

JMW-01ME-46

SOCIAL STUDIES OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

An Interactive Qualifying Project Report

Submitted to the Faculty


of the

WORCESTER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of Bachelor of Science

By



Timothy Nash



Ploypan Thongpradit

Date: May 3, 2005

Professor John M. Wilkes, Major Advisor

Authorship page

Timothy Nash: Introduction, Lewis Supplement, proof read

Ploypan Thongpradit: Methodology, India research -Knowledge for power, and role
playing game, References

Acknowledgments

Mohammad Abouezz

Table of Contents

Authorship page	2
Acknowledgments	3
Table of Contents	4
Introduction	5
Methodology	9
Project Summary	9
Goals.....	11
Strategy for implementing the final products	13
Research materials/ Literature reviews.....	14
Lewis Supplement Book Reviews.....	14
Orientalism:	15
Covering Islam:	15
Knowledge for Power Book Reviews	16
British Impact on India (Griffiths, Percival J, Sir)	16
Growing up in British India (Walsh, Judith E)	17
Reflections on Orientalism: George Orwell Colonial days (Said, Edward, Bresnahan, Roger [et al.], and Cohen Warren I, ed)	18
Interview.....	18
Final Products	18
Further Research Opportunity	19
Background Material	19
Lewis Supplement	27
Knowledge for Power	46
India History	47
East India Company	50
British India	53
India's Independence.....	57
Conclusion	59
India in the Role Playing Game	62
References	64

Introduction

In order to acquire an undergraduate degree at WPI, one must take at least two courses in the social sciences, which usually are recommended to be applicable to the student's prospective IQP. Professor Wilkes, a Sociology Professor in the Social Science Department at WPI currently teaches a 1000 level class which presents the very basic concepts of sociology. Given the prominence of the Middle East in current world politics, especially for Americans, it would be irresponsible not to deal with the Middle East, yet it will never get attention at WPI if "global studies" are tied to places WPI sends its students for project work. For this reason, he has made the first half of his class an introduction to macrosociology in which he presents some major concepts. Such concepts ultimately result in Western Europe emerging as the most "modernized" part of the world. The second half, he spends dealing with the Middle East, which is presented as the most resistant to modernization of the kind experienced by Europe. As a segway from conventional western sociology to this study of the Middle East as a counterexample foreign to their experience, Professor Wilkes asks that his students read a very controversial book titled What Went Wrong? The Clash Between Islam and Modernity in the Middle East by Bernard Lewis. This book is controversial for several reasons, all of which deserve attention. Wilkes' goal is to teach "critical thinking" and he wants the students to learn factual information from Lewis but not be fooled into believing Lewis's whole arguments. To get the fruit without the thorns, one must read the text with the mindset necessary to critically analyze a book which contains some esoteric material, which is based on 500 years of Islamic observation and interpretation of the infidel Christian West. From prior experience, as a member of the class one of the

authors is aware that this did not always work. Some students did indeed take Lewis's arguments as the truth. The Professor had all the students within the class write a critique of the book, and several did present a positive response. These students most likely felt "tricked" or "cheated" when Professor Wilkes examined the book in class over the next week and proved most of what Lewis wrote to be quite invalid and inconclusive or misleading. In short, this seductive, credentialed author was biased and politically motivated. This unpleasant feeling of having been "tricked" has the potential to destroy the student's remaining experience of the class, and sociology in general, unless it is handled with some dexterity.

To properly prepare future students for this experience, a twofold effort must be made. First, the students must understand what Lewis is analyzing; which in this case is Islamic culture. We do not intend to present an elaborate description of religious and cultural facts, but the intention is to present ideas of why so many Americans have invalid opinions of Islamic culture. This will at least get the students thinking about how much they really know about the Middle East even if they saw news reporters reporting bomb hits in Baghdad. This effort will hopefully sensitize them to the possibility that their pre-existing opinions of the Middle East, and Islam are subject to media bias. If it does not solve the problem, it will at least encourage the students to think twice about what they actually know or what the media present to them. Second, we must look at Lewis's arguments as a product of his own opinions, and not that of a politically neutral writer. By this, it is meant that Lewis is not writing for the general good of society, but is influenced in some way. Lewis's motivation can be understood by observing his blatant tendency to function as an Orientalist.

Lewis is criticized as being an Orientalist, which is one of the reasons why his book is so very controversial. His book takes certain views which are typical of the Orientalist, but do not do justice to the entirety of the debate with respect to why the Middle East was not able to “modernize” as the west (Western Europe) did. We intend to research and explore the meaning of Orientalism, for the purpose of analyzing What Went Wrong? by Bernard Lewis. Obviously, we do not want students reading about the book before they actually read it. Therefore, we will prove that Lewis is indeed an Orientalist, validating our effort, with an analysis of some of the key elements which enable us to make this judgment, and then summarize and explain the critical reading material for future students in preparation for Lewis’s book.

The book’s value has several dimensions; unfortunately, most of them are best understood by seeing the faults with Lewis’s arguments. By understanding these faults, the reader, being a beginning level student, or at least a student with little or no background in sociology, can understand sociology to a greater extent, and also improve critical reading skills.

It will be at the Professor’s discretion to choose whether or not the students are to read our analysis of Lewis’s tendency to write in an Orientalist fashion before or after reading the book by Lewis. We think of our work as a preparation for reading Lewis that should precede the experience. After the students read a brief introduction to Orientalism and related material, they will get more out of the read and not feel used or made to feel gullible or foolish. By related material, we mean that we intend to look closer at the source to which most of the incoming students gain their knowledge of the Middle East, and even more specifically, Islam. This source is indeed the media, and we intend to

uncover several generalizations and assumptions made about Islamic culture all starting with the media's covering of the United States Embassy in Teheran, Iran being held Hostage in 1979 and the oil shortage of the 70's. Once they know about Orientalism as a concept and know how it works, they are ready to "critically" read Lewis' book. This year, Professor Wilkes used the term but did not fully explain it.

The importance of analyzing Lewis' book is seen within its value as an example of a book which can be "critically" read, and yield important lessons. Not only will learning introductory sociology be beneficial, but the skills of analyzing a source, compiling a review, and finding ways to fill in the spaces left by the errors within the source, are also very valuable with respect to successfully completing an IQP, and in life in general. Our work will prepare the students so that they will not be misled by Lewis's eloquent presentation of historical facts. To overlook gaps in his argument they will begin the text with that which we are able to offer, and will hopefully keep it in mind while reading Lewis's book. If this is successful, then Professor Wilkes will be able to present some very striking ideas within sociology, which will incorporate the first half of the class into the analysis of the book. Before the students move on to the final section of the class (the role playing game), they will be equipped with a thorough introduction of major sociological concepts and relevant vocabulary, as well as a paramount critical reading experience. This reading experience develops new ideas, which uses ideas already learned to derive concepts which will enlighten students to the proper way to classify a society, detect a sociological issue, and to analyze the opinions and writing of others, even experts.

Finally, for reasons which will be discussed later, it is quite critical that a third element be presented in the class. Professor Wilkes spends much time on sociological basics, and then extends his lessons to the “modernization” process, or with respect to Western Europe, the Protestant Reformation. He then compares the results of this experience with the present Middle East. In an effort to avoid this dualistic approach to sociology, we will recommend that future cultural comparison classes incorporate a third entity, India. Technically, India is not a part of the Middle East, or Europe, but today is affected by both. We will present some relevant facts about India’s history, which will represent an example of knowledge for power. The British used their knowledge of India to help them conquer and transform India without much resistance from the inhabitants. We will not develop future lesson plans in detail, but will provide only a summary of important facts to support our arguments and so that there is enough to appropriately add India into the Role Playing Game. We want to add India into the Role Playing game because we feel that it will be interesting to see a point of view on modernization from another country that is not in the West or the Middle East.

Methodology

Project Summary

This project consists of two main intentions. First, this project was initiated by one of the student authors because he felt that Lewis’s arguments about what went wrong with the Islamic countries are invalid. In order to truly understand why Lewis’s book is so controversial, and cannot be used to understand the Islamic country’s difficulties with modernization, the students must come to understand why Lewis’s arguments are invalid. In the reading supplement we have prepared a discussion of the term Orientalism, which

is appropriate given that Lewis is suspected of following this concept while practicing scholarship. In addition to this, a discussion of the influences of the media on the general public's perception of the Middle East and Islamic culture in general is also presented. This section is highly relevant, for most of the student's initial opinions of Islamic Culture are most likely or most a result of media source like news channels, magazines etc.

Second, the project includes a research unit on India. This research was originally started in the hope of getting another set of examples of Orientalist scholarship. We intended to find a scholar of Indian life and culture, who like Lewis, also shows an Orientalist mindset. Unfortunately, we were unable to complete this task because we were not able to find a suitable author in time to complete the project on schedule. The goal for this section, then, turns toward the idea of knowledge for power. Britain spent over 150 years in India before it actually took complete control. Why did they take so long? What were their reasons and advantages to this rather slow imperial takeover process? The report will provide background information about India and Great Britain, and then show how knowledge leads to power, making Edward Said's point another way.

Another branch that can break off of this research on India is that we now can also have the option of adding India to the role playing game. The role playing game right now consists of many countries, but they are either members of Western Europe or the Middle East. Adding India to the game will broaden it, and can make the game more challenging for the students. It is quite obvious what the West wants from the Middle East and vice versa, but what about Asia? We do not hear about India from our nightly television as much as the Middle East. Some of the students may not recognize India and

its role in Asia and the world as much as they should. India will be a good addition to the game. By providing another option for the students to negotiate around, will make the game more exciting, and the experience of “cross-cultural” negotiation more worthwhile.

Goals

The following are the goals for this project to support our thesis, and improve the effectiveness of the course material.

Reading supplement

The final product will be in the form of a reading supplement pertaining to Orientalism and the media. As has already been described, certain events in the late 20th century resulted in a negative image of Islamic culture due primarily to media coverage. The supplement is to demonstrate that their current opinion of Islamic culture might not be as valid as they had assumed they were, since most of what students know about such politically relevant material come from the media.

Following what is to be a somewhat preliminary approach to limiting false conclusions about Islamic culture, the concept of Orientalism is introduced. The fundamentals of the philosophy behind what Edward Said calls Orientalism is vital to the effort which is extended to avoid having a reader, especially a young student, fall into the clutches of Lewis’s false conclusions regarding where the Middle East lies on the path to modernization in comparison to the Western world’s experience. The discussion of Orientalism becomes central to the ability to classify Lewis’s book as somewhat invalid in its conclusions, and influenced by factors external to scholarship. These factors outside of scholarship are those which create a complex relationship between a scholar

like Bernard Lewis and the media, which leads to the final, yet brief section of the supplement.

The remainder of the reading assignment intends to extend the readers mind into an area of political science and media policies without actually introducing any. The point to be made in this final section is that the media and scholars, politicians or anybody else with authority do indeed function together. As to whether which source of information presents first, is irrelevant. What is important is that the reader approaches a level of understanding of the media and an authority high enough to enable the consideration of cooperation between the two. This understanding should enable the reader to better fathom exactly why a noted scholar like Lewis might write something as inaccurate and invalid, as far as his conclusions about Islamic culture and modernization, as What Went Wrong?.

Knowledge for power of the British in India

The final product will be a report on how the British gained knowledge about India, and how they used the knowledge to gain more power in India. Students must know some history of both countries before understanding this paper. In the report, we've provided a brief summary of India's history. The background history will provide assistance to some students who are not competent in Asian history. The paper will discuss India's history, and how it gave an opportunity for Britain to gain control of India easily. The role of The East India Company will be discussed because it is the starting point of the British invasion in India. A brief history of the British people and their faith is added to the paper, in order to guide the reader toward the reason for innovations, and

discoveries in science. The history will give some examples of the British's image of themselves as superior than Indians. The effect on Indians of their presence in India, including what they've brought from the West will be discussed. This background information will provide the reader into thinking about how the British applied their knowledge, which led to power in India.

Strategy for implementing the final products

As discussed in the introduction, the work in this project on Orientalism will act as a guide, and give the students the ability to “red flag” statements made by Lewis while reading his book. Professor Wilkes will be addressing the class about the book, and give the students the reading supplement. The Professor will be assigning the student to read this supplement before and/or while they are reading What Went Wrong? as he feels necessary. It is intended that this supplement be combined with lecture material as to encourage thought on the subject and further investigation. The reading will reduce, if not completely free up the amount of time the Professor has to spend convincing the class that Lewis's conclusions are invalid. This will enable replacement lecture material, which will upgrade the quality of the class. As of the next time the Professor teaches the class, the material will be altered slightly in that a new small section on Orientalism might be covered. This section would only be intended for clarification of the reading. The supplement is meant to be concise, and providing only that which is vital to our argument. If the instructor feels the necessity to clarify the concepts of Orientalism, it is recommended that he extract the material from Said's book, titled Orientalism.

The research on knowledge for power of the Britain in India was mainly to support the idea of the Westerner mindset. It does not apply to the class as much, but it can be added to the role playing game in the second half of this course.

Strategy on how these works will be implemented to his lectures

Research materials/ Literature reviews

As an advisor for this project, Professor Wilkes provided advice to guide us into the right direction while researching for this project. We met once a week for three terms to discuss various topics, and go over our weekly progress.

WPI library database system-WPI library website provides an excellent database research for our project. We both used WPI Gordon Library website to search for the books we used in this project. We needed to borrow books from the interlibrary loan website because our project is focused on very specific topics.

Two books were used in conducting the research on India. Each of the books contributed to the project in different way; The British impact on India gives a solid background history of India, while Growing up in British India: Indian autobiographers on childhood and education under the Raj gives first hand stories from the people who were affected by the British colonization.

Lewis Supplement Book Reviews

The primary author of this material is Edward Said. In his past, Said has been Parr Professor of Comparative Literature at Columbia University, and Visiting Professor of the same field at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford, and Harvard. Said was also a Professor of English at Columbia University. He

has delivered lectures at Princeton, and in 1976 was the first ever to receive the annual Lionel Trilling Award given at Columbia University as a result of his book Beginnings: Intention and Method. Said seems to be the top source of the knowledge which we will need to properly supplement Lewis's Book. The two texts written by Said which we will use are Orientalism, written in 1978, which deals with the actual philosophy of Orientalism, and Covering Islam, written in 1981, which deals with the media's influence on how the West (specifically the United States) perceives the Middle East, and Islam in General.

Orientalism:

An elaborate derivation of the fundamentals of Orientalism is presented. Said begins by discussing some motivation of the study of another's culture, concentrating primarily on political influences. Some political figures of England are quoted, and their statements are analyzed. Said builds brick by brick a more philosophical idea of what Orientalism is. These concepts are applied to this effort in that they describe more precisely why Bernard Lewis's conclusions with respect to Islamic culture are premature and false, while the motivations of such poor scholarship are highly political, and encouraged by little more than the idea that one can claim superiority over another culture, simply by retaining much knowledge of the culture, and comparing it with their own.

Covering Islam:

Said discusses the tendency of the media to report the news in a fashion which not only delivers "facts" to viewers, but which also serves some higher power, primarily the mother country of the news channel, magazine, etc. Two primary examples are used to

demonstrate the validity of, and verify his thesis. These examples are the Oil shortage of the early 1970's and the hostage crisis of Teheran, Iran in the late 1970's. A thorough analysis of how the media tend to alter, and thereafter manipulate or control the public's consensus of some politically relevant ordeal, like those which he describes, makes this text vital to the current effort. This work is also very useful for it retains a theme which centers on the affects of the United States' media and the citizens interpretation of Islamic culture, which has a paramount importance in the current effort.

Knowledge for Power Book Reviews

British Impact on India (Griffiths, Percival J, Sir)

This book provides factual knowledge about India and Britain. The book started out by giving background history of India. The author describes Indian's society before the British's power came in. It explains the motivation of Britain for coming to India, how the East India Company was established, the Crown, politics and economics in India. Although the book includes politics, this research paper does not get involve with it as much. Politics is a big topic that can be researched into much more detail separately. This research paper focuses on the social and economic structures in India, rather than politics.

In terms of social structures, the author goes into detail about the Indian's diversity and its effects on the country. It talks about orthodox traditions in India and new traditions brought by the west; specific examples of culture clash and people's mindset when western thinking influenced them. The author discussed changes in India's economic pattern. Britain altered their production strategy, from self sufficient to mass

production. Technologies and medicine increased India's population growth. This book provides backbone information for the paper.

Growing up in British India (Walsh, Judith E)

This book was chosen as one of the sources for this research on India because this book contains autobiographers. It provides much information about the Indian cultures and traditions, which were affected by British rule. The book consisted of autobiographies from those who lived under the Raj. Their experiences are powerful tools in writing a research paper about foreign domination. These expressions and feelings are real and written with Indian's perspective, not westerner's. The reader's mindset when reading an autobiography is very different from reading something someone has already interpreted. The reader is able to directly connect to those individual's memory without going through another source.

These autobiographies allow the reader to go into detail on specific topics. This book allows the reader to go into specific detail about someone's past: father-son relationship, student-teacher relationship, Indian mother's role. It also provides information that is sensitive; one's inability to decide which tradition to follow and the consequences of following western cultures. This kind of information is useful as a guide for students who will be playing in the role playing game. Because these facts include feelings from the writer, the students will have an easier time getting an understanding of what the Indians went through during colonization of Britain.

Reflections on Orientalism: George Orwell Colonial days (Said, Edward, Bresnahan, Roger [et al.], and Cohen Warren I, ed)

This book provides an autobiography of George Orwell, a British man who was born in India and lived there for a short time when he was young. Then he left India to grow up in England. The book gave a brief history of his life in India as an English boy in an English school. In his autobiography, he explains his theory of why he thinks the British think that they are racially superior to Indians. His point of view gives a very interesting approach in trying to understand why the British would feel racially superior. His hypothesis is nothing that requires a lot of knowledge about the history or psychology, but it definitely gave an interesting way of looking at what the British were feeling while colonizing Indian people.

Interview

We interviewed Mohammad Aboulezz, an Egyptian graduate student at WPI, who was born and raised in Egypt until the age of 35. He gave us many insights and useful information on the topic of media's role, and how the media presents information to the public. We discussed with him in detail about the similarities between the Egyptian culture and other Islamic culture. We asked him questions to see his point of view toward the western culture with respect to his culture. The interview gave us a chance to listen to a Middle Easterner who has an experience in both cultures, which helped us expand our thinking to another level.

Final Products

Our final products were achieved. There was a change in goals on the topic of India as discussed earlier. The original goal was altered due to resources limitation. The

new goal was achieved by using already existed research materials from the original goal, but focused on a different topic to best fit the new goal.

Further Research Opportunity

As a result from this research project shows that there were not enough resources from Indian scholars to support, and be another example to our critique of Lewis for being an Orientalist. For future students' research, the student could try to find another scholar, and pick another country to defend the same argument; that Lewis is an Orientalist. Scholars of Egypt and Indonesia should be taken into considerations.

Another idea that will be great to improve the role playing game is to add India and Africa to the game. Right now, the game only has countries that are representing the West and the Middle East. The game becomes the West versus the Middle East. It will be extremely interesting to add India and Africa to the game. The students will be able to learn a lot more because these regions have very different interests, and they play different roles in the world. It will be an eye opening experience for some students who may not know much about those countries that are seldom on the US television and news.

Background Material

If we are to have students read about Orientalism, then we must show how valid it really is when discussing Lewis's book. It is quite interesting how truly blatant it is that Lewis is indeed an Orientalist. There are generally three ways of understanding the term Orientalist. First, an Orientalist is "Anyone who teaches, writes about, or researches the orient". This is true for any profession, as long as it pertains to understanding the orient. Some examples may be a historian, sociologist, or anthropologist (Orientalism 2). Second, an Orientalist is anybody who practices a style of thought which makes the

distinction between the orient and the occident, or more specifically the east and the west. This might be quite striking for some, for several practices using this very distinction without question, including prominent politicians, philosophers, economists and novelists. Several of their elaborate theories are based on this very idea (Orientalism 2). The third and the most specific understanding of the term is one which is more historically relevant. Edward Said defines this third form of Orientalism as “A Western [intellectual] style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the orient” (Orientalism 3).

It should be obvious that Lewis is an Orientalist of the first two forms mentioned. However, recognizing him as a classic example of the third form of an Orientalist that Said deplors might not seem so obvious to a student new to the field. Some encouragement to label Lewis as this most critical form of an Orientalist is how he so regularly renders Islamic culture inferior to “Western” culture through the use of esoteric historical knowledge of Turkey and the Ottoman Empire. For example, in the book, Lewis says, “During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries clocks figure with increasing frequency, first among the gifts presented to European embassies and companies to Middle Eastern monarchs and notables, and then as articles of commerce. Maintenance and repair of these unfamiliar devices were of course a problem, and all too often, when clocks for one reason or another ceased to function, they were neglected and abandoned.” (Lewis 124). This statement consists of a direct comparison of “Westerners” to those within the Middle East (Muslims) in terms of their capacity to create and care for a “complex” technology like clocks and watches. Even though this statement may not seem to deserve any red flags, the fact that these kinds of comparisons

appear very often in his book makes all of them separately and together critical to our decision to classify Lewis as an Orientalist. Another such statement made by Lewis which implies superiority and is stated via condescending language is, “Western help was not limited to diplomacy. Military help—the supply of weapons, even the financing of purchases, were old and familiar, going back beyond the beginnings of the Ottoman state to the time of the crusades.” (Lewis 19). It is not the intent of this discussion to regurgitate excerpts from the text, but it is extremely relevant that it is noted that Lewis, by the definition of Orientalism, and by his writing tendencies, can very easily be classified as an Orientalist with considerable justification.

Further encouragement to classify Lewis as this most critical form of an Orientalist appears when the potential reader first picks up the book and reads the title; upon this action, the conclusion should come readily. The title, What Went Wrong?, should raise some questions. First, the reader should ask: what’s the problem? To motivate the question, which is the title of Lewis’s book, one must observe a significant magnitude of disappointment, surprise, or in other words, a result not equivalent to that which was anticipated. But then, you read a statement written below the title on the front cover: *The Clash Between Islam and Modernity in the Middle East*. So, the problem is now identified; however, the way the statement is made, it implies that something within Islam went wrong. Also, to look closer at the problem, Islam and modernity clash, and thus the Middle East is unable to modernize because it is Islamic. If the reader were to look at the rest of the world, they would see that it is only the West which has modernized due to internally derived social dynamics and its own economic capacity. The rest of the modernized world was colonized or did so to avoid falling under western

imperial or economic control. To elaborate on this, it was only the west which was given the social force to modernize. This social force was the Protestant Reformation.

Businessmen and scientists now were carrying out duties in the name of God; scientists, like Sir Isaac Newton, now conducting experiments to learn about nature, physics, or more specifically, God, for if God created the world, to more about his creation, is effectively the same as knowing more about God. These are a few of the details of the Protestant Reformation and spurt to capitalism and science. Also, with the Protestant religion incorporating the idea of predestined fate, it was sacrilegious to go against God's will by giving charity to those he had damned. So business owners had nothing to do with their earnings, other than to reinvest it into their businesses for they could not give it away or spend it on themselves without risking their immortal souls, and admitting this was not one of God's "Elect". Also, given the importance of what God mandates, which can be found in the Bible, universal literacy was strongly encouraged. This belief system is indeed the beginning of capitalism, just as the foundation of the bureaucratic society. Therefore, you have science and technology, the business to develop the economy, and the emerging authority structure to maintain the efficient movement for modernization through the coordination of specialists in an elaborate division of labor. It's is modernization or the development of technology and business to this extent which grants a society access into modern world affairs i.e.: other societies which have reached similar levels of achievement in science and technology. Therefore, if the West (Western Europe) was the only region to "modernize" in this way and to this extent, then modernization is not a term used to define the process of developing a society in its own terms, on the contrary, the way it is used in Lewis's text implies that modernization is

normal, the lack of it is problematic and in effect it is another term for westernization. With this said, it is quite possible to conclude that Lewis is arguing that the Middle East did not grow into something similar to that of the “Western World”, and so therefore something must have gone wrong, for the west is the prime example of the way to do things correctly.

It should now be clear that the third meaning of an Orientalist does indeed apply to Lewis. Lewis is very condescending when he speaks of the Middle East, or shall we say all Islamic societies except Indonesia, for he assumes that they have done something wrong, for the societies have not become a reflection of the “Western World”. This is quite obviously a claim of dominance over Islamic society, and also a claim of superiority, since he devotes his time to showing why Islamic culture is incapable of changing in the necessary ways, or does so only under the threat of outside intervention.

The multiple claims of dominance and superiority provide all which is needed to confidently label Lewis as an Orientalist (of all three kinds). This classification allows for a reading supplement to be developed pertaining to Orientalism. At least we will try to write a preparation article in an effort to protect fresh minds to the politics of scholarship from uncritical acceptance of positions with political implications that seem to be factual.

The thorough understanding of the discussion above might not come to the reader of this book quickly, but with the proper background we think the average student will recognize Orientalism in Lewis rather readily. For a beginning student of sociology, it will be necessary to introduce the concept of Orientalism first, so then they will be able to “red flag” controversial statements within the text. For this material, it is important to

derive the basic concepts, extract important yet complex ideas from outside sources, simplify, and insert them into the reading. However, if one is to read the derivation of the fundamentals of Orientalism, especially that pertaining to the implied polar relationship between Western Europe and the Middle East, it will be vital that the students enter this process without any generalizations, assumptions, and opinions of the Middle East and Islamic Culture implanted by their primary source of world affairs, the media. Actually the media have been predisposing them to see Lewis' way of arranging the world reasonable and normal. This is why Professor Wilkes' detailed critique had shock value, and led to some discomfort.

Within the reading supplement, we discuss vital characteristics of the media, the media's tendency to generalize the situation, and its tendency to only cover that which paints a terrifying image of the Middle East for the millions of American viewers to see. We stick closely to events which initially created much of the existing hostility towards the Middle East, and even more strangely, towards Islam. These events were the first events in modern times taking place in the Middle East which developed the idea of the Arab in power, and against "us". One of the two events are the hostage crisis beginning on November 4, 1979 involving 63 American diplomats stationed at the United States Embassy in Teheran, Iran, which was occupied by nearly 80 Iranian students for 444 days (Cosgrove). The other is the rapid increase in oil prices during the early 1970's. Both events were covered in extraordinary detail by the media, yet superficially given the sheer volume of articles in the press over a period of years, and both, as a result of the media, placed the Middle East in a position of power over the West. Of course this power was yielded voluntarily by the West.

Obviously recent events involving U.S. efforts to intervene in the Middle East, especially military efforts as a reaction to world wide terrorism carried out by radical Islamic Fundamentalists can be said to give the media the same opportunity to place the entire Middle East, and even Islam in the hot seat. Further we assume that these recent events will carry on well into next academic year, and beyond. The U.S. is now engaged in an area of critical importance to the world economy, based as it is on oil energy sources. How long will WPI students care passionately about understanding the Middle East? Probably 6-10 years. If so, this justifies starting a 3 year project to develop and redefine this course. Our contribution will be to help them see and avoid any subtly imposed and unexamined opinions they may have about the Middle East. The same logic will apply to other subjects later, when the press moves on to other subjects from the Sudan or North Korea. It is quite fair to assume that students will have much more to say in an effort to argue against our points, if our points incorporate such sensitive material. Also, given the indisputable fact that there is so much political motivation in the recent events covered by the media, it would be unwise to attempt to deal with the media's influence without incorporating information on the political influences. For these reasons, we are choosing to discuss perfectly valid examples, examples which can be covered by discussing the media alone, and not incorporating politics. Also, these examples do not incorporate the rather complex feelings resulting from the current military retaliation. Our example will be drawn from the past, but a relevant and analogous past.

In addition to the sections of the supplement pertaining to Orientalism and the media separately, it is necessary to ask the reader rather or not he/she feel the media and those who might follow an Orientalist mindset are possibly connected in some way? Indeed the media does have a large influence on politics, and since an Orientalist has the

potential to alter politics in some ways, it is necessary to consider possible interconnection between these factors. An extensive description of neither political science nor media policy are required or provided. However, if the readers' mind is aware of the possibility, it will make the filtering of such relevant statements made by Lewis much simpler. Then the reader will have a political explanation to why an author and scholar like Lewis might write things in such a way as to place blame anywhere but on those with political power, who seem to be trying to get Middle Easterners to see the error of their past ways.

Lewis Supplement

Many people have very skewed opinions of the Middle East and Islam. If you are reading this, then you are likely to learn something important: that you can't judge a society based on what other people tell you. One might ask, who is telling me anything? The answer to this question is quite simple, for you hear it every day. Every time you watch the news you are bombarded with stories about the Middle east, most of which are on the negative side. You should understand this based on your experience watching the coverage and hearing stories of certain events occurring within the past 50 years. Other than the media, some sources attempt to influence you so that your resulting opinions are not consistent with that which is actually true. You might ask how this is rational, why would somebody attempt to create opinions which reflect what is untrue, or negative, when there are only (or primarily) positive things to say? The answer to this question comes in several parts. First, some sources of information have a hidden agenda. By this, it is meant that it is not the author's intention to simply educate their audience, but to direct their minds via the force of their notability to some conclusion. Second, there are generally two forms of knowledge, that which is political, and that which is apolitical. Some knowledge has the potential to redirect politics, the public's opinions, or worse yet, history; while other knowledge is capable of only ordinary education. With this much said, at this time it is appropriate to disclose the purposes of this relatively short reading: first, to discuss some important characteristics of the media, and identify exactly how it can affect the opinions of those who tune in; second, to inform the audience of the different capabilities of different forms of knowledge, and to educate the audience in how to differentiate various forms of knowledge; and third, perhaps most importantly, is to discuss those other sources besides the media. These other sources are usually authors, or

others who have access to many ears and enough notability to gather attention before what they have to say has even been revealed. Regarding this specific experience, it will be those classified as Orientalists who will be analyzed. You will see that Orientalism is certainly something to be aware of when listening to material related to the Middle East or Islam.

As stated above, first it will be important to investigate, within your own mind, exactly what it is you truly know about the Middle East and Islam. Every person has different experiences when it comes to the Middle East or Islam in general. The one thing that all Americans have in common is their primary source of information, the media. On behalf of the media, Edward Said states, “For most Americans (the same is generally true for Europeans) the branch of the cultural apparatus that has been delivering Islam to them for the most part includes the television and radio networks, the daily newspapers, and the mass circulation news magazines; films play a role, of course, if only because to the extent that a visual sense of history and distant lands informs our own, it often comes by way of the cinema.” (Covering Islam 43). The media delivers knowledge about what is happening around the world right to your living room, college residency, etc. This “service” seems quite convenient; however, how many people do you think actually think while listening to the media’s reports: “I wonder how reliable the media really is?” Possibly with respect to local stories, the media can generally be trusted. When it comes to national news, the media can “usually” be trusted as well. However, when the media covers regions of the world which seem to be acting against the interests the mother nation or the company, it has a way of altering the truth of the matter, without actually reporting something that is totally untrue. This may seem to the

reader as a rather premature conclusion; however, let us analyze some characteristics of the media's coverage of the Middle East and Islam, starting with two very relevant historical events.

OPEC (Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries) declared an embargo on the export of oil to all countries which supported Israel in a conflict with Egypt on October 17, 1973. The severity of this situation can be seen by understanding the United States' dependence (which doubled between 1950 and 1974) on an imported oil supply. At the time of the embargo, the United States accounted for just 6% of the world's population, and yet was consuming nearly 33% of its available energy supply. With the sudden drop in availability, oil consumption dropped 7% by the summer of 1974. Within this time period, the amount of oil exported to the United States from Arab nations dropped from 1.2 million barrels daily to just 19,000 barrels daily. As a result of the shortage, a national speed limit of 55 miles per hour was mandated, and in 1977 a cabinet-level Department of Energy was created (Houghton).

The OPEC oil embargo experience certainly changed several things with respect to U.S. Arab relations. "...before the sudden OPEC price rises in early 1974, "Islam" as such scarcely figured either in the culture or in the media. One saw and heard about Arabs and Iranians, of Pakistanis and Turks, rarely of Muslims." (Covering Islam 33). However, with the sudden incorporation of the Middle East on the "nightly news", a new enemy was chosen, rather than just OPEC. "Closer to Europe than any of the other non-Christian religions, the Islamic world by its very adjacency evoked memories of its encroachments on Europe, and always of its latent power again and again to disturb the West. Other great civilizations of the East—India and China among them—could be

thought of as defeated and distant and hence not a constant worry. Only Islam seemed never to have submitted completely to the West; and when, after the dramatic oil-price rises in the early 1970's, the Muslim world seemed once more on the verge of repeating its early conquests..." (Covering Islam 5). No longer was OPEC in the center of the media's attention, their attention after the embargo was directed at what they thought to be the source of animosity towards the Western world and its way of life. In the summer of 1980 commercials featuring film clips of immediately recognizable OPEC representatives and well known figures of the Islamic world in general were broadcasted. None of the figures were mentioned by name; however, at the end of the film clip a statement was made on the lines of: these are the people who control America's sources of oil (Covering Islam 3). The target in such advertisements was not the actual source of the embargo, Arab oil companies which in 1974 accounted for 7 of the top 15 Fortune 500 companies totaling over 100 billion together, instead the target was the entire Middle East, or Islam in general (Houghton). The similarity that all of the figures shared, is that they all were equally recognizable as Islamic. "A retreat into religion became the way most Islamic states could be explained, from Saudi Arabia—which, with what was supposed to be a peculiarly Islamic logic, refused to ratify the Camp David Accords—to Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Algeria. In this way, we can see how the Islamic world was differentiated, in the Western mind generally, in the United States..." (Covering Islam 30). Before elaborating further on how the media pulled Islam into the oil crisis, let us recognize yet another historical event.

Unlike any economic scenario, no emotions can come close to those resulting from a situation involving actual physical harm. Such a situation might be a hostage

situation. Such an event involving the United States and the Middle East, specifically Iran, has occurred. On October 4, 1979 a group of militant Iranian students took the United States Embassy in Teheran, Iran by force. The motivation for this event has somewhat of a long history, which will be covered briefly. In 1941 Mohammed Reza Pahlavi was declared Shah of Iran. Things generally went smoothly for the new Shah until in 1953 when the Shah and the Prime Minister of Iran experienced a power struggle with respect the nationalization of Iran's oil industry. To prevent this from occurring, the Shah acquired aid from the United States in the form of economic and military power. Then, in the early 1960's the Shah announced plans of reformation which would accelerate the "Westernization" of Iran. This of course was to take place primarily through the United States' aid. By 1963 Iranian nationalists were rioting in the streets condemning the Shah's regime. The Shah fought back, arresting and sending several into exile. Among those exiled, was a religious nationalist and sworn enemy to the United States, Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini.

For 16 years after the rioting in 1963 Mohammed Reza Pahlavi spent billions of oil dollars on the development of military power. As a result, he experienced a great loss in popular support. Finally the Shah's regime fell in revolution, and Mohammed Reza Pahlavi fled Iraq on January 16, 1979, never to again return. When the Shah's regime collapsed, Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini returned to Iraq. Months later, after being aware of the former Shah's arrival in the United States to undergo cancer treatment, the Ayatollah incited several Iranian students to act in a militant fashion, and attack the United States by taking the Embassy (Jimmy). The militant students held nearly seventy American hostages for 444 days. The crisis ended on January 20, 1981 after the United

States offered \$8 billion in frozen assets and a promise to lift trade sanctions which were initially a counteroffensive as a result of the hostage crisis (Cosgrove).

In addition to the oil crisis of 1974, “What makes the Iran crisis a good occasion for examining the media’s performance is exactly what made it understandably agonizing for so many Americans: its duration and the fact that what Iran came to symbolize represented American relations with the Muslim world.” (Covering Islam 77). These relations can be understood as a power struggle between the “Western” world, particularly the United States, and the Middle East. However, the point is that these “relations” were reinforced in the minds of Americans repeatedly. In other words, “Iran has aroused seething passions in Americans, not only because of the deeply insulting and unlawful seizure of the Teheran embassy, which was occupied by Iranian students on November 4, 1979, but also as a result of incredibly detailed, highly focused attention of the media to the event.” (Covering Islam 75). The facts of the situation were of course never altered; however, the way Iran was discussed, it seemed as though Iranians had no other culture than their opinions of the United States. Every time a “Middle Easterner” was seen on TV, or was heard on the radio, he or she was expressing their hatred for the United States. The fact that the media stripped Iranians of their lives outside international politics was known by observing that, “When the American hostages were seized and held in Teheran, the consensus immediately came into play, decreeing more or less that only what took place concerning the hostages was important about Iran; the rest of the country, its political processes, its daily life, its personalities, its geography and history, were eminently ignorable: Iran and the Iranian people were defined in terms of whether they were for or against the United States.” (Covering Islam 50). This renders

the Iranian to either anti or pro-America. Of course, the media has a way of also extending their reports to the entire Middle East. When this is done, the connection between Islam and the Middle East can allow the audience to conclude that somewhere in Islamic culture is an anti-American root. In other words, "...if the Iranian crisis is regularly rendered by television pictures of chanting "Islamic" mobs accompanied by commentary about "anti-Americanism", the distance, unfamiliarity, and threatening quality of the spectacle limit "Islam" to those characteristics; this in turn gives rise to a feeling that something basically unattractive and negative confronts us (Americans)." (Covering Islam 44). This leads on to the conclusion that the media has the potential to render Islam as a "negative" culture. Given the above discussion, "It is only a slight overstatement to say that Muslims and Arabs are essentially covered, discussed, apprehended, either as oil suppliers or as potential terrorists. Very little of the detail, the human density, the passion of the Arab-Muslim life has entered the awareness of even those people whose profession it is to report the Islamic world to Americans. What we have instead is a limited series of crude, essentialized caricatures of the Islamic world." (Covering Islam 26).

Before concluding this brief discussion on how the media treated those events, it is important to discuss some vital characteristics of the sources of the stories which you hear, the reporters. First of all, no matter how varying the methodology of reporting is amongst American news channel journalists and reporters, they can all be grouped together into a single category, for they all report for news channels who share a mother country. In other words, "The media can do all sorts of things, represent all sorts of points of view, provide many things that are eccentric, unexpended original, even

aberrant. But in the end, because they are corporations serving and promoting a corporate identity—“America” and even the “West”—they all have the same central consensus in mind.” (Covering Islam 48). Therefore, ask yourself whether or not it’s rational to wonder if American news reporters in some way function for the good of the United States. Of course, you must consider the obligation of a reporter to only report what is true, but is it possible for the reporter to report that which is in the best interest of the country?

One must recognize that the United States is not full of people who share every characteristic. There are different groups of people who want different things to happen within the country. The question now is whether or not these people feel the same about the well being of their country relative to others. For, as stated by Said, “...we must remember that because the United States is a complex society made up of several often incompatible subcultures, the need to impart a more or less standardized common culture through the media is felt with particular strength.” (Covering Islam 49). Therefore things are generalized, and events which involve people causing harm onto the United States, result in those people, or even those regions, and at the worse, entire religious communities being viewed as ominous. Again phrased more eloquently by Said, “We do not, in short, live at the mercy of a centralized propaganda apparatus, even though a great deal of what is really propaganda is churned out by the media and even by reputable scholars...For like all modes of communication, television, radio, and newspapers observe certain rules and conventions to get things across intelligibly, and it is these, often more than the reality being conveyed, that shape the material being delivered by the media. Since these tacitly agreed-upon rules serve efficiently to reduce the

unmanageable reality into “news” or “stories”, and since the media strive to reach the same audience which they believe is ruled by a uniform set of assumptions about reality, the picture of Islam (and of anything, for the matter) is likely to be uniform, in some ways reductive, and monochromatic.” (Covering Islam 45).

Increasing the complexity of this discussion, let us expand the present ideas, but first derive some necessary concepts. Edward Said says in his book Orientalism, “It is very easy to argue that knowledge about Shakespeare or Wordsworth is not political whereas knowledge about contemporary China or the Soviet Union is.” (Orientalism 9). The writers of this reading do certainly agree with him. Not to say that you are reading this material to learn about politics or Shakespeare, but the point to be made is that certain knowledge has the capacity to be used for reasons outside that general field. When one thinks of Shakespeare they think of “Romeo and Juliet” or “Macbeth”.

Certainly one with extensive knowledge of what Romeo says to Juliet the first time they speak is not empowered to the extent of delivering a rebuttal about nuclear arms, or any political topic. However, someone with knowledge about the Soviet Union is to some extent enabled to discuss politically relevant material. The difference here is that Shakespearian poetry is not spoken of in reference to world affairs, where Soviet history, or any other knowledge about the Soviet Union, is. Phrased more elegantly by Said, “To some extent the political importance given a field comes from the possibility of its direct translation into economic terms; but to a greater extent political importance comes from the closeness of a field to ascertainable sources of power in political society.” (Orientalism 10). Ask yourself, before continuing on, rather you believe this statement. If not, think harder, for this point will be used to further analyze the way some

speak of the Middle East, or more generally the entire Eastern world. More specifically, we wish to investigate Orientalism.

First, there are three general forms of Orientalists. The first, and the most simple, is anyone who studies the Orient. However, in order to study the Orient, one must obviously know what to study; therefore, leading to the second form, an Orientalist is also one who makes the distinction between the Orient and the Occident. Hence, it is impossible to practice the first form of Orientalism without practicing the second. The third form of Orientalism is much more complex, but draws concepts from the first two. The discussion of this third form will incorporate ideas about knowledge, and will separate the two forms of knowledge. The importance of knowledge in this discussion of the third form is understood once one appreciates exactly what knowledge really is. Let us elaborate precisely what it means to know something, or study something.

To study something, one must analyze it, scrutinize it, test it, and deny it autonomy, for it is difficult to study something which you cannot control. In other words, and more to the point, “Knowledge means rising above immediacy, beyond self, into the foreign and distant. The object of such knowledge is inherently vulnerable to scrutiny; this object is a “fact” which, if it develops, changes, or otherwise transforms itself in the way that civilizations frequently do, nevertheless is fundamentally, even ontologically stable. To have such knowledge of such a thing is to dominate it, to have authority over it. And authority here means for “us” (Westerners) to deny autonomy to “it”—the Oriental country—since we know it and it exists, in a sense, *as* we know it.”

(Orientalism 32). Therefore, it can be concluded that in order for any student or scholar to study the “Middle East” as he has, he must dominate the Middle East, to have some

authority over it. This point may be difficult to understand, or agree with; however, it is true.

By studying the Middle East, one is forcing it under the microscope, and then the only thing known about what is placed under that microscope, is what the person studying it has to say, hence the control. When a scientist observes a cell in a dish, he or she is living in a separate world from those cells, even if they are alive. A perfect example would be the millions of animals killed every year so that students may dissect them. Science and knowledge go hand in hand with power, dominance, authority, and in the case of the Western world, and the Eastern, hegemony. The tendency for certain cultural forms to dominate over others, just as certain ideas and concepts dominate others is known as hegemony. In the world of the Orientalist of the third form, “The relationship between Occident and Orient is a relationship of power, of domination, of varying degrees of complex hegemony...” (Orientalism 5). Indeed, this is the definition of the third form of an Orientalist. This domination over the Orient, enabling scrutiny, to some extent controls how the Orient is seen by the general public; for, “Knowledge of the Orient, because generated out of strength, in a sense *creates* the Orient, the Oriental and his world...the Oriental is depicted as something one judges (as in a court of law), something one studies and depicts (as in a curriculum), something one disciplines (as in a school or prison), something one illustrates (as in a zoological manual). The point is that in each of these cases the Oriental is contained and represented by dominating frameworks.” (Orientalism 40).

With this said, it should be clear that knowledge of the Orient, or more specifically, the Middle East, can take the form of knowledge which enables the scholar

to extend some power. This power could most certainly be used in politics, but it could also be used to perhaps prove the inferiority of a region, perhaps the Middle East.

“Orientalism can...express the strength of the West and the Oriental’s weakness—as seen by the West. Such strength and such weakness are as intrinsic to Orientalism as they are to any view that divides the world into large general divisions, entities that coexist in a state of tension produced by what is believed to be radical difference.” (Orientalism 45). In other words, with the Middle East being represented by “dominating frameworks”, the picture generated whenever there is mention of the Middle East may be controlled by those who create the frameworks: the scholars who act as the first, second, and third form of an Orientalist.

This generated picture may be positive, negative, or simply something which illustrates the Middle East’s inferiority. Ultimately, after this source of information is consistent in presenting it to the rest of his or her community, this source’s notability has the potential to reinforce the truth in their conclusions. In other words, “...from its earliest modern history to the present, Orientalism as a form of thought for dealing with the foreign has typically shown the altogether regrettable tendency of any knowledge based on such hard-and-fast distinctions as “East” and “West”: to channel thought into a West or an East compartment. Because this tendency is right at the center of Orientalist theory, practice, and values found in the West, the sense of Western power over the Orient is taken for granted as having the status of scientific truth.” (Orientalism 46). The motivation of this discussion is to prevent this automatic tendency from taking hold by challenging its validity.

One might ask what an Orientalist sounds like. In other words, what should one be looking out for when reading material of the nature noted above? To demonstrate what an Orientalist might sound like, two examples will be used, including statements made by Arthur James Balfour and Evelyn Baring, the first Lord Cromer.

Arthur James Balfour is best known for serving as British Prime Minister between the years 1902 and 1906 (Arthur). On June 13, 1910 he lectured the House of Commons on the ways in which to deal with Egypt. Within he lecture he says, "... Western nations as soon as they emerge into history show the beginnings of those capacities for self-government...having merits of their own... You may look through the whole history of the Orientals in what is called, broadly speaking, the East, and you never find traces of self-government. All their great centuries—and they have been very great—have been passed under despotisms, under absolute government. All their great contributions of civilization—and they have been great—have been made under that form of government. Conqueror has succeeded conqueror, one domination has followed another; but never in all the revolutions of fate and fortune have you seen one of these nations of its own motion establish what we, from a Western point of view, call self-government." (Orientalism 32-33). Notice how the inferiority of the Oriental is generalized, for Balfour is technically just lecturing on Egypt, and yet extends his statement to all Orientals. Also, notice how this superiority over the Orientals is assumed, taken for granted without a shred of evidence, and though it is thought of as scientific fact, or at least a fact which has been derived from some knowledge, here, history.

Evelyn Baring, the first Lord Cromer served in several offices in England, and also had much experience working with several English officials in Egypt and India. A

portion of his “success” is in his two-volume book Modern Egypt, first published in 1908. Within the thirty-fourth chapter of this work, Cromer states, “...The European is a close reasoner; his statements of fact are devoid of any ambiguity; he is a natural logician, albeit he may not have studied logic; he is by nature skeptical and requires proof before he can accept the truth of any proposition; his trained intelligence works like a piece of mechanism.

The mind of the Oriental, on the other hand, like his picturesque streets, is imminently wanting in symmetry. His reasoning is of the most slipshod description. Although the ancient Arabs acquired in a somewhat higher degree of sciences of dialectics, their descendents are singularly deficient in the logic faculty. They are often incapable of drawing the most obvious conclusions from any simple premises of which they may admit the truth. Endeavor to elicit a plain statement of facts from any ordinary Egyptian. His explanation will generally be lengthy, and wanting in lucidity. He will probably contradict himself a half-a-dozen times before he has finished his story. He will often break down under the mildest process of cross-examination.” (Orientalism 38). Again, note the scientific language applied to describing the incompetence of the Oriental. And again, see how the discussion of Egypt is extended to all Orientals.

The above two examples successfully demonstrate how notable figures have a way of conveying the “Oriental” as incompetent, selfish, unorganized, and incapable of controlling their own communities among other characteristics. And hence are in need of Western colonial administration until they learn how to do these things. It is remarkable to see how these two figures, who both certainly had long and very successful careers, were able to paint a picture of the Orient using nothing but incomplete historical

knowledge. Their statements obviously place the “West” over the “East”, and even attempt to show that the Orientals are better off under the control of the West, for the West has the capacity to self-govern, while the Orientals do not, limiting their ability to progress. This assumed power over the Orient is a result of nothing more than the regurgitation of historical facts, and the endless attention to the image of the East with respect to that of the West.

Unfortunately, the same thing just discussed in the previous paragraph can be said about the media. For the media places the East in a position in which it is contrasted to the West, or even to specific countries. To bring up a previously used example, the importance of oil in the United States is broadcasted in a fashion which places the East in a threatening position, identifying members of the Islamic culture as antagonists. This is done by making constant references to the Islamic culture, and how it contrasts to “Western” culture. This is the same strategy of the English politicians Lord Cromer and Arthur James Balfour, for they generalize any member of a “non-Western” origin as an Oriental, and compare them to “Westerners” in terms of several characteristics, repeatedly concluding them inferior.

An important question must now be dealt with. For, if it can be shown that the media has the potential to portray “Orientals” as threatening or inferior; and scholars, politicians or any other notable individual proven to be trustworthy (due to their intellect, credentials, or support from the majority) can portray “Orientals” as threatening or inferior, then is there some connection between the influence of these individuals and that of the media? Strikingly, both tend to result in the same situation: members of “non-Western” origins being perceived as something they are not for the sake of some goal,

either imperialism as in the case of Lord Cromer and Arthur James Balfour, or to increase oil availability as in the case of some journalists during the 1970's and 80's. So—is it irrational to suspect there somehow exists a connection the between scholars or politicians and the media? An “experienced” American would certainly answer no to this question, but it might seem difficult for some, especially young students, to fully comprehend the interworkings of a nation with an agenda. The scope of this reading is not to educate the reader in the details of politics or media policies, so a description of how this occurs will be avoided. However, the reader should in the future be aware, or at least suspicious, of the complex nature of the relationship between the media and the government. The co-authors of this document need not to mention the current status of international relations, especially those between Western and Middle Eastern nations. However, taking these “suspected relationships” into account while digesting what the media or a scholar might have to say about Islamic culture will be of the utmost importance. In the field of sociology, it is a commonplace belief that it is impossible to avoid preconceptions and hence bias. Hence, the only protection a scholar in the field can turn to or a way of preserving objectivity is to be aware of one's biases on a conscience level—and share them openly with one's readers as part of reporting on research, especially cross-cultural research. Normally that takes the form of reporting what motivated the research and what funding or sponsorship has made it possible. Sometimes investigations go into their personal histories and even the gut level reaction that led them to question something others have reported as factual knowledge. Self awareness is part of being able to focus on just the facts. It will be impossible to learn anything at all, let alone the consequences with respect to one's own opinions and how

they themselves perceive any society, if not the world at large, until the tendency toward ethnocentrism gives way to the conscience discipline of cultural relativity of judging practices only in terms of the values of the society in which they occur not your own values and norms imported from an alien and often judgmental vantage point.

It is for this reason, and this reason alone, any student attempting to venture into the world of powerful sources of knowledge, must be aware that these sources may not be delivering the objective facts that you were expecting from an authority in the field. Instead they are delivering a message which serves them or some higher authority by defining the situation in a parochial or a self interested way. For example, as was discussed above, the media, even though it is charged with reporting truthful “news”, does indeed have a tendency to slightly alter the information, without rendering it untruthful, but manipulating it in a way which best serves a higher authority i.e. The United States’ interests in the Middle East. Certainly, if OCEP raises oil prices to protest Israeli support by the U.S., the media will, as was discussed above, attempt to develop a negative image of the whole Middle East for the viewing by the general public. As a result, the United States’ oil interests are supported within the country in protesting this “abuse of power”, but for all of the wrong reasons. It is actually the oil companies that have created the artificial dependency which allows the embargo to inflict pain on a nation that has ample fossil fuel supplies of its own in the form of coal and is squandering cheap under priced oil in deplorable ways. As far as a scholar’s or a politician’s reasoning behind developing such images that they can’t blame on the outsiders, the possibilities are endless. Again, it is the experts and scholars what have extensive knowledge about the Middle East which is capable of being used in a politically offensive

fashion to make the coming hardships patriotic duties and punish those who inflict them. Politicians act to serve their nation by justifying the situation in some way. These individuals are often influenced and/or encouraged by the media, and how it covers stories regarding politically relevant news. Sometimes an individual can question the media, viewpoint, even campaign, long enough to placing several politicians and news channels, etc in the spotlight. However, given the brute strength of the media and the government, this often results in professional or political career suicide. For several reasons including this one, individuals tend to follow the general trend, i.e. whatever the consensus of the general public is, that is what will be broadcasted. The problem with this situation is that once the ignorance of the public serves a political interest that is powerful and much to be perpetuated to preserve the status quo, the situation is unstable, vulnerable to sudden massive change unless the public develops a willful ignorance actually denying the possibility of that which it suspects is true. Then those who threaten the consensus will certainly be in jeopardy. The messenger rather than the perpetrator is the one in danger of a public lynching. So, once the public is captured by a distortion or untruth, it can be difficult to set it free again from the constraints of those in power, or those with authority due to the risks the people who know better must take to get the media to dismantle the mythology they helped create. As a result, learning how to do your own critical thinking and becoming able to read in a fashion which enables them to ferret out “red flag” statements like Arthur James Balfour’s, Evelyn Baring’s, and potentially Bernard Lewis’s is a crucial skill to develop. When one can’t count on the authorities and media professionals to engage in self corrected open debate, you have to engage then with your own skepticism and separate the factual reporting from the

selective interpretive frameworks in wide circulation. In the case of Bernard Lewis, one has a scholar with a wealth of historical facts, details, and a good sense of what the Turkish leadership was thinking and doing as Western Europe “modernized” and became a worthy adversary after centuries of relative weakness. On the other hand, his very expertise regarding the Ottoman Empire seems to lead him to dismiss the possibilities that other political entities and other historical periods play an important role in explaining the current situation of the Middle Eastern nations vis-a-vis the Western Powers.

Knowledge for Power

The spreading of human development through colonization has immediate effects on the subject country's well being in terms of economics and politics and it causes a long lasting sense of non-self in the people who live under the dominant country. India is one of the countries in the East, which was deeply affected by Western influence through colonization.

The British colonization of India emerged from the change of the Britain's attitude and primary objective: from attempting to improve its trade relations with overseas suppliers to a quest for colonization. It was Britain's success in trade that led to the change of goal from trading partner to imperialist. But what motivated them? What drove them towards this idea of colonization and gaining complete control of India, a subcontinent several times the size of the home country, when the initial goal was only to trade spices and hope for an adventure?

Orientalism, as discussed in part of this project, is such an in depth philosophy that to provide another example of an Orientalist mindset to compare to Said's observation in Egypt is extremely difficult to do. It involves a lot more knowledge and research power to truly understand the terminology and be able to apply it effectively. To understand Orientalism, a basic understanding of knowledge for power is important because they are very similar concepts. To be an Orientalist, one must gain knowledge about the Orient, and make judgments about those "other" different countries in terms of what makes them similar. In order to ease into the subject of Orientalism, this paper will focus on knowledge for power of Britain on India.

Since the beginning of its time, India never had a structured or united government or ruling power that controlled the whole subcontinent and ruled it as a single country. There were separations in the people due to their religious differences. There were wars, and fights between diverse groups of people. India was vulnerable to a divide and conquer strategy during that time. How Britain gained control of India had a lot to do with knowledge for power. Great Britain first stepped into India through the East India Company in 1607, which had a monopoly concession for trade, which the entrepreneur with royal connection helped world flourish. The British slowly learned about India and its people through trade. They made friends with local rulers, some are the Islamic Mughal, and some are the Hindus. They slowly gained control over the vast Indian market. For over 150 years since the establishment of the East India Company, with knowledge of India, and support from their home country, Britain assumed the responsibility of mediating disputes between the rival groups of people. Britain stepped in using their military power, and took full control of India as a country in 1858. India was ruled under British colonized law until its independence in 1974. It was Britain that united the subcontinent and imposed a single language, educational system, and trading areas over the whole region for the first time.

India History

Since the beginning of its recorded history, India has been a consisted region that has been through many challenging events, which altered the lives of the people who lived through them. Because India was unstable, and thus vulnerable, many invaders have come and gone. Out of all of India's invaders, the country which brought the most

dramatic changes to India was Great Britain. In order to understand why Britain became the conqueror of India, we must first look at the complex sociopolitical history behind India, prior to this major turning point.

India was inhabited first by the Dravidians. They were invaded by the Aryans in 1500 BC. The Aryans came from south Russia and Turkey and began to conquer India. They, like any invaders of any country, disregarded any local customs and cultures. The Dravidians got pushed to the south, and the Aryans occupied the north of India. There was a distinguishable line dividing the types of people and many believe that the caste system in Hinduism grew out of this period of subjugation and separation. People practiced Hinduism as a religion, which involved believing in gods and goddesses who guide Indian people. Hinduism was not only a religion to people, but it also set many social laws, governing every aspect of their lives through the caste system. But Hindu beliefs only gave people their way of life, it did not give the kingdom of Hindus the political power, organization or unity they need to protect themselves from intruders; therefore, for lack of a cohesive empire or nationalism, the region was unstable due to competing principalities.

A centralized government did not exist in India. The country consisted of many differences and separations among its peoples. We can categorize the diversity of the Indian people into three different categories: language difference, north-south differences, and religious differences. By the 18th century, India had a dividing line between invading Muslims, Moguls, and Hindus. With both of the religions being very strict and being practiced in the two opposite extremes, it divided the people in the country based on who ruled each kingdom. For example; the religion sects wear different

types of clothes to distinguish themselves from the other groups and they eat different meat or none at all. Even within the same religion, Hinduism, the caste system classifies people of different prestige. Intermarriage was prohibited, and people of different castes and sects were not able to interact with each other. These religions are so opposite that it created too much tension and stress when people try to live together in the same community; fights between the two groups were common. Hence, they tend to sort themselves out by kingdom, into Muslim and Hindu, Sikh and other subgroup areas.

Along with the country containing many separation lines between people, India started to decentralize even more when villages and towns started to break down, and govern themselves. India did not have a unified government structure for its people. India had no growth or development in government other than that imposed by new invader at the height of their power since the beginning of its history. The Indian people did not have a nationality like other country because there were so many different kinds of people. It was hard for Indian people to recognize themselves as part of one political entity. The people had no sense of nationalism, pride, government, unity, nor did they have firm rulers, or rules.

Aside from its governing issues, Indian people lived without pressure from the outside world. Indian family occupations were passed down from generation to generation. The children grew to be adults and lived in the same village they were born in. The traditional work ethic of Indians is to work for the family and the village. Local deities and some ancestor worship flourished. If there was conflict the people would go to the next village, but they rarely thought of the need for fundamental change. New methods or ways to improve their usual way of doing the daily routine was at odds with

the system by which people got their lots in life-by being apprenticed to a parent. There was not an economic unit at the country level because every village was self reliant. Money did not play a great role in economy. It was used as a store of value, not as a medium of exchange. There was little or no competition; people just lived their lives without any stimulus for improvement.

East India Company

Great Britain was modernized and invented advanced technology to better its industrial plant. The push to modernization came from their Christian faith, which was deeply affected by the Protestant Reformation. Calvinists, Pietists, Puritans and other extreme Protestant groups believe that in order to go to heaven, they must please God and understand God, but that since he is Omnipotent their destiny already predestined. To find out if they are of the elect or the damned they study the bible to develop a personal relationship with God. They also studied what God created in the hopes to finding something out about God through nature. Making a great discovery (like making a fortune at work) was taken as a sign of God's favor and evidence that one was of the "elected." They studied matter on earth and tried to understand these laws that govern the earth that God had created for them. This belief system pushed them toward sciences and capitalism. Due to their investment in improving business efficiency many inventions and discoveries were implemented. These technologies put Great Britain into a process of modernization and then the Industrial revolution by 1750. England improved its ships as an island nation stressed the Navy for defenses. They created much profit from building docks to increase sea traffic for trade with the neighboring countries. British people had a sense of pride and continuity during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, who led

her nation to victory over the Spanish Armada. People were conscious of their power and their growing role in the world market as they began to take the dominant sea power. An increase in economic power pushed them to find cheaper raw materials. The British started to search for other places both to the East and West.

In the middle of the 16th century, the British capitalists stepped on the Indian's subcontinent for the first time. They had two main purposes: an exciting adventure, and hopes for trade. The East India Company got a charter with five ships from the British Crown to go to India. By 1607, Captain Hawkins laid the first official Indian trade (Griffiths, 50). Captain Hawkins set up England's first right to establish a trading station at Surat. Their main goal was to trade for spices; cinnamon and cloves. At the same time, the Portuguese were already trading with Indians. The Portuguese were not happy that the British started to establish trade with Indian Posts. By this time the Portuguese military was weaker than the British so there was not much they could do about it to expel their competitors. When the British defeated the Portuguese in 1612, they impressed the Indians (Griffiths, 52). This made the Indians wanted to trade with the British rather than with the Portuguese. The English trading company prospered in trading with India and by 1619 there were factories in Surat, Broach, Agra, and Anmadabad, turning out local goods for the British market.

By 1663, the East India Company had expanded trade with Indians even more. More ports were created, and Britain also gained all of the coast concessionary ports from the Dutch and the Portuguese after defeating them in the war (Griffiths, 52). Britain brought not only an increased in trade and commerce to India, but they also increased Indian's population. In Bombay, the population tripled in 20 years. Through friendship

w/ local rulers, the Englishmen gained their first piece of land in Madras from an Indian Prince in 1639. Madras became the head quarters for the East India Company in 1658. Great Britain continued to be successful with trade and kept expanding in India to Hugli, Patna, Kasimbazar, Malda, Rajmahal, and Decca in 1650. They brought more experts to improve manufacturing and increase their production. They started to gain more and more control of the economy in India. Indian people were very impressed with the British's success and advancement. By 1717, the leader of Bengal gave the company an exemption from paying custom duties in Bengal.

It was easy for Britain to play a major role in India because India was unstable in terms of politics, governmental organization, and economic system. The British used their knowledge of government and they started to learn more about the political situation in India through trading. Britain gained the power from the Mughal Empire when they started to collect revenues from farmers, and passed the Regulating Act in 1773. This Act gave the British parliament power in India. The British also practiced indirect rule through local leaders that they supported. But when a province's ruler dies and there is not a male successor, the area became a province of British India's territory, with an appointed governor backed by British military force.

Even though the Company was gaining much profit during that time, it failed to help the local Indian people dependent on it during the famine in 1769-70, which led to the death to a third of the population in a large region. Despite this error and the rebellion such as the Sepoy Mutiny that followed it, Britain power continued to expand throughout India. At the same time, there were conflicts between the Mughal and the Marathas. The Muslim and Hindus conflicts kept growing stronger. To the British, the

ongoing guerilla warfare was a threat to its economy activity, so the British felt the need to step in. Great Britain assumed the position of a peacemaker to stop this war. In 1858, the Company was removed when the British army arrived to stop the rebellion. From that point, India became a British Crown colony and a national responsibility. India officially lost its independence at this time.

However, Britain's role in India was very well established by that time. The British not only improved trade in India, after defeating the Portuguese and stopping guerrilla warfare, Britain was also seen as a strong country to India both as a protector and ruler. The British took their time to get to know India. It took them over 150 years to finally establish a formal colony. India was so weak when they first arrived that they could have brought the British military in establishing their rule right away. But the British chose to take their time and wait until they could legitimately take over with the acquiescence of the people to end a problem that they could not solve themselves. This way, they not only got to know Indians better, but they also got to represent themselves as a country that is a protector rather than an oppressor, a nation that is on India's side, rather than exploiting the people.

British India

Once the British Crown gained complete control over India, right away, they brought drastic changes to India. They altered India's economic pattern, increased in production, and eventually population, improved the average Indians standard living, and the most important brought centralization to the government. For the first time, India had a centralized government, a common language and a common ruler. Britain built more factories, railroads, established schools, and universities.

The British established new school system in India. Indian students learned English in schools, and used English textbooks. Britain learned a lot about India prior to conquering, which led the British to develop a certain view point toward the Indian people. The British tried to establish the idea of their natural superiority by sending negative messages in children's textbooks about the Indian people. The content in the text suggested that Indians are weak and backward by describing how bright, brave, manly, noble, and so forth the white British people. The textbooks claimed that by nature Indians are effeminate, cowardly, superstitious, untrustworthy, and black (Walsh, 7). Indian children used to go to school and then help with the family occupation after school. Playing sports after school were not their top priorities. By comparison, the British children are typically very good at sports and take them seriously compared to Indian children. Therefore, Indians were seen as weak and small because they couldn't play sports as well (Walsh, 87). In an autobiography from Growing up in British India, a textbook was quoted, "India's strength and vigor could be renewed only by infusions of energy from British culture, values and customs" (Walsh, 99). The British's point of views toward Indians and themselves were clearly shown through these textbooks. As a result, many children who went to British schools came to value the Western idea and thus had to abandon their orthodox traditions: leaving home after finishing school, accepting caste excommunication, and marrying at a later age (Walsh, 8). In the mid to late 19th century, many student groups created a reform movement to remodel India along the line of the west.

George Orwell is an English man who was born in India. In his autobiography, he mentions his point of view on why the British thought they were superior to the

Indians. He compares the endurance level between the British and Indians. The temperature in India is very high, and it is torturous for Englishmen mentally and spiritually, but not for Indian people. Orwell believed that this endurance comparison, along with the fact that they are far more advanced technologically, led to the British people's feeling of superiority over Indians. He thinks that they must feel that they were racially superior and biologically superior because Englishmen are not as tolerant of the sun as Indians. That's the reason why they get sun burn easily. As George Orwell wrote, "The thin skull was the mark of racial superiority and the pith-helmet was sort of emblem of imperialism" (Reflections on Orientalism 28).

The establishment of universities set the social standard in the working area. Indians were excluded from high government positions. Indians were now required to have a degree to work in work places. Indian parents were seeing British education become very important. They sent their children away for a "good" education. The British form of education was expensive and far from most villages. Young children had to travel and lodge at distant places just to get a western education. One father is quoted on saying, "continue your English education even if we should go begging on the street" (Walsh, 38). An orthodox way of working for the family, doing the same occupation as the family, and staying in the same village was no longer followed.

Indians were introduced to a more serious Western life. Western life meant disciplines that they must educate themselves to prepare for an occupation, testing and passing examinations. People came to identify themselves by what degree of education they had, rather than by caste system. They started to desire a higher degree of education, instead of forming a family and finding work right away. Children and young

adults were no longer provided with predetermined adult identities by parents. They were given choices.

The British planted the ideas of personal freedom, democracy and nationalism through their western education. The British knew what they needed to do to get the Indians to accept them as legitimate rulers. They put Indians down to make themselves look better, inculcating these ideas in children who will soon grown to be adults. They intentionally gave Indians new ideas, caused them to question who they were and what they believed in. Indian people, young or old, were greatly affected by this change: culture clash between the west and orthodox India were happening in the society.

Young adults and children who grew up under British rule and school had trouble deciding how to live their lives. They lived in two very different and opposite cultures at once. They were confused about their own identity and unable to decide which set of customs or traditions to follow. The mental tension worsened from generation to generation, as people valued what they could not be and found themselves accepting inferior status as the natural process of thought.

In terms of economic changes, Britain changed Indian's way of life by bringing in more technologies. Better transportation through railroad brought convenience and efficiency to trading. They increased trade between villages by setting up specializations on certain crops to be produced by certain villages. This system benefited the British in that they can control production and draw to monocrop producers into the general economy. But, it also reduced self-sufficiency in the villages. The village now must depend on other villages for the things they were not producing, when they actually could and had produced all they needed internally. It might be less efficient but it was less

risky and assured independency. Having factories divided Indian society into industrialized towns and slums resulted. Many villagers left their village to work in the city. The average Indian's standard living increased: utensils were used instead of using their hands; people wore better clothes, and had better housing, but the distribution of wealth was uneven and the British at the top took the largest share. Population grew as well because of western medicine reducing infections and diseases. Deaths from small pox and cholera were dramatically reduced (Griffiths, 476) and their victim were often children who now started to live. Parents accustomed to having 6-8 children to assure the survival of 2-3 now had 5-6 children surviving children to raise on the same plot of land.

India's Independence

India gained its independence in 1947. Prior to its independence, there were many movements and rebellions going on in India. The famous non-violent movement leader was Mohandas Gandhi. Gandhi was the leader of the Salt March in 1930. The Salt March was a campaign against the British's monopoly on salt. Britain prohibited Indians from making or their own salt along the coast line. They forced Indians to buy salt that was very expensive because it was highly taxed. The march was 240 miles; from Sabarmati to Dandi. Prior to the march, Gandhi announced that he would break the law by sending a letter to the Viceroy warning the British in advance. The British did not agree to stop monopolizing salt. On March 12th, 1930, Gandhi and 78 male satyagrahis started their 23 day journey. When they got to the coast, Gandhi and his followers broke the law by making salt. A month later, Gandhi and many satyagrahis were arrested. The salt march was the major and first civil disobedience campaign against Britain.

Another famous leader toward independence was Jawaharlal Nehru. He was the leader of many civil disobedience campaigns. Nehru was also elected to be the first prime minister of India. Gandhi and Nehru started the Quit India program. This program was established to demand complete independence from Britain. This is their way of warning the British that a massive protest and disobedience will occur if the British did not give India independence. This program was the biggest civil disobedience event India had ever known. The Anti-British protests in 1919 created lots of chaos: telegraph lines and railroad were destroyed, strikes, bombs were exploded, and fires were set to the British government buildings. Britain had to declare state of emergency. While Britain was engaged in World War II, Indians showed more tolerant of the British rule, but only to a point. The British were afraid to have another war against the Indians so Britain offered independence to India on the condition that the British-Indian army promised to help the British army fight against the Japanese. India agreed to this offer and after the war, India gained its independence from the British on August 15th 1974.

Prior to the British colonization, India was decentralized and defenseless prey to many invaders. Its vulnerability gave the British a window of opportunity when the British arrived. For 150 years, Britain slowly accumulated their knowledge of India, and British entrepreneurs made their way into controlling Indian's trade, and eventually, into controlling their way of life. The British familiarized themselves with Indian's way of living, made friends with local rulers, and increased Indian's crop production. The British used their knowledge about India to take advantage of the subcontinent's resources. They presented themselves in a positive manner to the Indian society, whether it was by building factories, increasing jobs, implementing educational system, and

increasing standard living, or bringing in western medicine. Many Indians were impressed by the British's advancement and wanted to imitate them. Their positive role in India allowed them to play a powerful role in controlling India, its market, and consequently other markets in the East as well. It was opium grown in India that the British sold in China. Although not everyone in India was pleased about British invasion because of the negative effects on the people's psychological mindset, and the culture clash, the people were living their lives with a higher material standard for a time. By Gandhi's time the system was exploitive and trapping people in poverty, but the technology that the British brought with them was always accessible to educate Indians. The way Britain gained control of India, and able to be successful was a direct consequence of gaining knowledge about India so as to earning the right to rule it. Once the Colonial government was viewed as a threat, they started a propaganda campaign to stay in power that was less justifiable and had detrimental effects.

However, science, technology, agricultural knowledge, governmental and economic skills, there all justified the Colonial Government. The colonial government supported considerable resources into land and the people, industry and manufacturer out of local cotton crops as well as anthropological and historical study. There can all be seen as part of a pattern of Orientalist Scholarship to justify British Rule.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the uses of Lewis' book in Professor Wilkes' class certainly deserve merit. However, the potential issues resulting from reading the book, which was with no doubt written with some political motivation, must be dealt with before the students read it. A supplement to the book was prepared for this reason.

The primary theme of the supplement is Orientalism, which is relevant to western scholarship in a field which makes the distinction between the orient and the occident, and compares the two through some characteristic, for example the capacity to “modernize”. Lewis is a credentialed historian with wide-ranging knowledge of the long history of the Ottoman Empire. An extensive introduction and discussion of the fundamentals of Orientalism are contained in the reading supplement.

To elaborate on how a scholar such as Lewis might be encouraged to write something such as What Went Wrong?, a discussion of political motivation was also presented. The primary example which can reflect such motivation is the media. An analysis of how the media functions in the Middle East was made through the use of historical examples, specifically the hostage crisis in the American Embassy of Iran located at Teheran, and the oil “shortage” during the 1970’s.

After much is presented in the form of this supplement, it is our opinion that the reader should be well prepared to read Lewis’ book without being too accepting of his arguments with respect to why the Middle East has not been able to “modernize” as the “western” world, or more specifically Western Europe did. With the students responding much differently to the book than former students have in the past, Professor Wilkes’ detailed analysis of the book will not have the same, if any, capacity to deliver shock to the students, resulting in their discomfort and disliking of the class in general. The shock which is described is that which comes about when one’s beliefs or what they have accepted to be true, are shot down. If the goal of the supplement is satisfied, the readers will not easily accept, and will hopefully reject most of Lewis’ conclusions about the reasons for the lack of “modernization” within the Middle East. When this happens, the

students will be able to follow right along with Professor Wilkes' analysis, and will expect within Wilkes' lectures the same conclusions which rendered so many of the past rather disappointed or feeling "tricked".

Knowledge for Power is an introduction of a similar concept of Orientalism. It is also written in this report in order to prepare the reader's mind set for what is to be encountered while reading the book What Went Wrong.

The British's views of Indian people as shown through this work support the idea of one culture making judgments toward another culture using their knowledge. The culture that is more technologically advanced assumed its superiority and responsibility over that of a less advanced one. In this case, British Crown took more than 150 years to study India subcontinent, then used the knowledge of India to slowly gained control and attack the weak areas that India was lacking. The British, as a consequent of success in trade and technologies, developed the feeling of responsibilities that they need to help India, who was not as talented as they were. Their attitude toward the Indians as inferior emerged as the result of their power and domination over them.

An example of the relationship between Britain and India will provide enough background knowledge and implement basic understanding of what is to be analyzed further while reading What Went Wrong.

India in the Role Playing Game

As part of learning about sociology, Professor Wilkes constructed a game for students to play called the role playing game. The goal of the game is to open the student's eyes to other regions outside of the United States. The student will be working in groups. They will be representing a country, and pretend to be in a regional conference; negotiating for the best interest of their country. Although this is a role playing game, the topics, issues and problems from each country that they students will be discussing are very real. The game is taken very seriously. In the game, each student represents a different character from that country. The character sheet provides information on the character's life: job, educational experiences, ownership, and salary etc. The student will follow the character sheet by finding out more information about that character's role in a particular country by doing research.

The countries that were included as part of the game were Britain, France Germany, Italy, Spain, Turkey, Egypt, Iraq, Iran, and Saudi Arabia. From the list, it is clearly shown that these countries portray the idea of the Western Europe versus the Middle East. For the game to be diverse and interesting there should be at least another country represented at this conference. India would certainly be a good candidate to add to this role playing game. First, and the most obvious, India will eliminate the idea of the Christian west versus the Islamic east in this role playing game. It is neither, secondly, the students will learn much more if the foundation of the game is broader. There will be many more interesting topics to discuss, and more point of views being represented. In terms of the conference discussions, the groups will also have more options to negotiate

and work around. India's history of being patronized under the British rule for over a hundred years after being invaded by Islamic groups will make the game more interesting. The people of the country are most likely going to have a certain attitude and feelings toward the British and the west as well as tension with certain Muslim nation. Indian cultures, social structures, and advancement are also very different than the west, which means that the people will also be different. What they value, need, and what they think is the best for their country will make this game more educational and less likely to support an Orientalist view of the world.

References

- “Arthur James Balfour 1848 – 1930”.
<http://www.geo.ed.ac.uk/scotgaz/people/famousfirst5.html>. Jan 6, 2005.
- Cosgrove, Alexandra. “Iran Hostage Anniversary”.
<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2001/01/18/iran/main265244.shtml>. January 18, 2001. February 20, 2005.
- Griffiths, Percival J, Sir. The British impact on India. London : Cass, 1965.
- Jimmy Carter Library and Museum. “The Hostage Crisis in Iran”.
<http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.org/documents/hostages.phtml>. November, 20 2002. February, 21 2005.
- Lewis, Bernard. What Went Wrong?. Oxford University Press. New York 2002.
- Said, Edward, Bresnahan, Roger [et al.], and Cohen Warren I, ed. Reflections on Orientalism. East Lansing, Mich : Asian Studies Center, Michigan State University, 1983.
- Said, Edward W. Covering Islam. New York: Pantheon Books, 1981.
- Said, Edward W. Orientalism. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.
- Walsh, Judith E. Growing up in British India : Indian autobiographers on childhood and education under the Raj. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1983.