs. The form and content of these collections embodies a singular aspect of (predominantly male)
Qatari cultural identity, with a focus on weapons, technology and copies of the Quran. One of the heritage house museums that forms part of the Msheireb Properties ‘Heart of Doha’ development, Bayt Jalmud, which will tell the story of slavery in Qatar and the region, has embraced a design based on the domestic space it inhabits, and will utilize the concept of the ‘host’ in communicating the story, in order to present a difficult heritage in a familiar environment. Throughout Qatar’s history of heritage development there has been a strong Western influence on a variety of scales, from archaeologists and ethnographers creating stories of local identity to heritage professionals and architects creating Qatar’s global Islamic brand. The alternative models of heritage that are emerging are still influenced by Western input, but in a manner that works in dialogue with indigenous Qatari heritage conceptions and lifeways. For example, as argued in this paper, Qatar has been witness to an emerging awareness among both Western heritage specialists and Qatari nationals that there is an alternative to the global model of heritage representation.

As a way forward, we propose thinking beyond Orientalist binaries that aim to locate the heritage narratives within or without a particular region and a heritage discourse that seeks to find coherence within established Western heritage constructs. Rather, it is more fitting to address this negotiation within a cosmopolitan framework that resists viewing the local as a construction of the global, i.e. Western perspectives, electing instead to consider the arrangement of complex alliances that crosscut the global, national and local categories proposed by cosmopolitan heritage approaches exemplified in recent debates over the location of the local voice at the archaeological site of Çatalhöyük in Turkey (Hodder 2009, 184–6). Equally, regional discussions need to move beyond debates that situate regional cultural developments as reacting in unison or against the phenomenon of a branded modernization, as theorized in relation to the phenomenon of fast-growing regional urban centers through concepts of ‘Dubaization’ (Alraouf 2006) and ‘Dohaization’ (Alraouf 2008), which threaten to become the monolithic heritage focus of the Arabian Peninsula. In this paper, we have argued instead that only recently have the nations of the Arabian Peninsula been featured in distinct debates that distinguish themselves from the regional and often monolithic ‘Middle Eastern’ foci, with discussions that address the key role of heritage construction at different official levels, pinpointing the need for more in-depth studies that address the non-official heritage narratives that may complement or resist them. The way forward is to continue to identify the unique trajectories of these nations in consideration of, and beyond, regionalisms that inevitably establish centre and periphery hierarchical dynamics.

One of the greatest challenges in these emerging debates is the formulation of a theoretical framework that is able to recognize, accommodate, encompass and reflect the variety of heritage dialogues and practices that exist in Qatar, and may provide a methodological framework for researching the wider Arabian Peninsula, its histories and heritages. Such methodologies can include, but not be limited to, oral histories, the accommodation of contradictory testimonies, a recognition of local forms of authority and witness, written works in Arabic and visual documentation. Such alternative and locally shaped methodologies will help emphasize that just because many aspects of Qatari heritage do not take a form easily recognized by traditional Western academic method or fit within the boundaries of the ‘Middle Eastern’ heritage discourses this does not mean that there is no heritage in Qatar.
Note

1 These dates are estimates. As the National Museum is currently under construction, it is not possible to confirm whether this display also featured material from an earlier PPNB (Pre-Pottery Neolithic B).
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