

## **Orientalism and Orientalists between Extremism and Exaggeration (\*)**

**Dr. Ahmed Gumma Siddiek**  
Former Head/Dept of English  
Azhari University-Sudan  
Shaqra University  
KSA

### **Abstract**

*This article discusses one of the most important issues that formed the cultural, political and social discourse between the West and the East. Orientalism was a hot issue that began some centuries ago and still going on. The Orientalists were the spearhead in the Western political and cultural invasion in the East. The Muslim World has been a subject to investigations and experiments carried out by the Orientalists, who were supposed to use survey approaches assumed to be objective and scientific to study the cultural resources of the Islamic Values. These resources were the Quran as the primary authenticated source of Islamic Knowledge and Islamic Teachings. In addition to the Sunna of the Prophet Mohammed (peace be upon him) as the second source. But most of the Orientalists' purposes and objectives were to disgrace these Islamic values by attacking the Quran and raising doubts about the prophet to destroy the Muslim personality. Great efforts were exerted to wash the brain of the Muslim individual, to pave for cultural occupation that would pave the way for military invasion of Muslims home lands, to serve the Western interests. This paper is shedding light on the historical controversial issue of Orientalists role in the Arabic Islamic World from the viewpoints of both the Western and Eastern scholars. The author claims to see a glimpse of hope to establish a new relation between the West and the East, based on the idea of sharing common human interests at one hand, and on the other hand, the West must be reminded of indebtedness to the East as the original source of all values and wisdom on which the Western modern civilization had been built.*

**Keywords:** Orientalism Orientalist- Islam Christianity- Judaism - Quran Arabs

### **1. Background**

The East and West relations were and still are about conflict rather than cooperation for coexisting on this planet. The conflict had a long history since the clash between Christian Europe and the Islamic Ottoman Empire. The conflict had always taken its religious nature as a continuous war between Islam and Christianity or Islam and Judaism. Although Christianity and Judaism were not always at good terms but the followers of the two religions have shared common grounds and common interests to stand united against the Islamic Thought. So most of the time and through the long history the attacks were violently carried out against Islam and Muslims. The Crusades campaigns and the colonial period were two evidential experiences where the West had practiced great tyranny against Muslims on their own lands. The Colonial practices of France and the great tortures against the Arabs and the Muslim community in Algeria and some other parts in the African continent were so great that no apologies could fill the physical and psychological gaps between the two factions for many centuries to come. The two great World Wars were mainly the product of the Western insatiable nature and the result was so disastrous, as millions of souls were lost and huge natural and human resources were damaged. But the Western political mind did not learn from those lessons; as very terrible and dreadful human experiences; instead it blindly began to seek compensation of its great loss by invading other peoples' lands to take control of their wealth, through the colonial invasions after the Second World War. The share of the Muslim world from this was so great and the loss was so big, not to mention the loss of Palestine which was given by the British Colonialists to reward the Jewish community for backing the British in their wars. This Palestinian issue was always hot and will remain forever. It will always cause the Arab and Muslim wounds bleed all the time.

But the Western mind, built on individualistic dogmatic and pragmatic thinking; made many other recent attacks on Muslim countries, equipped with massive killing machines in Afghanistan and Iraq to add another bad experience, in which huge numbers of human souls were lost, others suffered from physical or psychological tortures. Others were displaced from their homelands.

They still suffer and will remain for a long time as victims of political agendas based on Orientalists efforts and politicians aspirations to occupy the land and exploit the people. The agendas of Sykes Picot Agreement signed on (6 May 1916) and Bernard Lewis (born on 31 May 1916) and some others' ideas are still adopted by Western politicians as framework and guidelines to build the new East. So the relationship with the West was always seen from the perspective of defending Western interests in the Eastern Muslim area. The Orientalists whether: historians, sociologists, psychologists, anthropologists, political scientists, ethnologists or theologians were all active and effective tools of invasion of our land. So the allegations of these people to be a part of the colonialist machine were a fact despite their efforts to make their image look bright through the use of their questionable research methodology. The Muslim East had greatly suffered from the psychological damage made by these scholars more than suffering from the physical damage made by the military machine. The Orientalists always worked on the mind of the Muslims by washing their brains to destroy the Muslim individual basic values, which were/are directly derived from the Quran and the prophet Mohammed Teachings. So the conflict was basically ideological followed by military invasion. The two factions -the Orientalists from one side and the military force from the other side- harmoniously coordinated to work to subject the individual Muslim and Muslim communities to serve the Western interests. But recently some awareness has grown on both sides of Western and Islamic scholars to think of sharing some human dreams of living together on this Earth. This can now be seen in some running dialogues between the East and the West to build a new World, where the human race can enjoy some peace, share and exchange interests on equal bases. This article is in line with this trend to suggest real conciliation and encourage peacemaking efforts between the Christian West and the Islamic Oriental Civilizations. The people of the East would always want to remind the Western mind that all the values on which the West believed/or to believe, were practically the products of the East, the cradle of all Divine Religions: Judaism, Christianity and Islam as well as other beliefs from the far East, such as Confucianism and Buddhism in China and India, in addition to some other great philosophies and values from Persia, Arabia and Africa. The great wisdom of the West has been the original product of the Eastern Mind.

## ***2. The Continuous Islamic Question in the West***

In May 1983, Vienna celebrated the 300<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the drawback of the Turkish Army from its gates. The celebrations lasted for a whole month, during which extensive lectures were given on the fast growth of the inhabitants of the ancient city, the Ottoman military organization, and the conditions of the Ottoman state and its relations with the West during the Islamic Invasion to Europe (1400-1683). The organizers of the festival attempted to lessen the provocative nature of the marches and celebrations by opening up semi-thematic conversations about the commonalities between Christianity and Islam, and on human relations between Muslims and Christians - despite the military conflict - in the middle Ages. Some issues appeared to the surface during the debate on the sidelines of the proud anniversary; such as: the recognition of Islam as a religion, the Muslims as a political group in contemporary Europe (in Austria today half a million Turkish workers and in Western Europe about 10 million Muslims of Turkish, Arab, Indian, Balkan and European origin)\*\*. But despite all these efforts, the moderates could not suppress the cries of the instigators who saw the Islamic force operating in the West, as a "creep" of a new kind that would threaten the destinies of modern "Western civilization" as it had once done before. Shortly before this celebration, the Conference of the German Orientalists was held in Tubingen; amid the insistence of the organizers on the classical nature of Orientalism. But when the voices of some of their young men rose to demand a study of Muslim-Christian relations in addition to other issues such as Islamic laws today; their leaders went to say that such discussions were purely "politics"; so their arguments differed on this issue; as some of them argued that the study of contemporary issues would require taking a position, but taking a position itself was harmful. Some of the organizers said that the conflicts of the temporary East are so mixed and unclear to be subjected to objective scientific debates. A third group saw such research as a concern of the political scientists and strategists; so they believed that Orientalists would not be able to add anything new to these debates. On July 7, 1999, the State Department issued what could be called "a sheet de facto", in which the Department explained that some Muslims and some others believed that the United States sometimes links

between terrorism and Islam, but this is not the policy of the US. It is important to recognize that terrorists are criminals and they must not be defined by race, nationality, ethnicity or religion.

Islam and the West are not in a situation of confrontation. Most Americans and most Muslims share basic values such as peace, justice, security, economy and good governance. I intended with these examples to demonstrate two things: to show the continuous presence of the Islamic question in the West, on one hand, and the fate of all Orientalist research on a contemporary issue in particular on the other hand. Orientalism was thought of as contemplations on the East-West relations and on Western Christianity with Islam; otherwise, it goes without saying, that all that had been said was a sort of delusions or deliberate negligence to consider the issues as mere politics.

### **3. The new phase in the question of Orientalism**

Edward Said's two books: **Orientalism** and **Covering Islam** were behind the new phase in the question of Orientalism. The two books raised a heated discussion that its light has not extinguished since its publication [20] years ago, especially the first one; which was a political book of first order, and it was a book of civilization as well. So if it was not possible for us to limit East-West relations to political and economic subordination; it would not be possible - at the same time- for the living Orientalists (and those who still practice writing on classical subjects in particular) to belittle (the cultural) issue, by displacing nearly one billion Muslims living in the world today from human civilization. So in order for the issue not to remain in the realm of general and previous judgments, for example, I could mention Louis Massignon and Bernard Lewis (who were studied by Edward Said in his book). Both men worked in the area of History. The first was concerned with the theoretical and intellectual history of Islam. The second was concerned with the social and political history. But Massignon was an historian of thought who worked in the contemporary East. His writings influenced the policies of his country (France) in dealing with this issue. But his worried soul engulfed in high psychological pressure that led him to write wonderful writings (that could be understood at more than one level) about the fateful contact between the followers of the religions of Tawheed (Islam and Christianity in particular). However, he remained torn between the projected image and the disappointing reality. The second man insisted on staying on the ground of reality, even though he was writing about items such as (urban professional groups in middle Islam), and the relations between Arabs and Turks during the heydays of Islam.

The man had been a Zionist dealing with ancient Arab historical text, the Ottoman tax records while he was watching with his own eyes the contemporary Zionist encroachment of our land. Even when he left Britain to the United States he completely gave a blind eye towards Islam and its culture as if they were no longer present issues in his mind; save his American beliefs about the Middle East, which he and others contributed to its formulation. The Islamic political issue was no longer present in his mind but only the attitudes of the rightist and leftist Islamists against the Zionist entity and the Western interests in Palestine and the Islamic world. We were aware of the worries of the traditional Britain, German Italian and Spain Orientalists; about their images, which were shrinking in the minds of the people of the East. Their researches (no matter how far their concerns about the present), were seen within the same telescope, with which researches of Lewis had been observed. But the German scholars such as Halmot Raiter, Rudi Paret and Jacob Barth made creative work, and Raiter in particular excelled in the area of history of Islamic religious thoughts as well as excelling in literary studies in Arabic, Farsi and Turkish. In the last twenty years of his life, *Rudi* vowed to study the Qur'an both scholars did not really deal with the East-West conflicts, but the implementation of knowledge is not determined by the individual's intentions. They both knew that their societies surrounded them with suspicion as Muslims do, despite the difference of reasons. The modern Western state has dominion and means of control so - and they know it - that the results of their studies would be used in channels to serve their interests in our country; and he or she was a fool - of us or of them- who could see systematic or purely coincidental differences in the studies of Watt (British), Rodinson (French) and Jacob Barth (German) about the Prophet of Islam; We were not shortsighted at the same time, to consider them as the only ones who were mainly ideologically responsible of our stereotype image and contemporary. In his books "**Islam in the West**" and "**Covering Islam**", Edward Said explained that, it was the modern media that created the image and the opinion, so that the brave, the objective and the moderate person among them (if any), was the one who could dare to face the means of making public opinion, that dealt with issues of Islamic East and Islamic events.

#### 4. Orientalism and Orientalists

All of this would lead us to ask the great implicit and explicit question at the same time: What was Orientalism, and who were the Orientalists? They were the people who were interested in the East in the old times (since the eighteenth century), included: travellers, missionaries, officers, colonial administrators, linguists, theologians, anthropologists, historians of civilizations, romantic travellers, and archeologists.

We could add to them, since the turn of the century other such as: educators, intelligence men, economic historians, corporate trainers, business market experts, politicians, and people of good intentions who were interested in the East-West dialogue and Christian-Islamic relations. So it was natural, as long as the areas of interest and motivations were different, the results of the studies and the aspects of their exploitation were varied. So wasn't it the right of the individual person in the East (the subject of those studies!) to doubt and check the reasons and methods before reading those research? Over the past decades, the Orientalists had a one-dimensional view that they wanted to sell all their goods with at one time. So Louis Le Gran, Turner, and Anderson - for example were differed from Gérard Leclerc, Horowitz, and Rabinovitch. All of them according to the classical scale were studying Islam but all were not Orientalists.

In his book, "The Image of Islam in Europe in the Middle Ages", Sutherlin said at the beginning that he would not place himself in the ranks of the great scholar of Islam such as Norman Daniel author of (Islam and the West, Arabs and Europe). But a careful reading of Sutherlin and Daniel would put them together outside the field of Orientalism if Orientalism meant good knowledge of Islamic faith and civilization. The two men critically read the Middle Western picture of Islam; but when they tried to present what they considered the true image of Islam, they made blatant errors, where Massignon and even Gibb did not commit.

#### 5. Obituary of Orientalism

Today, many circles were mourning Orientalism, not including its traditional opponents from the West's anthropologists and politicians and the radical Muslims in the East. The phenomena could be noticed in the few studies and research that had been issued three decades ago of classical Oriental studies and research. It could also be seen in the decline of the number of Western scholars who knew the languages of the East and who were studying Islam and its civilization. In addition to the lack of interest in Orientalism that could be noticed in the development of orientalist institute; it could also be seen in the decrease of the number of university academic chairs, and in the presence of some young people specialized in oriental studies staying unemployed. On the other hand, the same events in this century were being renewed in some Orientalist circles in France and America, where the Classical students of Orientalism left university chairs to serve as advisers and experts in government institutions or close to government and decision-making. The uproar that arose in the late 1980s about researcher Nadav Safran, who received financial aid from the CIA, shed light on the issue we had talked about. So the young people were working as small informants and report clerks in foreign and war departments, and companies. But the issue had another face. Orientalism was already in recession because this was inseparable from the economic and cultural stagnation of the old West. But this did not mean the end of it, since the above phenomena remained external, and did not affect the essence of this area of specialization and its branches; Orientalism in reality was threatened by other factors. So those who spoke of the imminent end of Orientalism mentioned three reasons that justified this from inside: *First*: the scientific writing in the west in the social sciences, in particular, had witnessed revolutionary developments that dealt with the issues of "the historical image", the structure of the text, and the relationship of the ancient text with the contemporary scholar and his society.

History Studies still prevailed among the classic orientalist. Historiographical approach had a moral nature that yielded many fruits one hundred years ago, especially in the field of critically publishing texts, and in the comprehensive presentations on certain epochs, people and on certain events. (1) However, any return to that history was but a repetition at its best would remain a reminder of the old times without changing the picture or making it clearer. But Julius Wellhausen study which was entitled "**The Arab State and its Fall**" was a good example of what we meant. It was published in 1902 in German and then in English and other languages, including Arabic. It could be said that this study had formed a certain image of the Umayyads; and indeed an image about the nature of the Rashideen Caliphates still prevailing among scholars. Those who lately wrote about the origin of Islam or the Umayyads (Caliphates or individuals) had always sought to quote Wellhausen's opinions and filled those opinions with some details.

This was because the historical Islamic text about the Umayyads was still read in the same way, based on collecting narratives and then rearranging those narratives without examining the text from inside, and without focusing on the writer behind that text, in addition to the public discourse about the political or religious tendencies of the narrator. A man like Muhammad Abdul Hay al-Shaaban tried to transcend Wellhausen - not by borrowing social science methodology - but by means of using strange methods.

So his three studies on the First Days of Islam, the Umayyad Caliphates, the Abbasid Caliphates, and the Fatimids provoked disapproval as they were based on exaggeration of details and depended on innovation on deep interpretation using some ambiguous terms and vocabulary. The systemic crisis of methodology in Orientalism and some other branches of the humanities were really fateful in the West. As there were many Orientalists who were gathering, collecting and scrutinizing small details, and looking for the history of the dead. They were still swallowing and chewing what Ignác Goldziher, Theodor Noldeke and David Samuel Margoliouth had already swallowed, chewed up and spat out years ago. Perhaps their feelings about blocked roads before them, and the sense of uselessness were some reasons behind driving some Orientalists to seek other new and serious methods of investigation. There were some attempts within the classic Orientalism to use methods of contemporary science (history of science philosophy of science, and the generative study of the text). And as the attempts were few so their seriousness and feasibility could not be judged. But Orientalism did not benefit from the structuralists' advocates, save their efforts of giving precise enumeration of words and letters; those efforts did not deserve follow up as we believe.

But the blocked roads had prompted a group of Islamic scholars working in the West to completely turn back. If men such as Richard Burton, Knott and Fred Donner sought out methods other than classical methods in search for more objectivity and novelty; others such as John Edward Wansbrough, Cook, Patricia Crone, Gerald R. Hawting, Zimmerman and David S. Powers reverted to primitive Decartesian methods to be used in criticizing the texts as used in theological studies in (Old and New Testaments).

The works of this group in the West was similar to the work of the 19th century historians who used to refer to issues dealing with the beginnings of the Islam such as: the emergence of the Qur'an, the emergence of the art of writing, the emergence of theology, the emergence of the Prophet's Hadith, and the formation of the prevailing ideology. They used to begin with denying everything and returning it to periods too early for what the sources had mentioned. But men like Goldzhehr, Karl Vollers, Margoliouth and Schacht had tried to change the image of the old Arab sources on these issues, arguing that the documents were either lost, insufficient or impound during the first and the second centuries of the Hijra of the prophet (peace be him). But during the past three decades we saw some documents and texts so old and original, which made the images of Goldzhehr, Schacht and others become irrelevant. The dissemination and rooting of these texts was contributed to the work of Western and Eastern researchers such as Nabihh Abboud and Adolf Grohmann, Fuat Sezgin, Mohammed Mustafa Al-Adhami, Mohammed Hameed Allah. The researchers who planned to sabotage the old/new image used to raise absolute doubts without any clear explanation or evidence.

They considered the earlier Hebrew, Byzantine and Syriac as more acceptable and considerate evidences. But what they resorted to of foreign non-Arabic texts, were often from the early Islamic period, by at least two centuries. So if they found any Arabic text that went beyond the prevailing norms, they would accept it as non-refutable evidence, thus undermining their first theme in not recognizing the early Arabic-Islamic text. In the German Orientalists Conference in 1980, Angelica Nuevert wrote a critical study about this trend. Thus, in dealing with Orientalism of the classical Islamic studies, there appeared the themes which were already adopted by the old missionary Orientalists about their claim of Islam as a derivation from Judaism and Christianity; in addition to what was said of the falsifications made by late Muslims to distort the evidences provided by previous religions about the earlier Islam. So if we looked to the issue from two faces: first the face of the repetitive history or adopting the René Descartes skepticism; it would clearly demonstrate the systematic stalemate of Orientalism and would support the skepticism of those heading to the belief of the bankruptcy of Orientalism and its near fate to disappear. But to be fair, these two trends were not prevalent in contemporary Orientalism. On the basis of the harmonistic approach (analytical approach to criticism of text), an enthralling study was made by Angelica Nuevert, who defended the Quranic text when she had examined the Makkah Quranic Surahs and found out that the Quranic text was original, unified and old. Second: The loss of privacy: Orientalism - in the eyes of modern Muslims and Western critics - was based on an assumed specific nature of this region of the world.

This particular image required integration into a common specialty to carry out their own studies to uncover the unique features of the East, and distinguish them from the West. The criticism was based on two points; the assumed image of this region was purely Western, and in certain remote details. The Western intellectuals (and those interested in the East in particular) had drawn a stereotype image of the East in an imaginative manner to satisfy tendencies, interests and dreams of the West and to make distinctions between them, which in turn remained very general and cloudy concept.

(3) The evidence from this concept of the East emerged from anthropological, ethnic and ideological views that transformed the East into a field of experiments for hypotheses and lagging theories from the viewpoint of the history of science and philosophy, and from the viewpoint of the biological sciences and societal studies. The Anti-Semitism concept appeared with its moral and mental characteristics, and in turn appeared the other ethnicities. Ernest Renan, Émile-Félix Gautier and Joseph De Gobineau were prominent in this field. There also appeared the ideas of Maximilian Carl Emil Weber, in the sociology and the anthropology of the primitive societies;(4) in addition to the emergence of the Marxist vision of the so-called Asian model of production, and (5) the hypothesis of the world's distinct cultural spheres which was developed by Carl Heinrich Becker and Hans Heinrich Schaefer (6) and which reached the climax at the hands of Giorgio Levi Della Vida and Gustav Von Grunbaum in their Studies of Islam. The second point contained contradictions that revealed the risk of the idea of the peculiarity of the nature of the East from both scientific and political sides. This was the point about the concepts of the Third World and Middle East as adopted by the American Orientalists. So if we thought deeply about the concept of the Middle East here on its direct connection to our subject, we would find that it was fully formalized in the new world of Orientalism by four people: Gustav Von Grunbaum, Bernard Lewis, Hamilton Gibb, and Panayiotis Jerasimof Vatikiotis. The concept of the Middle East was essentially a geopolitical concept that began with hypnosis of the peculiarity of the Middle East as a cultural domain, this concept which had eventually been emptied from every historical or intellectual characteristic.

To remain a geographical area for Western and American interests in particular; and the focus of struggle for wealth among the super powers The issue of the Middle East in Orientalism, and the studies of the contemporary Arab world in America (in particular), France and England, were purely political. They eventually became trivial so that they could just be considered as reports to guide the Western politicians in dealing with the region. Scholars, otherwise held different views about details; but the objectives would remain clear. There were some people from among those scholars, had classic tendency to see things that emphasized the cultural continuity in the region, so that they denied any developments and considered these new features as non-Islamic and not authentic. These scholars gave advice to politicians in the West to stand and support certain regimes in the region because these regimes were representative of the authentic culture and capable of defending the Western interests in the region. There were also other people with political and strategic tendencies among them. They considered the national and regional phenomena as to be similar to the West, and that would deserve support and encouragement; because that would mean the engagement of the people of the Middle East in the contemporary mood which had been created by the West itself, and thus these people of the Middle East would be capable to protect the western interests in the present and future.

Those scholars believed that the problems of the West in the Middle East were due to the failure of modernization in some regions, and its failure and its drawback in other regions. Some analysts of the former trend stood puzzled by the non-traditional and anti-Western Islamic phenomena in the Middle East; such as the Iranian revolution and the contemporary Islamic movements. The supporters of the second trend regarded these self-righteous phenomena as evidence for the need to modernize the Middle East by force if necessary to preserve the interests of the West). 7)The critics of Orientalism who based their work on the peculiarity of nature of the East such as Anwar Abdel Malik, Bryan S. Turner, Peter Gran, Fred Halliday, Edward Said, J. J. Schultens and Karl Vollers; despite some differences among them; they saw the images of the Islamic East, the Third World, and the Middle East in the eyes of the Western scholars as manifestations of Western Narcissism and Centralism (regardless of the historical culture and civilization of the region; with undeniable facts). These manifestations of Western narcissism and centralization should disappear in the context of the deep and long-term emancipation processes, in these changing and opposing geographical, civilization and political worlds. Then Orientalism would not be able to deny these variables; but it would inevitably disappear in its traditional sense, when it would be forced to recognize those changes. *Thirdly*: Multiplicity of interests: An Orientalist in this century, considered himself, and considered by his society, to some extent, an expert with full authority in the affairs of the Islamic East.

But this expert per excellence according to his qualifying- was and still is limited with knowledge and ability to understand, but this fundamentally was not a defect. So a man like Erich Braunlich (who wrote his doctoral thesis on Bustam bin Qais al-Shaibani - the leader of Bani Shaiban during Islam), and Martin Hartmann (whose interest was in Yemen before Islam), and Werner Caskel who studied the ancient Yemen, and the tribes of the Euphrates, these people were not expected to understand the social and political structure of Islam of the Middle Ages. So how could such people guide their governments on issues such as dealing with the Arab tribes of the 20<sup>th</sup> century; or the conflict of interests between Germany and France in the East before the first war, and between the two wars? But they did try as others had done and the results were so disastrous. This was evident in the debate on the Orientalist magazines during the first war between Karl Heinrich Becker and Snouck Hurgronje. The former was a specialist in the social/economic structure in the beginning of Islam, while the second was a scholar of the history of Makkah who published some ancient texts related to that time. Hurgronje tried to help his government to control Indonesian Islam, while Becker tried to make the Cesarean Germany understand the Islam of the Ottomanic Empire. They both showed and exchanged accusations of hostility to modern Islam and the use of science in colonial politics. However, the two men failed as colonial experts, and from Becker's contribution there remained only his analysis of the abscess system in Islamic Egypt, and his discussion of Islam's relationship with Hellenism. Nor was any of Hurgronje contributions, other than his publications of some classical text remained as well. What had been said about those scholars already mentioned could be said about many others; such as Hamilton Gibb who was a good scholar of the classics of Islam as he tried in his attempt to enable modern American companies to understand current trends in Islam; while Joseph Schacht, was a good scholar of Islamic jurisprudence, attempted to understand some of the political phenomena in the revolutionary Islamic Africa. The history of Cambridge of Islam was the last of these bankrupt attempts, as these volumes published in four parts, were written by famous Orientalists under the supervision of P.M. Holt, A. Lambton and Bernard. Lewis. However, those old Orientalists with illusion of totalitarianism occupied their heads, miserably failed in their classic/historical surveys and generalizations. Therefore, B.Spuler, although he was a famous Persian political historian, could not understand the theory of the Islamic Caliphate, but rather satisfied by quickly collecting the views of J. Wellhausen, Gibb and Franz Rosenthal. A. Lambton who was a well-known scholar of early Persian social and political formations, also failed to understand the variants of Safavid and Qajari Iran. In addition Nooruddin Zein repeated a hasty vision of the late Ottoman union. James Robson wrote a chapter on the Western influence in the East. He said, that article did not take from his time more than just one evening. But it will take us a long time to turn to a detailed enumeration of the shortcomings of this huge project of the academic nature.

### ***6. Contemporary Oreintalists often do not know the languages of the people***

So if our criticism focused on the classical Orientalists who were trying to study modern and contemporary Islamic society, this did not mean that the contemporary Orientalists were capable of avoiding the imperfections of the old totalitarianism. It was quite the contrary, as many of these who were reading contemporary Islam through some sociological or economic scope to serve the administrations of their countries or companies (which often financed their research); often did not know the languages of the people they studied. These modern Oreintalists sometimes turned into experts after being unable to specialize in other fields. They would evade going deep by one of two ways; they either resorted to statistics and enumeration in the field of the phenomena, or they would jump to conclusions of a political nature; which had already been assumed from the outset. Or they would either resort to history to review their own collection of secondary references of the classicalist Orientalists to arrive to the same results. So if the first team was presenting a naive and comprehensive picture, the second team was not providing more than a hasty intelligence report. What was counted against the critics of Orientalism concentrated was their perception of the phenomena of the East as not being seen different from the phenomena of the West. So the Orientalists who were studying the Western Sociology in a certain era should not be considered as authorities in any time other than the time they were living in. Even a man like Fernand Braudel was not expected to say anything new rather in the social worlds of the middle Ages in Europe. Therefore, how was Bernard Lewis able to write about everything in the East in 15 centuries? Irrespective of that view of the East, based on Western centrism - a phenomenon that we had already presented. The Orientalists critics offered a scientific evidence of this deceptive inclusiveness of Orientalism. And how could Claude Lévi-Strauss be only an anthropologist; while Fr.Taeschner and Jacques Berque were playing the roles of historians, sociologists, politicians and economists at the same time when they were dealing with the Islamic East?

Orientalism - in the eyes of these critics - was scattered in various disciplines such as history, sociology, anthropology, economics and politics. There was no longer a single world called Orientalism; but there were different worlds, each with its own domain. If the concepts of the East, the Third World, and the Middle East were vague and non-scientific, so should be the concept of Orientalism as well. A reference of a recent example of this was the Samuel Phillips Huntington opinion on the clash of civilizations, who came to final conclusions on the nature of Islam, religion and civilization. Although we have been struggling for (five) years to correct them, but in vain. The man is a political science professor, a writer on the Cold War, but he has nothing to do with Orientalism.

### ***7. Violent religious and political defense against Orientalism***

But the Islamic, Arabic, and eastern criticism of Orientalism was older than that, and with various premises and objectives. Perhaps the disputes of Jamal al-Din al-Afghani and Muhammad Abdo with Ernest Renan and Gabriel Hanotau were the first chapters of this type of criticism. Since then, the defense against Orientalism had been deeply religious and politically violent. This harsh attitude against Orientalism was but a manifestation of the unsteadiness of the East-West relationship. It was the most explosive and hostile aspect of the cultural sphere. So if the West militarily conquered the East and Islam centuries ago, Orientalism - in the eyes of its Muslim critics had accompanied this invasion, but it was ahead of the invasion, as Orientalism progress had paved the way for the invasion of the East at the cultural and intellectual fronts. Indeed, this vision of Orientalism did not exclude it from the rest of the image about the West. These critics saw in orientalism a chapter in a major conspiracy against Islam and Muslims called 'the West', whatever the identity of this West was; as this West when it was holding Christian belief, it wanted to beat Islam to spread Christianity by force and by missionary efforts. But when it became secular, it wanted to "sabotage" the beliefs of the Muslims, to weaken their resistance so as to facilitate their exploitation. The people who said this held the view of those who used to say that the international Judaism was behind the beating of religion in Europe, to control and to have full penetration in it; and definitely it was not expected from the dominant Judaism to be more compassionate to Islam. Communism, which was dominant in large parts of the world in their view also, had a major interest in the destruction of Islam. The Marxism-Leninism was always against any religion in any case. The Russians themselves had a major Islamic problem at home, as millions of Muslims were settled in the territories inherited by the Russian Federation from the late Soviet and Caesarian Russia.

The criticism of Jamaledin Al-Afghani and Mohammed Abdou, against the Western vision of Islam and the East- focused on the general aspects, with its totalitarian nature such as: the Semitic and the Aryan mentality, the contribution of Islam to the progress or backwardness of Muslims, dealing with women. But we found Mohammed Rashid Ridha's responded to Emile Durmingham's book about the Prophet, and Ahmad Shafiq Pasha attacked the Orientalists view of slavery issue in Islam. Then Mohammed Farid Wagdy and Tantawi went on to prove the "rationality" of the Islamic solution to contemporary problems in the face of what they had considered irrational orientalist stance on the contemporary Islam and its issues. Even if the 1930s witnessed a relatively quiet debate, it turned into mere accusation of the Western Orientalism in everything; this trend prevailed and still prevails among some Arabs and some Muslims. There are some observations that should be made on this Islamic situation against Orientals.

There was always a tie in the minds of those who rejected Orientalism, and who were always skeptic about it, whether Orientalism was scientific and objective in its approaches or whether it was a mere means to spread Christianity. Muharib al-Din al-Khatib's book: "The Raid on the Islamic World" and Faroukh & al-Khalidi" Evangelization and colonialism"; were two clear examples of this. There was always a sense that the Western Orientalist could never be of good faith or scientifically objective about Islam; so any praise of something in Islam or the East by some of those Orientalists would not prevent skepticism and questioning the orientalist's intentions behind their works or praise. This clearly appeared in Muhammad al-Bahi's book (Modern Islamic Thought and its Connection to Western Colonialism). It was also clear in Sheikh Abdul Halim Mahmoud; s booklets, and the well known messages of Malik bin Nabi. There was also a continuing sense that an orientalist would never be independent in his research and intentions; and that he should always be affiliated to an official-anti-Muslim-Western-based organization or he might be the spearhead in a secret organization conspiring against the religion and the culture of Muslims. This was clearly reflected in the studies of Muhammad Hussein, Anwar al-Jundi and Muhammad al-Ghazali.

Finally, there was a firm conviction that the conflict between the Eastern (Islamic) and Western cultures was fateful, with no room for commonalities. This clearly appeared in the writings of Al-Mawdudi, Al-Nadawi and Muhammad Qutb.

It seems that as if Kipling's verse (OH, East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet,); remained a non-disputable according to the prevailing Islamic view. But the other side of the case would remain ambiguous if we did not notice the elements of this sharp position which were all defensive. As all the Islamist writers saw themselves in confrontation against a sweeping civilization's march in which they could not help but to stand up in a jittery defense posture. The issue became more complicated if we took into account the appreciation of those Islamist critics to some Orientalists' research and quotations. These Islamist critics sometimes feel proud, when the Orientalists praised certain phenomena, or said good words, in praising some individuals in the modern Islamic East; despite the issue of plagiarism about the pre-Islamic poetry which was raging in Cairo by Taha Hussein, who was influenced by Margoliouth. And while the Islamic critics were heavily attacking Orientalists; some of these critics of Taha Hussein and Margoliouth and others were eager to attend the lectures of Ignacio Guidi, and Carlo Alfonso Nallino at the Egyptian University at the same time. They were secretly working very hard and openly to cooperate with Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer and August Fischer and others in the draft dictionary of the Historic Arabic Language Dictionary. The visit of Roger Garaudy and Maxime Rodinson to Cairo in the late 1960s was a huge cultural event not only to the intellectuals of Egyptian universities but also to the sheikhs of the Azhar Mosque as well. But if these Orientalists happened to write in a case related to Islam in the East or about some Arab Muslim societies; these intellectuals oral assessment would disappear and they would return to their old positions. It was noticeable that nothing was new in their criticism; as the same accusations that had already been cast by Sheikh Rashid Ridha at David Émile Durkheim, were cast again by Mohammed al-Bahi, and his students, Abdullah al-Arawi, Qasim al-Samarrai, Muhammad Arkoun and Hicham Jouait in the 1960s and 1970s. And even recently the accusations were cast on Montgomery Watt, Rudi Paret, Rodinson and Wansborough. Although some Muslims authors on orientalism might be mastering a foreign language in most cases, but it was notable that they based their criticism and their rejection of Orientalism, on the limited number of references that had been translated in the 1940s and 1950s of this century. I have read two articles on "Orientalists and the Sources of Islamic Legislation" in (1981-1982) in the Kuwaiti Law Review (1981-1982). The authors of those articles were only familiar- from among many Orientalists with only Goldziher and Joseph Schacht, although the studies of these two scholars on the legislation issues had been overshadowed by Orientalist research some decades ago.(8) In fact - the insistence of the critics of the Arab intellectuals Orientalists, not to renew their information about it, and at the same time turning the issue into a stereotype case, by even ignoring the names and titles of the books; this behavior - was not only due to the despair from their side, but it was due to two other things; the first was the campaign on Westernization and cultural invasion, on the political systems, and the other was the considering of intellectuals as present representatives of the West and Orientalism on our land. (9)

Orientalism, then, too many of the modern and contemporary Arab and Muslim writers was the cultural aspect of colonial policy in the East. But what I am doing here is just describing the phenomenon and giving it an evaluative description. The case is not difficult to understand anyway. So if Orientalism (even from an advanced point of view like Edward Said's) was a dimension of the complex and arduous relationship between East and West, then this iceberg was beginning to appear. The Contemporary Muslim intellectuals (Salafi and liberals) are suffering difficult labouring amid the ongoing attrition on their land and the political entities; so we should not wait for a wounded and a bleeding person to be able to determine, who from among the attackers, his shooter had been. So this is the way the contemporary Muslims scholars see this issue. But the issue has a historical and psychological dimension that cannot be denied. There was a strong rapprochement between Arab Islamic civilizations, and the Western Civilization. This convergence had its own history and problems. Muslims saw that they were forming an original part in the Western civilization; so the events of the last two centuries appeared to many of them as stabs in the back that could not be forgotten or ignored. The writings of Ahmed Lutfi al-Sayyid, Muhammad Hussayn Haykal, Muhammad Kurd Ali, Ahmed Amin and Abbas Mahmud al-Aqad in the 1930s and 1940s foretold that the wounds would heal one day, and that the issue would eventually come to some reassurance amid the manifestations and the decline of the ancient colonialism. But then appeared the Palestinian tragedy and the projects of the regional and sectarian entities, in addition to the persistence of Western pressure on Islam in Asia and Africa. The glare of the wound returned again, and everything went rigid, that trying to keep the "balance" looked naiveté or even a betrayal.

Until recently, Muslim intellectual's situations were fluctuating between rigid, hard, tired and desperate. And there was no hope in the horizon of their perspectives of a good and healthy relationship between the East and the West. In a debate that lasted for days with a veteran Islamic scholar, I tried to extract something positive; but after all he said that there were some individuals among the Orientalists who were clean and honorable; but they were marginal in contemporary orientalism and marginal in Western culture; and it is/was the educated Muslim's duty to establish a serious balanced and understandable dialogue with his native Christians citizens in the East to build a community unity that had not been attained. A man like Abd al-Latif al-Taybawi (may Allah have mercy on him), spent most of his years and his old age in the West, worked in his universities; but he believed that non-Muslims should not write about Islam.

### ***8. Is Orientalism over or almost over?***

The Orientalism was over or almost over for more than one generation. And the followers of the concept of the "Middle East" in Islamic studies in America; are still a few among the Orientalists for our good luck and the good luck of Orientalism. The systematic civilization crisis that threatened classical Orientalism had been exacerbated by a hostile view of large corporations and Western government officials; who saw Orientalism as not directly beneficial to their interests; hence, there was no point in continuing to spend money on its institutes and chairs. However, the stagnation which Orientalist worlds was witnessing today in the West, must not distract us from the vast heritage of texts and research that had been produced by Orientalists since the middle of the last century until today. With the exception of a few texts published in Bulaq or Hyderabad, the Orientalists published the most extensive Islamic and Arabic texts, which are still in the field of reading the Medieval Islam. (10) But whatever the value of the Orientalists' research in the field of Quran and Sunnah, it was the first analytical hope based on direct sources. Their research in the fields of history, geography, thought, society, authority, and East-West relations was pioneering and indispensable in any scientific research carried out on these issues. The issues of the stagnation of Orientalism, its systemic crisis, and the indifference of Western governments towards it today, should not distract us from major projects within its scope completed two decades ago or still exist. Two decades ago, Franz Altheim and his wife Ruth Stiehl completed the huge scientific project entitled "Arabs in the Old World". And the second edition of "The Islamic Encyclopedia" was still moving forward after publishing ninth volume, but it would not fall into less than eleven volumes. And due to our every day experience of this kind of issues, we believe that there is nothing more important than this Islamic encyclopedia, as a tool of education about Islam and its civilization. The German scholars conducted a comprehensive historical, social, political and religious survey of the geographical aspects for the past three decades, about the East from the earliest ages until today. Local maps, topographic, economic, and historical and social studies characterized with novelty, surveying and resource-mining have been issued within the scope of the project. And about 50 quarterly journals or so, in the United States, Canada, Australia, Japan, Russia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the Netherlands, Denmark, Poland, Germany, France, England, Italy and Spain, are concerned with Orientalism in the classical sense (Islamic studies). There were many conferences and seminars held on various Orientalist issues in Germany, America, and England that published research in specialized books and magazines; and many commemorative books were dedicated to old deceased Orientalists or newlywed's authorities but have little new ideas to come with.

There was also Fuat Sezgin who continued to publish his great work, "The History of the Arab Heritage". The project was followed as a revision of Carl Brockelmann's work: "The History of Arabic Literature". Then the work was then transformed into a new documentary reading of the whole Arab-Islamic culture. Recalling the name of Fuat Sezgin would take me to mention the Institute of "the History of the Arabic Sciences," which was recently established as collaboration of the University of Frankfurt, and some Arab countries and was headed by Sezgin, who was originally the author of the idea.

The connection between East and West within the scope of Orientalism is not limited to the work of Sezgin (Turkish origin) alone. In Western universities today, many Arab and Muslim scholars are practicing teaching and doing research work within the well-known Orientalists' approaches; among them are highly distinguished scholars, who are feeling the depth of the crisis of methodology and the disruption of the East-West relationship. Some Arab countries are supporting institutes and chairs for Islamic and Middle East studies in European and American Universities. Orientalism is still prevailing in dozens of institutes and hundreds of chairs in Europe and the Americas. But still we are not able to know Abdul Latif al-Tibawi's opinion of how to explain the acceptance of some Orientalists in the last two decades to convert to Islam.

In the midst of all this, it is difficult to predict what will happen two decades later. There is a possibility that the issue will develop under pressure from governments and companies. The solution that was previously imposed in the Marxist-Leninist political sphere will prevail as the "Islamic studies" have ended as a science or specialization in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe! Instead, many institutes and workshops for political, social and economic research have been established, some of which have interests in the East from the view point of mere historical materialism with its four known stages. The triumph of the political and economic needs pressures in the capitalist West will mean the disappearance of the concept of Orientalism in its classic sense, in favor of the concept of the Middle East in its American version. So if the "traditional institution" especially in Western Europe (Germany and England) resisted; the discipline may be divided into two branches: the Middle East, and Islamic studies; with the triumph of the former over the second. We have evidences in the course of things in the present that the second option may appear again; but the phenomena are still mixed.

### ***9. The Destiny of Orientalism***

The destiny of Orientalism, in recent decades, has to be critically thought of. Anwar Abdulmalik's article (11) in 1963: "Orientalism in Crisis" raised some responses and discussions; then the matter was forgotten until everyone felt the weight of the crisis of methodology in the field of humanities, in the early seventies, that renewed discussion on the concept of Orientalism and its subject; in addition to also renewing the issue of the Orientalist's relationship in the field of research; and the concepts of the East vs West and Islam and Arabs in Orientalism. Edward Said's study came in 1978 and prompted many to question the issue of orientalism. Anwar Abdel Malik's article had attracted the attention of many orientalists, including Francesco Gabrieli and Maxime Rodinson. Rodinson's interest in the issue continued from the viewpoint of history of thought, contemporary anthropological trends. His book, "The Attraction of Islam", was translated into Arabic. He also published articles in some conferences' books on anthropology and orientalism, orientalism and the Asian model of production, European Orientalism and Centralism. Horgronje Wardenburg's, reflected in his 1970 book, "Islam in the Mirror of the West" the development of Islam or its image among the leading Orientalists of the 19th and mid-20th centuries. In the mid-1970s, Charles Adams and Bielefeld made debates about Islamic studies and the history of religions.

A.O.van Nieuwenhuijze saw the issue as a radical critique, calling for the replacement of sociology with Orientalism; then he returned in 1978 to contemplate on the contemporary German Orientalism from the viewpoint of the philosophy of science. I remember that a colleague of mine and I, once suggested to some professors of Islamic studies in a German university in 1976: to present "Orientalism" as a subject for discussion in university seminars but they were afraid and hesitating. But today, the issues of history, image and methodology in orientalism are everywhere. Franz Rosenthal, the conservative student of Islamic classics, did not hesitate to present a lecture entitled "The Crisis of Orientalism" in 1980. And Wardenburg returned to propose a new approach to Islamic studies to overcome the present crisis; in addition to Jean-Pierre Charnay who published an article on orientalism and methodology in the same conference in 1981. In the 1960s and 1970s, Norman Daniel published his two volumes entitled "Islam and the West, Arabs and Europe". The two books were important documents on the evolution of the image of Islam and Arabs in the West through the ages. But Sutherland's lectures on the same subject came with a "new" vision of the issue. On the other hand, this Western self-reflection took on a new dimension with a desire to know the image of the West in the East and vice versa. This was reflected in the remarks of Hicham Jouait in French, which was widely known under the title of "Europe and Islam".

Then Anwar Abdel Malik in his article, already mentioned, made a note of Joseph Needham's call to listen to the Asian and African view about Europe and the West. The German researcher Rotraud Wielandt studied "The Image of the European in modern Arabic novels and plays" in a large and inquisitive volume published by the German Institute for Oriental Research in Beirut. The Institute of the Arab Development in Beirut published a study by Khalid Ziadeh entitled "The Evolution of the Islamic View about Europe". Also Nazek Saba Yared published a wide-ranging study entitled "The Arab Travelers and the Civilization of the West" (1979), but despite her deep investigations in her survey, she made preference to the Western references instead of referring to the original texts. We can also now refer to studies of different approaches to the historical images of the two parties, including the book by Idris Beni Hani in 1998, and the book of Muhammad Nūr al-Dīn Afāyah entitled: "Imaginary West" issued a (month) ago. However, Bernard Lewis's a ten-year-old-trend work, still unfortunately topping the relatively long list of issues of image, relationship, knowledge and discovery.

## 10. Co-existence

A German Journal reported that a German journalist asked the former German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt about his "projects" for the future after he had left the official political work. He replied after a long hesitation that he would like to write a book about the humanitarian and civilization encounter in the religions of Tawheed especially the Christianity and Islam!! Indeed, the issues of Christianity's relationship to Islam, Western civilization to Islamic civilization, and the future of life on this earth in the light of the conflicts of the East and the West, have preoccupied some people in the West, not colonialists, opportunists or missionaries, for more than a century. These issues were present strongly in the history of thought, the human vision of the world, and the aspiration for the East and the West are still close. This East has given the West its religion and the foundation of its present civilization. Today there are an increasing communication at all levels; there are debates on the dialogue of civilizations that have been raised by Roger Garaudy vision in his title, and there is the Arab-European dialogue. (13) There were the Islamic Christian conferences in coordination with the Catholic Church or with the World Council of Churches. In the 1940s and 1950s, the Western political institutions had control on some channels of communication for "the defense of the Middle East", "freedom of culture" and "union of faith", in the face of the Soviet Union. This constituted a setback to the issues at stake, and the Muslim participants raised doubts about the intentions of the Western communicators and their associates among us in the East.

But the last two decades have witnessed conferences and seminars that have reached a high degree of understanding, frankness and objectivity, in which crucial issues were discussed such as: human rights in Christianity and Islam, historical relations between Muslims and Christians, Christian-Christian co-existence and the potential of religions to contribute to world peace and disarmament, family conservation and environment. Some Orientalists directly contributed to the well-known journal, published in Rome since 1975, as: Christian Islam; where Christian and Muslim scholars wrote on issues of dialogue and cultural relations. There have been frequent statements by Western political leaders about Islam in England, Belgium, Sweden and America in recent years, and we knew that classical Orientalists often wrote those articles to them, but not the Middle Eastern scholars. But these writings were primarily meant to approach the large Muslim communities today in their countries without the reduction of the importance of these writings. In his statement, a State Department official made the remark mentioning the [1] billion Muslims in the world, as well as mentioning the growing number of American Muslims and their increasing effectiveness in the American society.

## 11. Conclusion

We have to produce cultural and historical knowledge. When Ahmed Al-Sheikh asked Jack Toby, a well-known Ottoman scholar: if he was an Orientalist? Toby was said to have replied with no; saying that he did not know if there was still a presence for some Orientalists! "Orientalist" as he said was an old term and that he was not an Orientalist but an historian of international relations.(14) When Andr' Miquel, a well-known Arab culture and literature scholar was asked the same question, he said that he was not an orientalist but his interests revolved around Arabic language and literature, especially the classics. So he claimed to be a specialist in Arabic language and literature, like others in France, specializing in English, Italian, and German literature, so he would prefer to be called "Arabicist" rather than Orientalist. It seemed from these statements that Orientalism has remained the prisoner of historicism, and the contemporary methodology has shattered that great school of thought. But not only historians and men of the theory of literature, but also some Islamic religious studies that still remained prisoners to Orientalism. The theological colleges in the United States, Germany and Britain are offering chairs nowadays for the study of Islamic religion, but distinguishing between the specialization of Islamic studies that had been inherited from classical European Orientalism, and the Islamic Religion which dealt with mere Islamic religious texts and Islamic religious sciences such as jurisprudence, philology, and theology, and this is quite significant.

This meant that the recognition of Islam as a religion like the other two religions, Judaism and Christianity. So with the advancement in the recognition of Islam, the studies of religions - which radically differed from the comparisons of previous religions-have led to the establishment of institutes, centers and magazines for Christian Islamic studies, that dealt with the history and present-day relations at all levels. Therefore, Orientalism should not lose in this field; but the Christian preachers, whose parasites had grown on the margins of Orientalism, who should lose. However, there are some issues still remaining unresolved or subject to developments.

The Islamic studies are concerned with the languages of Islam, its culture and its civilization, and the teaching of the Islamic religion to students. These studies are sensitive towards the philology and the languages of the Islamic civilization. In the past two decades those studies have been dominated by the advocates of the radical criticism that we have already mentioned. Finally, there are the studies of the near and Middle East, which confuse the ancient with the modern, but are dominated by modern and contemporary aspects of politics and economics. However, the intense specialization of these studies threatens the profound understanding of Islam and its modern and contemporary manifestations. The Middle East scholars are the ones who behind the profuse use of this concept of the theory of modernization, Islamic movements and terrorism.

The famous Moroccan professor Salem Ben Hamish has a series of studies published in 1991: under "Orientalism in the Horizon of its Blockage." Salem linked this with several factors such as: Orientalist discourse, colonial inheritance, rigid vision of Islam and Arabs, and systematic backwardness in the midst of the human and social sciences revolution. Therefore, if this blockage was true, and it was true, then there were several issues that have been a result out of that. The first of these is the fundamentals of sociology and anthropology, relating to the nature of our societies and the peculiarities of their development, these are still rooted in the Western social sciences and in the philosophy of history and human sciences, which can be seen as evidence that Orientalism was not the cause behind all of that.<sup>(16)</sup> It is clear now that the Arab-Islamic criticism of orientalism was not the one that its sun has overshadowed so can we aspire to be able to do so with the other sciences of Western origin, which are still very dominant in our universities.

Secondly, this cursed orientalism, which has passed through variables that ended its traditional formulas, is about to leave a vacuum in our cultural field. And apart from the publication of some manuscript texts and some jurisprudential attempts, there have been no significant Arab efforts in various fields of study such as history, Islamic cultural history, Islamic art, social sciences, life sciences, etc. Thirdly, if we have always understood orientalism as a manifestation of our troubled relations with the West, and Western culture - as I have tried to explain in this lecture, so does this knowledge or ideological decline mean a change in our relationship with the West? Or is it really the change that is taking place now behind the turning away of Orientalism from the facade or from its leading position? I said in my introduction to Ricahrd Sutherland's book, "The Image of Islam in Europe in the Middle Ages" in 1983:, that "Orientalism has long ceased to be the window through which the West views us: so don't we need to stop looking at Western culture and see it as mere cultural invasion?! My sense tells me that we the intellectuals will remain busy for a long long time with the problems of this complex relationship in the light of the blatant imbalance in the faces of power and effectiveness. And the last of these issues is that Orientalism will be present in all our disciplines of historical dimension, as a part of the history of thought. I hope that this would be the case, but this hope will be achieved only by the fulfillment of two conditions: our relations with the West will have to change in favor of equality and active participation, and the emergence of new generations of Arab researchers who are able to produce cultural and historical knowledge that will be references for our young people and for the Western research centers there as well.

## **References**

1. Read about the history of European thought in Friedrich Meinecke "Die Entstehung des Historism".
2. See discussions in the Journal of the Institute of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, BSOAS1978-1981.
3. The comprehensive calendar written by Ewald Wagner in the Journal of the Association of German Orientalists (ZDMG, M 132/1982).
4. Compare, for example, Ghassan Salameh's article "The Nerve of Orientalism": in (Al-Mustaqbal Alarabi) journal, No. 32/1981-in Arabic-and the two good books of Bryan Turner's writings: Marx and the End of Orientalism, Islam and Sociology.
5. Compare the book of "Anthropology and Colonialism" by Gérard Leclerc translated and published by the (Al Fikr Alarabi Magazine) in 1982 and the two books by Talal Alasad.
6. "The Genealogy of Religion and Colonial Encounter". See Turner's book: Marx and the End of Orientalism.
7. Compare the study of Joseph van S, Julius Wellhausen and K.H. Becke:in Islamic Studies; published by Malcolm Kerr, 1981.
8. See Bernard Lewis's: The West and the Middle East, and his book: The Future of the Middle East. 1997.

9. Read a comprehensive presentation of Muslims' views on Orientalism in G. Alleaume in the British Society for Middle East Studies (1982), a doctoral dissertation on the Arab Criticism of Orientalism (1994), and my 1997 article on Arabs and Orientalism.
11. Compare my two articles in my book: The Politics of Contemporary Islam 1997 and Eckhard Rudolf, 1994. See Orientalists of Philip Akiki-in Arabic.
12. Re-Published in a translated file in (Al-Fakr Alrabi) magazine on Orientalism in 1983. in Arabic
13. See (the Sociological Vision of Islam) Edmund Burke's in Islamic Studies - published by Malcolm Kerr, 1982.
14. Compare, for example, Journal (Shi-oon Arabia) issue No. 28. In Arabic.
15. Ahmed Al-Sheikh: (Hiwar Al-istshrag: Min Nagd Al-isthsrag ela Nagd Alistghrab), 1999, p.160. (Ibid P. 83).
16. Compare with Bryan Turner: (Islam and Sociology), and the views of Ernest Giellner and Clifford Geertz, Asaf Hussain and Robert Olson (1984), Orientalism, Islam and Islamists.

### **(\*) Notes**

This is a translation of an article originally written in Arabic by Dr. Rudhwan El Sayed, a visiting professor of Islamic Studies at Harvard University- USA. The title of the article was (Al-Isti-shraq Wa Almusta-shriheen Bain Alghlu Wa Al-Moghalt). Retrieved on May 2017 from <http://www.alhiwartoday.net/node/10637>. So all the information and dates need to be read within the context of the article publication history. This article was written in (18-12-1999). See <http://www.ridwanalsayyid.com/ContentPage.aspx?id=98#null>.

Although the article was published almost 18 years ago but the issues it handled are still hot. We have to recall this quotation from the author once again and work toward his goals that we need "...an emergence of new generations of Arab researchers who are able to produce cultural and historical knowledge that will be references for our young people and for the Western research centers there, as well."