

NOTES AND DISCUSSION

Anouar Abdel-Malek

ORIENTALISM IN CRISIS

"It is indispensable to view Europe from the outside, to view the history of Europe, the failures of Europe as well as its successes, through the eyes of that vast part of humanity which is formed by the peoples of Asia and Africa." Joseph Needham

In order to dispel "the iron curtain of false enigmas," of which Claude Roy speaks, it is urgent to undertake a revision, a critical reevaluation of the general conception, the methods and implements for the understanding of the Orient that have been used by the West, notably from the beginning of the last century, on all levels and in all fields.

This is an imperative of every exact science, which aims at understanding. And yet the resurgence of the nations and the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, in the last two generations, was required in order to provoke a *prise de*

Translated by J. W. C.

conscience, tardy and frequently reticent, of an exigency of principle become an unavoidable practical necessity, precisely due to the decisive influence of the political factor, i.e., the victories achieved by the various movements of national liberation on a world scale.

For the time being, the crisis strikes at the heart of orientalism: since 1945, it has been not only the "terrain" that has escaped it, but also the "men," until yesterday the "object" of study, and, henceforth, sovereign "subjects."

The domain of human and social sciences are also proving to have need of an alteration, an extension, a transformation which would not be just narrowed to the field; but for the time being at least no characterized crisis may be perceived. This is because several factors, and principally the growing role of the Marxist methodology, universalist and historicizing, but also methods which tie in with it at such or such a point, that is, methods of modern science and rationalism, allow more effective syncretism and flexibility, though still profoundly insufficient.

Let us examine the subject closer. Our study deals naturally with the Arab world, and more particularly with Egypt; it will also touch upon the sector of China and Southeast Asia, in a related fashion.

Numerous works¹ are at the disposal of scholars, disparate material, full of suggestions, rarely precise, on the history of traditional orientalism—from its foundation, decided on by the Council of Vienna in 1245, and from the first chairs of Oriental languages at the *Universitas magistrorum et scholarium Parisiensium*, until World War II.*

One will note with interest, however, that the real impetus of Oriental studies in the two key sectors, that of the Arab world and the Far East, dates essentially from the period of colonial establishment, but, above all, from the domination of the "forgotten continents" by the European imperialisms (middle and second half of the twentieth century): the first wave was marked by the creation of orientalist societies (Batavia 1781); Société Asiatique, Paris 1822; Royal Asiatic Society, London 1834; American Oriental Society, 1842; etc.); the second phase

* See bibliography and notes at the end of this article.

witnessed the appearance of orientalist congresses, the first of which took place in Paris in 1873; sixteen congresses were then held up to World War I (the last congress was the one in Vienna in 1912); since then only four have taken place...

Precisely what kind of studies were these?

The orientalist—"a scholar versed in the knowledge of the Orient, its languages, its literatures, etc."²—what kind of man, what kind of scholar is he? What are his motivations? What occupies him? What objectives does he set himself to attain?

Michelangelo Guidi (1886-1946) placed himself in the perspective of a philosophy of history as opposed to that of the hellenocentric peoples, upheld, notably, by Werner Jaeger:³ "By orientalists, I understand those who study the Near East; for the thought of India and China is certainly of the greatest interest in understanding the spiritual paths (...), but they have no vital contact with us;" "We orientalists, in fact, look towards the cultures in which the Oriental element appears in its most complete expression, that is, towards the pure national cultures, towards Islam, for instance, not only with the aim of recreating a foreign world, very high nevertheless, very worthy of scientific consideration, but also as the only means that would enable us to understand fully the nature of the elements of the admirable and very fecund fusion that occurred *in the zone of hellenism*;"⁴ "The orientalist, if he wants to be complete, must start with the classic world. But it would be anti-historical to disregard completely a period which is situated between us and pure antiquity. A *homo classicus* and a *homo orientalis* become, at a certain moment, a recollection or an abstraction. Only a *homo novus* of hellenism is a 'living' product of 'living' movements and not of movements artificially created by the scholars; all have been created by an original historical force." Therefore "we do not study these worlds to arrange a new series of phenomena in the show window of the human museum, to describe exotic and marvelous forms, in order to understand the βαρβαρῶν σοφία; we study these worlds rather to relive in their fullness the phases of intimate union of two different traditions, endeavoring to distinguish the modes and functions of one of them, with eyes made more keen by the contemplation of the manifestations of Oriental culture in its total expression,

with the possibility of a more precise estimation, with a livelier sensibility,"⁵ etc. Is it exaggerated to speak here of romantic "eurocentrism,"⁶ which animates scientific investigation, while one finds in a Raymond Schwab identical themes,⁷ and while the seven portraits of English orientalists—S. Ockley, W. Jones, E. H. Palmer, E. G. Browne, R. A. Nicholson, A. J. Arberry—drawn by this latter very recently,⁸ are moving essentially in the same sense? But we must see that we are—historically—at the epoch of European hegemony; the retrospective criticism must take this into account.

The most notable works of the principal Western orientalist schools spring from this current of thought, from this vision of orientalism (France, Great Britain, Germany, Spain, Italy, Russia and the United States). Their contribution has been multiple and fruitful. The Lebanese bibliographer Youssef Assaad Dagher distinguishes eight positive elements in the field of Arabic and Islamic studies: the study of ancient civilization; the collection of Arabic manuscripts in European libraries; the establishment of catalogues of manuscripts; the publication of numerous important works; the lesson of method thus given to Oriental scholars; the organization of orientalist congresses; the editing of studies, frequently deficient and erroneous from a linguistic point of view, but precise in the method; and finally, "this movement has contributed to arousing the national consciousness in the different countries of the Orient and to activating the movement of scientific renaissance and the awakening of the ideal."⁹ We will see further on what is in it.

This vision of traditional orientalism, however, was not the dominant vision; or, rather, it represented, in part, the essential segment of the work, accomplished in the universities and by scholarly societies, without however ignoring the whole range of the work that has been carried out and published within this framework and elsewhere. On the other hand, this study itself was profoundly permeated by postulates, methodological habits and historico-philosophical concepts that were to compromise, often, the results and the scientific value of arduous work, and to lead, *objectively*, a great number of genuine orientalist scholars to the politico-philosophical positions of the other group of researchers.

This latter group was formed by an amalgam of university dons, businessmen, military men, colonial officials, missionaries, publicists and adventurers, whose only objective was to gather intelligence information in the area to be occupied, to penetrate the consciousness of the people in order to better assure its enslavement to the European powers. "The optic of the Arab bureau," as Jacques Berque rightly observed, has led to the result that, "sustained, nourished at the same time and limited by action, the study of the North African societies has been oriented from the start."¹⁰ One may guess in which sense... The phenomenon is general, since it is built into the structure of the social science of the European countries in the period of imperialist penetration and implantation: Italian orientalism under Mussolini, the psycho-political penetration as practiced by T. E. Lawrence and his school, and previous to them the reports of missionaries, business circles and orientalists (a notable instance being the third provincial congress of orientalists at Lyons, in 1878), etc.—the examples abound, multiply, for we are still in the epoch of humiliation, of occupation, before the great liberating revolutions.¹¹

Can one speak, however, despite these very real differences, of a certain similarity in the general conception, the methods and the instruments introduced by these two schools of traditional orientalism?

We will answer in the affirmative: the community of interest, and not only of interests, is fundamental, in the face of the other, the world which later was to be called "third" with regard to the present as history.

1) *General conception*, that is, the vision of the Orient and of Orientals by traditional orientalism:

a) On the level of the *position of the problem*, and the *problematic*, the two groups consider the Orient and Orientals as an "object" of study, stamped with an otherness—as all that is different, whether it be "subject" or "object"—but of a constitutive otherness, of an essentialist character, as we shall see in a moment. This "object" of study will be, as is customary, passive,

Notes and Discussion

non-participating, endowed with a "historical" subjectivity, above all, non-active, non-autonomous, non-sovereign with regard to itself: the only Orient or Oriental or "subject" which could be admitted, at the extreme limit, is the alienated being, philosophically, that is, other than itself in relationship to itself, posed, understood, defined—and acted—by others.

b) On the level of the *thematic*, both groups adopt an essentialist conception of the countries, nations and peoples of the Orient under study, a conception which expresses itself through a characterized ethnist typology; the second group will soon proceed with it towards racism.

According to the traditional orientalists, an essence should exist—sometimes even clearly described in metaphysical terms—which constitutes the inalienable and common basis of all the beings considered; this essence is both "historical," since it goes back to the dawn of history, and fundamentally a-historical, since it transfixes the being, "the object" of study, within its inalienable and non-evolutive specificity, instead of defining it as all other beings, states, nations, peoples and cultures—as a product, a resultant of the vection of the forces operating in the field of historical evolution.

Thus one ends with a typology—based on a real specificity, but detached from history, and, consequently, conceived as being intangible, essential—which makes of the studied "object" another being, with regard to whom the studying subject is transcendent: we will have a *homo Sinicus*, a *homo Arabicus* (and, why not, a *homo Aegypticus*, etc.), a *homo Africanus*,¹² the man—the "normal man" it is understood—being the European man of the historical period, that is, since Greek antiquity. One sees how much, from the eighteenth to the twentieth century, the hegemonism of possessing minorities, unveiled by Marx and Engels, and the anthropocentrism dismantled by Freud are accompanied by europeocentrism in the area of human and social sciences, and more particularly in those in direct relationship with non-European peoples.

Among the masters of traditional orientalism, none have expressed this theme better, in speaking of the Arabs, dear to his mystic heart, than the great scholar Louis Massignon (1883-1962). In one of his last texts, a short time before his death,

he wrote: "I think that for the problem of the future of the Arabs, it must be found in semitism. I think, that at the base of the Arab difficulties there is this dramatic conflict, this fratricidal hatred between Israel and Ismaël. I think that it must be surmounted. Can we succeed in surmounting it? I believe it must be placed less in the drama of the mechanical incidence of actual technocracy in which Israel, in the final analysis, pulls the strings of the entire world, for due to its superiority of thought and technique in the construction of the problems—because Israel has never ceased posing these problems to itself, it is its strength of hope, an intellectual speculation in a pure state—the Arabs find themselves in collision with it in the claim of exclusivity among the semites, the privileged semites of the right. They, on the contrary, are the outlaws, the excluded; for many reasons, they proved themselves inferior to the task Israel had known how to overcome, but it seems to me that between brothers there should be a reconciliation, for Israel as the Arabs can bring internal testimony to bear; it is the testimony of their language, which is a sacred language, and which is also an instrument of abstract scientific research. The Jewish elite thought and wrote in Arabic during the entire Middle Ages. That is the essential problem."¹³

The generosity of the sentiment could not hide the nature, profoundly erroneous and capable of pernicious extensions, of this thematic. It would be, almost, comparable to seeing the history of contemporary Europe through the deforming prism of Aryanism.

2. Methods of study and research.

These are inevitably determined by the general conception:

a) The past of Oriental nations and cultures quite naturally constitutes the preferred field of study:¹⁴ in "admitting implicitly that the most brilliant periods of the Orient belong to the past," one admits, by the same token, "that their decadence is ineluctable." And Jean Chesneaux rightly notes that "the road followed since the second half of the nineteenth century, by the Greco-Latin studies and their rebirth as studies of "dead"

civilizations, completely cut off from their contemporary heirs, furnished an eminent model to the orientalists."¹⁵

b) This past itself was studied in its cultural aspects—notably the language and religion—detached from social evolution. If the general offensive of anti- and post-Hegelian irrationalism in Europe explains the accent placed on the study of the religious phenomenon, as well as its para-psychical, esoteric aura, this is tantamount to the rebirth of the studies of Antiquity, at the end of the last century, in the light of the historical method, and more precisely of historical philology, which explains the primacy accorded simultaneously to linguistic and philological studies by traditional orientalists. But the study of Oriental languages—such as Arabic, very much a living language—as dead languages was bound to cause a great number of mistakes, contradictions, errors, just as if one intended to furnish a commentary on the French language (of R. Martin du Gard, of Sartre, or of Aragon) on the basis only of the knowledge of the “*Chansons de geste*,” of the English of Shaw or Russell on the basis of Saxon, or of the Italian of Croce, Gramsci or Moravia on the basis of Church Latin.¹⁶

c) History, studied as “structure” was projected, at its best, on the recent past. That which re-emerged, appeared as a prolongation of the past, grandiose but extinct. From historicizing, history became exotic.

d) The scientific work of the scholars of different Oriental countries was passed over in silence, and for the most part completely ignored, except for a few rare works which are conceived in the sense of orientalism of the cities. The rest was declared to be without value, denigrated, and the retardation, imputable to historical conditions, notably to colonialism, became a specific constitutive characteristic of Oriental mentalities.

3. The instruments of study and research:

a) These are constituted essentially by the accumulation and concentration of the treasures belonging to the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America in the great European cities: the history of the Cernuschi and Guimet museums in Paris, of the

great collections of the British Museum, for example, follows the same trajectory, which is that of the immigration of the scholarly treasures of Europe in the direction of the United States, since 1919. In the field of Arabic studies, especially, the situation is particularly serious: several tens of thousands of manuscripts (the number 140,000 has been mentioned) are outside the Arab world, that is, practically out of reach of Arab researchers themselves; hence, they must work most of the time on the basis of indirect sources dealing with the matters at the core itself of their own national and cultural history. The League of Arab States, as well as several countries, principally Egypt, has established various organisms, publications and projects, whose aim is to restitute to the Arab world its irreplaceable sources.¹⁷

b) In the field of modern and contemporary history, the greatest and even the essential part of the materials concerning the colonial and dependent countries (notably India, Egypt and the Arab Near East, the Maghreb, dark Africa, etc.), which are collected in the state archives of the great ex-colonial powers, are for the most part inaccessible, subject to various kinds of interdictions (the least serious being the famous rule of "fifty years"). The approximative knowledge of the past is thus prolonged into a quest of one's self, full of perilous gaps.

c) The secondary sources used by traditional Western orientalis—reports by colonial administrators,¹⁸ by Catholic or Protestant religious missions,¹⁹ balance sheets and reports of boards of directors of companies, travel descriptions, etc.—are profoundly tainted by all the variants of ethnum and racism; the most moderate are exotic and paternalistic. One may see that, though furnishing numerous data, these secondary sources hide many other facts and could not, in any case, validly sustain scientific research work.

These are the main characteristics of traditional orientalism, that which represented the whole of orientalism up to the end of World War II, and which continues to occupy a disproportionate place to the present day.

But the rebirth of the nations and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, since the end of the nineteenth century, and the very rapid acceleration of this process due to the victory

Notes and Discussion

of the national liberation movements in the ex-colonial world but also to the appearance of the group of socialist states and the subsequent differentiation between the "two Europes,"²⁰ has shaken the edifice of traditional orientalism to its foundations. Suddenly, specialists and the public at large became aware of the time-lag, not only between orientalist science and the material under study, but also—and this was to be determining—between the conceptions, the methods and the instruments of work in the human and social sciences and those of orientalism.

Rejected by history and the national rebirth of the Orient, traditional orientalism found itself out of step with regard to the progress of scientific research.

Therefore, the whole problem had to be thought anew.

TWO FACES OF NEO-ORIENTALISM

"Two Europes" are rethinking this complex: the Europe (and European America) of the colonial powers; the Europe of the socialist states and movements, soon joined by the revolutions on the three "forgotten continents." The divorce is profound, notably in the matter of general conception.

A. THE NEO-ORIENTALISM OF WESTERN EUROPE

Two essential documents—the inaugural lecture of Jacques Berque at the Collège de France (December 1956), and the Hayter Report (1961)—and also several methodological works permit an analysis of this renewal of traditional orientalism in the Western colonial powers.

1. *General conception:*

J. Berque observes that "the personality of the world (of Islam) appears rather uncommunicable. To whomever frequents it, it awakens rightly images of a "cave" or of a "labyrinth" (...) it defends itself against the outside, the aberrant. Evasive, menacing or a charmer, it disappears by turns in mystery, injury

or seduction. It bars its true access, and hides its truth. Many stop at the first obstacle, and remain taken in by the caress of the picturesque, snared by the equivocal, the combativity of the gesture. Research must go much further (...) We must make ourselves more and more attentive and sensitive to the Arab other side of things." The work that he undertook, and whose first balance sheet he uncovers in this lesson, leads him to think that "the modern history for the Arab countries begins after World War I, or even World War II." According to him, "the tragic age of revision" results from this; however, he says, "under the gesticulation, let us recognize the testimony, this word so dear to Louis Massignon." Trouble set in everywhere: "The tension deforms them. Their structures become transient, their determinations ambiguous. The concrete with them is continuously surpassed by affectivity, and the act by the symbol. Every phenomenon is disposed for them on several levels, every attitude must be understood from more than one angle. Hence the extreme difficulties of expression for them, and of interpretation for us." Naturally, "these structures are incomprehensible, if isolated from their historic context and entirely from social psychology." But the verdict is nonetheless decisive:²¹ "The vast bustle of ideas that have established themselves (...) have associated confusedly structure with existence, true or false causalities with the needs of the heart and with the expansion of the gesture;" all attempts "seem to me to correspond, in the first place, to a search for solidity. A search frequently unskillful, summary, disfiguring, and sometimes insincere: a friend at least should have the right to say so. It has been inexpert, hasty in the majority of cases. In addition, the analysis of present-day political forms in the Orient does not lead us very far." Referring several times to Renan,²² he continues: "this history is not autonomous (...). Until the present this humanity has refused what has been called 'the *parti-pris* of things.' For, so far as things are concerned, history contests either its savour or precision (...). Harrassed by what an Egyptian essayist has called 'the heavy history,' they are tempted to search for their affirmations outside of continuity, of logic, and perhaps even of history (...). Now, can one fight against facts with tokens, even were they as august as that of freedom?"

Having thus established this affirmation of non-autonomy—that is, the impotence of the Arab and Islamic peoples to define themselves and to forge the instruments of knowledge, which alone would be capable of initiating in depth action and progress—J. Berque has naturally advanced to fill this vacancy, particularly in *Les Arabes d'hier à demain*, published in 1960: "The Arab soul today maintains or restores a reference to itself, an autonomy of sensation and of expression that no exterior system, as enriching as it might have been, should ever have denied it. Should this be a sufficient reason for the foreign researcher, because he is from the start suspected and held to innumerable precautions for fear of hurting live susceptibilities, to abstain from contributing his own theory? Entirely the contrary, the opportunity of his contribution will increase the spontaneity recovered by the Arabs. If then I dare submit to them a system of their contemporary history, it is in the hope of submitting it to their judgement. The more criticism from the inside that it excites, the better it will help to progress those it claims to serve. No doubt handicapped, in what it emanates, despite everything, of a foreigner, it will on the other hand have the advantage of distance. Its chances and misfortunes are, in the final analysis, only those of a new orientalism, at the same time disinterested and committed."²³ The reactions evoked by this view of the work undertaken prompted, two years later, this rectification: "An Egyptian essayist has pointed out, in connection with my last book, that I address the Oriental as well as the Western reader. He saw a novelty in this! Is it too ambitious? The study conceived in this fashion requires that its object become a partner in the dialogue, critical and participating."²⁴ The instrument of this research is French culture, "for French culture, I dare say it even today, remains the hellenism of the Arab peoples."²⁵

The two works of this author—on the Arabs, then on the Maghreb—set up the framework of this new typology. Being preoccupied here with methodology, we cannot examine its postulates, its theses, or its conclusions. However, it should be noted that the new typology, while remaining essentialist in its central core, is made more flexible by taking into consideration the economic factor.²⁶

The approach to the problem is different in the Anglo-Saxon world. In 1946, the "Middle East Institute" was founded in Washington, soon to be followed, in 1949, by the "Council for Middle Eastern Affairs" in New York. In 1947, the Scarborough Commission, on the advice of A. J. Arberry, undertook a renewal of orientalism in Great Britain: the end of the war required the rearranging of "the responsibilities that remain to us in the colonies, in our relations with the Dominions, the close neighbors of the peoples of Asia and Africa, and our new relations with India, Burma and Ceylon." The report formulates an undisguised criticism of "europeocentrism" and notes that the retardation of orientalist studies in Great Britain, compared to France, Germany, Italy, Holland, the Soviet Union and the United States (in that order) "is in disagreement with our situation of a great power, and is not adequate to our imperial responsibilities." It will be a question of organizing modern studies, finally, in order to aid notably the scientists, physicians, engineers and economists, who intend to make a career in the Middle East, and to integrate themselves well there.²⁷

The Hayter Commission, four years later, reacted in vigorous political terms to a situation which remained faltering. The center of gravity of the world having been displaced from Europe, the time is not for linguists but rather for a "surplus of historians, jurists, economists and other specialists in the social sciences." The main objectives envisaged are the following: "to furnish the nation with a more important and better equilibrated reserve of researchers and of published materials on the subject of these countries;" "to stimulate indirectly the interest in Oriental languages;" and finally, "to increase the proportion of modern studies, as well as the study of modern languages, by comparison with classical studies."²⁸ The Commission analysed the work undertaken by the United States, formerly one of the lagging behind countries at the time of the Scarborough report; it declared itself very much impressed by the "extent of the effort undertaken, the type of organization on which this effort was based, and the accent placed on modern studies." It called the attention of the British government to the following points: "The power of the support accorded by the

United States government to Oriental and Slav studies, due to their national importance; the efforts deployed, by means of study centers by area, to break down at last the barriers between the various disciplines, and to promote balanced studies of these areas; the enlivening emphasis placed on modern studies; the role of the scholarships granted to graduates in order to channel their activity towards new fields of work; the value of intensive language courses and mechanical aids destined to overcome the difficulties of languages that are not taught in the schools and to reduce the period of apprenticeship."

Did this mean that the United States should be copied? "The traditions of classical erudition, hellenistic and Oriental, are weaker than in Europe (...). The British field of research in this area, and more particularly in the Oriental languages, is situated between the classical and severe linguistic traditions of Western Europe and the more modernist developments, with the emphasis on social sciences, in America."²⁹ The difference of the conception from that of J. Berque may be seen: the dialogue and the interests of state must be assured through the enlargement and the publication of works, as well as the improvement of the qualification of the researchers, not through a "penetration" of the object studied—not capable of being autonomous—by European orientalism.

That this fundamental postulate, which is at the heart of all European orientalism, whether it be traditional or renewed, remains subjacent among all the non-socialist scholars of the West, could not be contested. Thus, Sir Hamilton A. R. Gibb, making a review of the history of Islam, from its origins to our times, relies on nineteen European authors; one sole Oriental—A.-E. Afifi—figures in their company.³⁰ The recent conference on Moslem sociology, at Brussels (September 11-14, 1961), heard twenty speakers, not including a single scholar from the Orient; a circumstance to which J. Berque rightly took exception.³¹ Yet it was the question of the evolution of the Arab and Moslem societies that was essentially dealt with ... The Egyptian historian Hussein Mo'nes easily demonstrated that a great number of the speeches were profoundly out of date in regard to current history.³² The recent writings of G. E. von Grunebaum proceed from the same vision; nevertheless, the

serious philosophical culture of their author frequently enables him to furnish structured analyses, in which the effort to overcome the old habits are evident.³³ The recent thesis by Vincent Monteil on *L'Arabe moderne* is full of errors—as opposed to the work of Hans Wehr—and is the culminating point of a will to theorize without understanding the inside of the studied area.³⁴

2. *Methods of study and research:*

a) The past continues to occupy the first place in Oriental studies. But it is now no longer alone. The requirements of politics, the displacement of the center of gravity outside of the European glaxis, the emotion caused by the thrust of the peoples of the Orient, yesterday still in varying degrees submissive and malleable, the needs of the modernization of working habits, if only to keep pace with the other social sciences—so many factors have contributed decisively to direct the new orientalist studies towards the modern, or even the contemporary, age.

b) This present, finally having been admitted as an object of study (often at the price of serious difficulties), nevertheless does not escape the requirements for the constitution of typologies appropriate to the different peoples of the Orient. The mediation—between the socio-political requirements for the constitution of these typologies and modernism—will be carried out by means of the structuralist philosophy. The philosophy, as is known, is the study of sectors of reality as such, as “structures,” and hardly, any more, as a product, a resultant or vection, of an historical evolution. Thus conceived, structuralism in human sciences appears as the most acceptable expression—the most “objectivized”—of phenomenology, the dominant form of the irrationalist philosophy of our times. But, in the field of orientalism, the structuralist method moves in known terrain, so to speak, as it is from linguistics that structuralism got its impetus, with F. de Saussure’s *Cours de linguistique générale* in 1906-1911 (the course was edited in 1916). The traditional orientalists, in great majority language or religion specialists, used to structuralism, thus easily recognize their modernist, neo-

orientalist colleagues, for whom the structuralist method provides the surest means—but also the most “modernist”—on which to found their elaboration of typologies in ‘novelties’.

c) The scientific work carried out in the Orient will continue to be denigrated, either because of ignorance (since it becomes more and more difficult, even impossible, to theorize on the subject of a whole sector—Arab, Chinese, Asian, Latin-American, Islamic—on the basis of a necessarily restricted documentation, while the autochthonous production grows continually), or in order to continue to maintain the (theoretical) primacy of knowledge.³⁵

d) The method of participation and penetration, elaborated and applied by J. Berque, appears more interesting: “In a matter so alive, so burning and also so long-suffering, the habitual means of science have immense value, but one that could not suffice. One must live in contact with these people, attempt to become friendly with them, almost to the point of connivance. Is this possible without involving passion?” It is certainly the question, considering this willingness and these procedures, of a “quest more than ever participating,” cherished by the author. The latter writes, a few pages farther on, forestalling the others: “Impressionism will not be my strong point. Our role is one of understanding. Only the analysis, to be efficacious, to penetrate sufficiently in depth, should not dissociate the facts either from their emotional context or from the sense in which they are colored by lived experience.”³⁶ Is this otherwise elsewhere?

For W. Cantwell Smith, whose Canadian environment is non-“imperial,” the value of this participation is to be judged by the autochtones: “The work will equally fail, if intelligent and honest Moslems are incapable of recognizing the precision of its observations, the extent and the desire for clarification of its interpretations as well as of its analyses.”³⁷

3. Instruments of study and research.

a) The Western powers, notably the United States, intend to add new centers of accumulation of treasures and cultural materials to the depots already existing; the means, employed

here, are out of all proportion to those at the disposal of the Orient, its scholarly institutions and researchers.³⁸

b) Collaboration with the scholars and researchers of Oriental countries is recognized as an objective necessity. One will note, however, that in the United States, they dispose of university posts and means of dissemination relatively vast in scope,³⁹ whereas in Western Europe, this collaboration is arranged on a subordinate level.⁴⁰

However, the realism of H.A.R. Gibb leads him, at the conclusion of a balance sheet of failure of the historical studies on the modern Orient, to propose a division of labor: "The first task of the Western universitarian is to research, coordinate and evaluate critically the Western sources. The special domain of the autochthonous universitarian is to research and to organize the archives and the local documentary materials." One will note that there is hardly a question, in this latter case, of "critically evaluating" the elements collected ... Simultaneously, "it must be established, with no possible equivocation, that the Western universitarian cannot realize any work on an academic level in his own field without having an adequate knowledge of Arabic, Persian or Turkish, according to the case, as well as of the historical and cultural background." This means, surely, that "the adult student of Middle-Eastern history, must be, to some extent, a kind of orientalist;" but it is "only when a historian possesses technical qualifications in a broader field that he can be a good historian in the Middle-Eastern field."⁴¹ Hence, the primacy of specialized scientific formation, alongside of an adequate ethno-cultural and linguistic formation, is well recognized.

So far we have dealt with Western scholarly neo-orientalism, as it is required. Parallel to it, the persistence of "Europe-centrism" by the means of modernist manifestations, which it took on after World War II, and the accentuation of the direct struggle between the colonized countries (of the Orient) and the imperialist powers (of the West), favored the formation of a new sub-group, that of the publicists and journalists specialized particularly in Asian and African affairs with, here and there, some universitarian extensions. The ignorance of the languages of the Oriental peoples was very frequently aggravated by a

Notes and Discussion

deficient scientific formation; the procedures of rhetoric and stylistics, the brilliance of great journalism served both as guarantee and a platform for specious publications, which requested to be taken as sources of direct and "specialized" information, at the same time by intellectuals of the Orient and by the general public in the West.⁴²

B. NEO-ORIENTALISM IN THE SOCIALIST SECTOR

The socialist sector of Europe (states and movements) will be considered here primarily. In fact, despite a common sphere, the work accomplished in China appears closer to the conceptions of the independent non-socialist national states and the socialist movements of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Immediately following World War II, researchers in the socialist sector became preoccupied with basic studies of the countries of the Orient. Maxime Rodinson, after a long stay in the Near East, undertook, from 1950 on, a basic analysis of the conceptions, methods, and area of application of traditional orientalism, in view of the advance of the movements of national liberation in the Arab and Islamic countries;⁴³ at the same time Jean Chesneaux began his work on *Le mouvement ouvrier chinois de 1919 à 1927*;⁴⁴ the eminent Cambridge biologist Joseph Needham, after twenty years of preparation, started publication, in 1954, of the first volume of his *Science and Civilization in China*, a monumental, encyclopedic work, which endeavors to restore to the civilization and culture of our times its second dimension—the Chinese dimension—which had fallen into disuse from the eighteenth century (European) on, a model of erudition, of scientific precision, of theoretical depth, which has rightly been defined as "the greatest action of historical synthesis and of intercultural communication, to which a human being has ever applied himself." (L. Picken)⁴⁵

In the socialist countries, the question was to take up again an already ancient tradition, then to direct it towards the new preoccupations of Marxist methodology and the political resurgence of the Orient.⁴⁶

The conference on the solidarity of the Afro-Asian peoples

in Bandoeng (April 1955) gave a decisive impetus to cultural renewal—notably in the matter of history, of the social sciences and of literature—in the two continents. It was soon to be followed by the 20th Congress of the CPSU (1956), which determined the “new course” of Soviet orientalism. The first congress of Soviet orientologists, held at Tashkent (1957), dealt explicitly with three general themes: 1. The collapse of the imperialist system; 2. The tasks of Soviet orientalism after the 20th Congress; 3. The worldwide importance of the Bandoeng Conference. The 21st Congress of the C.P. of the Soviet Union further accentuated this orientation, which was to reach its culminating point in the 25th international congress of orientologists, held in Moscow, in August 1960.

This short historical introduction will serve to situate the analysis of neo-orientalism in the socialist sector.

1. *General conception:*

a) On the level of the *problematic*, the end of European hegemony in political matters—recognized simultaneously by the Bandoeng Conference, Unesco, the Hayter Report, the ideological theses of the Chinese leaders, among others—must be accompanied by a fundamental critique of “europeocentrism,” that is, its final rejection, in terms of principle. “Western civilization continues to suffer from an unjustified cultural pride, which falsifies its contacts with other peoples of the world; this may rightly be defined as ‘spiritual meanness on a high level’ and also as τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις —‘the spirit of evil in divine things’”; and J. Needham, after having denounced “the psychology of domination always at work:” “The realization is very slow to come that the peoples of Asia themselves could also participate in all the benefits of modern science, that they could study the world of nature in a new way, that they could comment on, read, study and digest the *Journal of Biophysics* (for example), and regain respect for themselves in acceding to a higher level of life, as fine as that of any other part of the world, while keeping the best of their cultural and religious traditions.”⁴⁷

"The fundamental error of europeocentrism is the tacit postulate, according to which, due to the fact that modern science and technique, which originated in Renaissance Europe, are universal, everything that is European is equally universal." He shows that this is erroneous, both in the field of science and of history, and stresses the role of religion as a means of penetration by, and integration to, Europe.⁴⁸

The tone was quite different in the important speech given by Anastas I. Mikoyan at the opening session of the 25th orientalist congress: "It goes without saying that the revolutionary changes in the life of Asia and Africa alter in a radical way the character and content of orientalism. It can even be said that the new theoretical particularity of principle of orientalism is that, now, the peoples of the Orient create themselves their own science, elaborate their own history, their culture, their economy; in this way, the peoples of the Orient have been promoted from being objects (matter) of history to the rank of creators. This is what differentiates this congress from the others."

b) At the very same time, this affirmation of principle—which is in accordance with the *fundamental core* of the thought of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and their intelligentsia—is enhanced by a political vision, that of the world anti-imperialist front. "The duty of the orientalists in their work"—A. I. Mikoyan continued—"is to reflect objectively on the most important processes of the countries of Asia and Africa, to contribute, in a creative manner, to the elaboration of the fundamental problems of the struggle of the peoples of the Orient for their national and social liberation and to recover from their economic backwardness. One may rightly say that only then can orientalism count on a broad consideration and on success, from the time that it serves the interests of the peoples of the Orient."⁴⁹ B. G. Gafurov, director of the Moscow institute of orientalism, expressed the following thought, in his speech closing the congress: "We Soviet orientalists consider it our scientific duty, our conscience also obliges us, to help the peoples of the Orient, continuously, in their struggle for a better future; we are convinced that our discoveries and scientific results, our basic scientific Marxist-Leninist method, whose reality has con-

firmed its truth, as well as the experience of our country in the building of socialism, an experience based on a progressive scientific theory, we are convinced that all this will help the peoples of Asia and Africa find the best and most efficient way to achieve progress."⁵⁰

One will note that orientalism thus acquires value, scientifically, in direct relation with of its objectivity and of the support it will eventually give the work of national liberation and edification. It is above all on this last level that it must "provide aid," that is, participate with the "subject," "the creators."

c) However—on the level of the *thematic*—some socialist European neo-orientalists continue to think, along with J. Chesneaux, that "to reduce purely and simply the scientific study of the countries of Asia and Africa into the generality of historical or linguistic science would be tantamount, at the present stage of world evolution, to a relapse into europeocentrism. Not only does the linguistic barrier justify an organization for special work, but also still today too many common traits among all the countries of Asia and Africa continue to differentiate them from Europe, so that it is necessary to take them largely into account. Orientalism is an antiquated and outmoded concept, but Asian and African studies continue to pose problems proper to themselves: underdevelopment, the history of imperialist expansion and of national movements, their own mediaeval traditions, etc."⁵¹

The author rightly points out the enrichment of "the general Marxist theory of the history of the world" by the following elements, gathered in the study of specific national particularities of Asia and Africa: the importance of the "Oriental mode of production," within the general framework of the periodization of human history according to the five basic modes of production;⁵² the balance sheet of colonial imperialism, "taking into account its internal contradictions," of which "the principal aspect is the brutal domination and all the phenomena of regression and stagnation that accompany it," but without "ignoring its secondary though very real aspect, that is, the new elements of society," mentioned by Marx when he spoke of "the twofold character of British imperialism in India."⁵³ The appearance of the movements of national liberation in the colonies as an

element objectively more advanced than the working-class movement in the European countries; the importance of the factor known as "national psyche,"⁵⁴ the appearance of a third type of nation (in addition to the two types distinguished by J. V. Stalin) within the Afro-Asian group, according to the degree of their cohesion in history; "the universalization of Marxist thought;"⁵⁵ the different role of the working class, which tends to become the central element of the popular forces, of the people, and not of a unique dominating class.⁵⁶

The official Soviet formulation—after the 21st Congress of the C.P. (1958)—is more traditional: "The multitude of new problems and phenomena in relationship with the accession of the great countries of the Orient to the road of sovereign development, in particular the struggle of the working class to raise its standard of living in the process of industrialization of the countries weakly developed from the economic point of view, and in the social life of the entire state;" "the study of problems, relative to class differentiation within the peasantry and those of accelerated capitalist development in agriculture and its consequences;" "the problems of the struggle of the working class for hegemony within the peasant movement, in the framework of this new phase of development, are particularly interesting and important;" "penetrating research into the creation and development of the national literatures of the countries of Africa and Asia will give the destructive blow to the theories of europeocentrism; to this effect, the study of the problems bearing on the interactions among the literatures of the Orient and the West is of first importance."⁵⁷

2. Methods of study and of research:

a) In the first place, the question will be to define "a new attitude towards the problem of the relationships between orientalism and every one of the human sciences, each of them conceived in its planetary universality (...). Whether it be history, economics, sociology, literature, linguistics, the perspective must be to 'disorientalize' the studies relative to Asia (...), to lead these studies back to what could be called 'the common

law' of each discipline." And J. Chesneaux continues thus: "The obstacles of language and of the social and attitudinal heritage should not be shunned; but, once these two difficulties are surmounted, one must tackle, according to a similar method and with a similar problematic, the study of the Italian bourgeoisie and that of the Indonesian bourgeoisie, the analysis of the *Aufklärung* movement and that of the movement of the literary renaissance in China in 1920, the examination of the British economy under the continental blockade and that of the Indian economy since independence. This orientation will not only benefit Asian studies; it will provide at the same time a truly universal foundation to each of our human sciences, whose conceptual equipment and the basic data up to now were derived, with a few exceptions, from the sole study of Western Europe." Nevertheless, the idea of a certain general specificity of the Afro-Asian whole remains: "This perspective of universalization, of normalization of Asian studies, does not exclude, however, the fact that there still remain factual relationships and stronger ties among the various countries of Asia.⁵⁸ The name of Bandoeng is enough. The similarities which the contemporary evolution in the countries of Asia (and of Africa also) continue to show should be taken into account with the greatest care, as they still today differentiate them from the West. But this is another question, from the point of view of the method, than to preserve the traditional conception of orientalism. This is perfectly compatible with a methodological unity of the study of the societies of the Orient and the West."⁵⁹

Western ignorance of the Orient has many times been put on trial, particularly by J. Needham and R. Etiemble.⁶⁰ The study of philosophy in the universities of Europe and America, up to the level of the *agrégation* and the doctorate, is essentially that of European philosophy, when Chinese philosophy, to talk only of it, covers 3000 years of continuous development,⁶¹ when Greek philosophy was deeply penetrated by the religious thought and the myths of Egypt and the Orient, when Arab philosophy, during the Middle Ages, was quite a different thing than a mere "transmission of the Greek heritage,"⁶² when the idealism of Indian thought has nourished an ample, diverse and brilliant civilization. The same could be said of the history of the sciences,

Notes and Discussion

notably of mathematics, biology, medicine and astronomy. One begins only to discover what had been the traditional literatures of Asia and Africa, particularly thanks to the action of the different national commissions of Unesco; the modern field remains almost entirely ignored.

b) The emphasis is placed on the study of the present as a privileged field, the process of evolution of Oriental societies in the modern and contemporary period.⁶³ "The study in depth of the actual problems of the contemporary period must become central and fundamental;" whereupon the Soviet author quickly adds that "it will contribute to put forth creative solutions of the problems of Soviet foreign policy in the future vis-à-vis the countries of the Orient, which should constitute a question of honor for the orientalists."⁶⁴ The 25th congress of Orientalists in Moscow marked the rapid growth of the proportion of modern studies, even among traditional orientalists, as well as the multiplication of the national sections, an irrefutable index of the emergence of the nations and states which can no longer be grouped together under "typological labels."⁶⁵

Yet this decisive and ineluctable modification of the respective weight of the "classical" and "modern" sectors, in the field of Oriental studies, should not be achieved at the expense of the past. "I have certainly not the intention"—writes J. Needham—"of minimizing, in any way, the extraordinary amelioration brought about by the present Chinese government, under the direction of the Communist Party, in the condition of 'the hundred ancient names.' At the same time, this work can be understood by Westerners with difficulty, if the latter do not take into account certain ancestral characteristics of Chinese culture, which they ignore most often in a lamentable fashion. In fact, contemporary writers themselves, preoccupied with demonstrating the profound renewal in the rebirth of their country, sometimes tend to denigrate their own past, either by emphasizing its somber aspects, such as the subjugation of women, the rapacity of landowners, or by underestimating the philosophy or the art of the preceding periods. This is tantamount to sawing off the branch on which one sits. It is necessary that the rest of the world learn, in all humility, not only about contemporary China, but also about ageless China, for in Chinese

wisdom and experience there are remedies for many diseases of the mind, as well as the indispensable elements of the future philosophy of humanity.”⁶⁶

c) The Marxist conception of history and its methodology quite naturally permeate most of these works. However, one will note that the scholars of the socialist sector also include eminent non-Marxists—such as J. Needham—who take place within the larger spectrum of philosophical rationalism.

However, sometimes the needs of practical action, in particular for regroupings, invite the neo-orientalists of the socialist sector—notably in Western European countries—to accommodate themselves with irrational methods—essentially those of a certain phenomenology, which expresses itself by the subterfuge of typology, directly related to the fashionable structuralism—thus compromising scientific precision as well as the fraternity of basic work, which ought to be sought with intelligentsia of the countries of the Orient in its struggle for liberation and progress.⁶⁷

3. *Instruments of study and research:*

a) The socialist states, mainly the Soviet Union, did not have access to the same sources of materials—direct and mediate—which were a monopoly of the colonial powers. In return, the ever closer relations between the USSR and the Afro-Asian states and popular movements, since the Bandoeng Conference particularly, have led it to undertake a truly colossal effort in the field of modern orientalism: the “Institute of the peoples of Asia,” attached to the Academy of Sciences is the biggest in the world; all the universities organize studies on Asia, Africa and Latin America; new and important scientific reviews have been established;⁶⁸ all the academies of science of the Republics include sections or organs relating to these studies; the personnel who work in them (professors, research workers, technical assistants, translators, librarians, etc.) number from 18,000 to 20,000 persons; one publishing house alone, specializing in Oriental books, publishes a new title every two or three days; modern studies are on a par with classical orientalism, much in

honor in the Russia of yesterday; finally, in 1959, an "Africa Institute" was created under the direction of the academician I. Potehkin.⁶⁹ In a few years, the scientific data on the modern and contemporary Orient have changed abruptly: it is now impossible to undertake deep studies related to these sectors without the knowledge of the Russian language, in addition to the traditional European languages and one or more Oriental languages.

b) The scientific work of the research workers and scholars of the various Oriental countries is not only recognized, appreciated and solicited—which should be a matter of course—but placed, as it ought to be, in a privileged rank. J. Chesneaux refers, among other things, to "the problem of the aptitude of foreigners to study contemporary social facts with the same chances of success as the nationals;" in fact, "the latter are evidently privileged vis-à-vis of these facts, because of their knowledge of the language and also because of their innate familiarity with the entire attitudinal environment, the whole heritage of these peoples of Asia;" "in pushing this reasoning to the extreme, one could ask oneself whether it would not be reasonable to consider that the study of contemporary problems is essentially in the province of the nationals, while the further a theme recedes into the past, the more accessible it is to non-Asian scholars." His conclusion in part is similar to that reached by H.A.R. Gibb, quoted above: "If one may speak here of a national privilege, one cannot speak of a national exclusive, insofar as the study of the contemporary world is concerned. Foreigners, who come from far away with another cultural and social heritage, can frequently penetrate rapidly into, and give an original interpretation of, the life of other peoples. For example, Anglo-Saxon studies for the past five years figure among the best works on political life."⁷⁰

The cultural policy of China, at present, is not as open to foreign researchers: "The first thing to be noted is that academic research (for foreign researchers) is extremely rare," for it appears as "not distinguishable from espionage;" the central thesis is that "foreigners are incapable of understanding us: the field of sinology belongs to the Chinese;" however, "if this study can be conducted by the means of materials, official documents and with the help of a watchful orientation, it is perhaps possible to

approach even a delicate subject. But, if a study includes direct observation in the area, without orientation, the free and extensive access to people and independent work," obstacles emerge, "except for the most secure of the foreigners;" "it would appear *ab initio* that archaeology is not a delicate field politically; but, on the other hand, it falls within an area exclusively reserved, in all evidence, to the Chinese, that is, the study of their own national treasures and the interpretation of their own history with authority. Here, the specialist on Japan will recall how delicate the character of archaeology was in pre-war Japan." Yet, the American author of this study⁷¹ points to the intelligent and massive aid given to J. Needham, and that, more reticent, accorded to J. Chesneaux, while R. Dumont, Geddes and C. P. Fitzgerald (New Zealand), and S. Chandrasekhar (India) benefited by a very open reception. Here, the attitude of the Communist leaders of the P. R. of China is closer to that of the new independent national states of Asia and Africa than to that of the socialist countries and movements of Europe.

c) The type even of the scientific researcher must change radically. The study of mediaeval classical Arabic and that of Islamic mysticism entitle one to speak of them, but not to understand the differentiation into several sectors of the bourgeoisie of any particular Arab country, the problems or Arab realist literature after 1945, nor the ideology of the different components of the national and democratic movement.

The "normalization" of modern Oriental studies requires on the first level a solidity and profundity of specialized formation in a particular sector of the human and social sciences (economics, law, history, sociology, political science, philosophy, esthetics, etc.). This will have to be accompanied by a rapid but nevertheless reasonably sufficient study of the language of the country or the sector under study, such as it presents itself in the modern and contemporary period, both in its written and spoken variants. The aim of this linguistic study is to permit direct access to basic materials, on the one hand, and to improve the psychological and sociological understanding of everyday life in the country studied, on the other. In the Soviet Union, eight years are now devoted to this "double formation," while in the United States, only an "accelerated" linguistic formation following the termi-

nation of specialized studies is required.⁷² On this point, the official preoccupations of the Anglo-Saxon countries come together at the same time with those of the European socialist sector and, essentially, with the vision of the Oriental countries themselves.

It is this last question that we now propose to explore.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND NOTES

1. On the general history of traditional orientalism, more particularly in the Arab and Islamic field, is an abundant bibliography, notably: V. V. Barthold, *La découverte de l'Asie, histoire de l'orientalisme en Europe et en Russie*, Fr. tr., Paris, 1947; nothing in the *Encyclopédie de l'Islam*, nor in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*; "Orientalistika," *Soviet Encyclopedia*, Moscow, 1951, Vol. IX, 193-202; Giovanni Vacca, "Orientalismo," *Enciclopedia italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti*, Rome, 1935, vol. XXV, 537; G. Levi della Vida, "Per gli studi arabi in Italia," *Nuova Antologia*, Dec. 1912, 1-10; A. Bausani, "Islamic Studies in Italy in the XIXth and XXth Centuries," *East and West*, VIII, 1957, 145-155 and *Journal of Pakistani Historical Society*, V, 1957, 185-199; Z. M. Holt, "The Origin of Arabic Studies in England," *al-Kulliyya*, Khartoum, 1952, No. 1, 20-7; A. J. Arberry, *Oriental Essays*, London, 1960; M. Horten, "Die Probleme der Orientalistik," *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Orient*, XIII, 1916, 143-61; G. Germanus, "Hungarian Orientalism—Past and Present," *Indo-Asian Culture*, VI, 1957, 291-8; L. Bouvat, "Les Hongrois et les études musulmanes," *Revue du monde musulman*, I, 1907, No. 3, 305-24; Naguib Al-'Aqîqi, *Al-moustachbriqûn*, Cairo, 1947; Youssef A. Dagher, *Dalîl al-A'âreb ilâ 'ilm'al-koutoub wa fann al-makâteb*, Beyrouth, 1947, bibl. trav. étrangers, 150-60, Arabes, 161-7; Y. A. Dagher, *Fabâress al-maktaba al-'Arabiyya fî'l-khâfiqayn*, Beyrouth, 1947, 105-12; Y. A. Dagher, *Massâder al-dirâssa al-adabiyya*, vol. II, 1800-1955, Beyrouth, 1955, 771-84; J. Fueck, *Die arabischen Studien in Europa*, Leipzig, 1955; etc.

2. "Orientaliste," *Grand Larousse encyclopédique*, Paris, 1963, VII, 1003-4.

3. This is the famous book of the master from Berlin: *Paideia, Die Formung des griechischen Menschen* (I, Berlin-Leipzig, 1934), thus synopsisized by M. Guidi, "No broadening of the historical horizon can change anything of the fact that our history starts with the Greeks (...). Evidently, this history cannot have the whole planet for its theatre, but only the "hellenocentric" peoples (...), since it is they who have taken from the Greeks the conscious principle of the true *Kultur* (...). It is not at all difficult to draw the practical consequences from this theoretical formula: the absolute and central value of antiquity, as the eternal and unique source of the constitutive principle of our culture, and, consequently, as the force of formation and education. Total humanism." (M. Guidi, "Trois conférences sur quelques problèmes généraux de l'orientalisme," *Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales—volume offert à Jean Capart*, Brussels, 1935, 171-2.)

4. Our italics. They point out well the reference to one's own self, i.e., to Europe.

5. M. Guidi, *op. cit.*, 171-80. He defined thus orientalism in 1954: "The scholar from the Orient, or orientalist worthy of this name, does not limit himself to the knowledge of certain ignored languages, or who can describe the foreign customs of some peoples, but he is the one who unites rather the study of certain sides of the Orient to the knowledge of the great spiritual and moral forces which have influenced the formation of human culture, the one who has been nourished on the lesson of ancient civilizations and who has been able to evaluate the role of the different factors which have participated in the constitution of the civilization of the Middle Ages, for example, or in the course of the modern Renaissance." ("Ilm al-Charq wa târîkh al-'oumrân," *Al-Zabrá'*, rabie awal 1347 H., August-September 1928, quoted by Y. A. Dagher, *Massâder...*, 771.)

6. On the definition of "europeocentrism," cf., among others, J. Needham, "Le dialogue entre l'Europe et l'Asie," *Comprendre*, No. 12, 1954, 1-8; equally, the preface of our *Egypte, société militaire*, Paris, 1962, 9-13.

7. R. Schwab, "L'orientalisme dans la culture et les littératures de l'Occident moderne," *Oriente Moderno*, XXXII, 1952, Nos. 1-2, 136.

8. A. J. Arberry, *op. cit.*

9. Y. A. Dagher, *Massâder...*, 779-80.

10. J. Berque, "Cent vingt-cinq ans de sociologie maghrébine," *Annales*, XI, 1956, No. 3, 299-321.

11. "The advanced studies, and in particular Oriental, philological and historical studies, are they not, on the contrary, the most valuable auxiliary of the colonial expansionist policies of Italy?" (A. Cabaton, "L'orientalisme musulman et l'Italie moderne," *Rev Md. Mus.* VII, 1914, No. 27, p. 24); the moving postscript of Lawrence in *The Seven Pillars of Wisdom* (London, 1926), showing how he was caught himself at his own game, is known: "Damascus had not seemed a sheath for my sword, when I landed in Arabia; but its capture disclosed the exhaustion of my main springs of action. The strongest motive throughout had been a personal one, not mentioned here, but present to me, I think, every hour of these two years. Active pains and joys might fling up, like towers, among my days: but, refluxent as air, this hidden urge re-formed, to be the persistent element of life, till near the end. It was dead before we reached Damascus." "The French nation works, accumulates. From its adventurous consuls to its utopian designers of railroad lines, to its moved travelers, a Lamartine, a Barrès, it edifies in the Orient a work, of which the Champollions, Sacsy and Renans erect the scientific counterpart. In this period the Arabs neglect their own past, and stammer their noble language. Contemporary orientalism was born from this vacancy. The exploration, the resurrection of such moral treasures was the chance of the erudite Christian, who as well as the Christian of the Bank concurrently revived the wasted space and filled the warehouses (...). For instance, look at the Arab tribe, at beduinism in general, Orientalism approaches them through three great political thrusts: the phase of our 'Arab Bureau,' in Algeria, until about 1870; the phase of the 'revolt in the desert,' the triumph of British agents in the Near East; the contemporary petroleum expansion." (J. Berque, "Perspectives de l'Orientalisme contemporain," *Ibla*, XX, 1957, 220-1); in 1822, the founders of the "Société Asiatique" pledge themselves to "permit to the historians the explanation of the Antiquities of the peoples of the Orient," and to

Notes and Discussion

collect a "valuable documentation on the diplomatic operations in the Levant and the commercial operations in all of Asia;" among the questions posed to the orientalist, at Lyon, let us point out the following: "Is it in the interest of the Europeans to demand that treaties give them the right of residence in the interior of China, in order to buy themselves cocoons and silk directly from the producers; in order to establish spinning factories, and to engage in business in general? What are the advantages and disadvantages of the coming of Chinese coolies into foreign countries?" (Texts quoted by J. Chesneau: "La recherche marxiste et le réveil contemporain de l'Asie et de l'Afrique," *La Pensée*, No. 95, Jan.-Feb. 1961, 4-5.)

12. On ethnist typology, cf. M. Rodinson, "L'Égypte nassérienne au miroir marxiste," *Les Temps Modernes*, No. 203, April 1963, 1859-65.

13. J. Berque and L. Massignon, "Dialogue sur *Les Arabes*," *Esprit*, XXVIII, 1960, No. 288, 1506. On the relationship between orientalism and colonialism, these words from L. Massignon, "I myself, strongly colonial at the time, wrote to him about my hopes for a coming conquest of Morocco by arms, and he answered me approvingly (letter No. 1 from In-Salah, Oct. 2, 1906). Let us admit that Morocco then was in a terrible state. But fifty years of occupation, without Lyautey and his high Franco-Moslem ideal, would have left nothing that was essential." ("Foucauld in the desert before the God of Abraham, Agar and Ismaël," *Les mardis de Dar el-Salam*, 1959, p. 59.)

14. Precise criticisms in *University Grants Committee: Report of the Subcommittee on Oriental, Slavonic, East European and African Studies* (London, H.M.S.O., 1961), under the presidency of Sir William Hayter; "Modern Far Eastern studies are a closed book in almost every other history or social science faculty." (p. 38) "The more inward looking characteristics of the language departments and their lack of interest in modern studies and languages have contributed to a number of unfortunate results." (p. 46), etc. A very recent selection, *Études d'orientalisme dédiées à la mémoire de Lévi-Provençal* (2 vol., Paris, 1962), groups sixty-one articles, only eight of which deal with the modern period, and three are of a bio-bibliographical nature related to it.

15. J. Chesneau, *La recherche...*, 5.

16. Omar Al-Dassoûqui, *Fi-'l-adab al-hadîth*, 3rd edit., Cairo, 1954, 325-6; Y. A. Dagher, *Massâder...*, 779; N. al-Aqîqi, *op. cit.*, 207-9; Mohamed Hussein Heykal, *Hayât Mo'hammad*, preface to the 2nd edit. (6th edit., Cairo, 1956), 60-1; Anouar al-Guindî, *Al-adab al-'Arabi al-'hadîth fi ma'rakat al-mouqâwama wa'l-tagammo' min'al-mou'bit ila'l-khalîg*, Cairo, 1959, 621-4; then: *Al-fîk'r al-'Arabi al-mou'âsser fi maarakat al-taghrîb wa'l taba'iyya al-thaqâfiyya*, Cairo, s.d.c., 1962, 271-85, etc.

17. Particularly the "Institute of Arab Manuscripts," directed by Prof. Salah Eddine al-Mounajjed, attached to the Arab League; the review *Magallat al-makhtûât al-'Arabiyya*, which has been published in Cairo since 1955; the creation of the new "Institute of Islamic Research," at the University Al-Azhar, under the direction of Prof. Abdallah al-'Arabi (*Al-Abram*, Nov. 23, 1961); the effort of restoration undertaken by the Ministry of Culture and National Guidance of Egypt, mainly under the impetus of Far'hi Radouân, Hussein Fawzi and Tharwat 'Okâcha, must be mentioned; similar efforts in Syria and Iraq, in particular. In Egypt, the existentialist philosopher 'Abd al-Ra'hman Badawî has undertaken,

since 1940, a gigantic work of publication and has given the impetus to many works on Moslem thought, while the great philologist, Mourad Kâmel, authoritatively cleared the ground in the Coptic, Ethiopian and Semitic field.

18. J. Berque mentions it at length, critically, both in *Le Maghreb entre les deux guerres* (Paris 1962), and in his lectures at the Collège de France. Equally, J. P. Naish, "The Connection of Oriental Studies with Commerce, Art and Literature during the XVIIIth and XIXth Centuries," *Journ. Manch. Eg. and Or. Soc.*, XV, 1930, 33-9; J. Chesneaux, "French Historiography and the Evolution of Colonial Vietnam," in D.G.E. Hall, *Historical Writing on the Peoples of Asia—Historians of South-East Asia*, Oxford-London, 1961, 235-44.

19. Cf. M. Khalidi and O. Farroukh, *Al-tabchâr wa'l-isti'mâr fi'l-bilâd al-'Arabiyya*, Sayda-Beyrouth, 1953.

20. On this idea, cf. R. Makarius, *La jeunesse intellectuelle d'Egypte au lendemain de la Deuxième Guerre Mondiale* (Paris-The Hague, 1960), and our article "La vision du problème colonial par le monde afro-asiatique," publ. in *Cahiers inter. de sociologie*, vol. 35, 1963, 145-56.

21. Jacques Berque, who stands as the friend of Arab renewal and the link between our cultures, did not fail to honor several of our intellectuals. I thank him myself for the mention he made, many times, of our works—particularly those of Mahmôud al-'Alem and myself, as well as of the narrators and novel writers of the Egyptian realist school—both in his lectures at the Collège de France, in "L'inquiétude arabe des temps modernes" (*Rev. des Et. Islamiques* XXVI, 1958, No. 1, 87-107, *Les Arabes...*, p. 102).

22. Yet it was Renan in France who theorized on the differentiation between semitism and aryanism, the peoples of the first group being inferior, in every respect, to those of the second group (cf. *Histoire générale et système comparé des langues sémitiques*, 1st part, Paris, 1855); D. Kimson is influenced by it in his *Pathologie de l'Islam et les moyens de le détruire* (Paris, 1897). This theory has since been continuously combated by all the thinkers and scholars of the Arab world.

23. P. 10-11; a critical analysis of this book is not our purpose here.

24. *Le Maghreb entre deux guerres*, Paris, 1962, 8.

25. *Perspectives...*, p. 237.

26. Exposé of the theoretical results in "Expression et signification dans la vie arabe," *L'Homme*, I, 1961, No. 1. 50-67.

27. *Report of the Interdepartmental Commission of Enquiry on Oriental, Slavonic, East European and African Studies*, London, H.M.S.O., 1947; commentary by A. J. Arberry, *op. cit.*, pp. 240-9, analysis and balance sheet in *Hayter Report*, 6-40.

28. *Hayter Report*, 45-52.

29. *Hayter Report*, 53-63. General P. Rondot, who studies "Les Etats-Unis devant l'Orient d'aujourd'hui" (in *Orient*, 1957, No. 2, 19-52; No. 3, 31-80), points to the role of the foundations, of the Language and Near-Eastern Area School, attached to the American Embassy in Beyrouth, and the two American universities of Beyrouth and Cairo (the latter, we should note, being the only establishment of higher learning authorized in the U.A.R.); the statement of the reasons given by the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor), for enlarging its study program on the modern Orient, is expressed thus: "1) To make the greatest

Notes and Discussion

possible number of Americans acquainted with the Near East; 2) To encourage the idea that the United States have a vital interest in the present and future developments in this area; 3) to constitute an elite group of intelligent Americans, experts in the questions of the Near East." The judgement of the author on the work accomplished is, however, most reserved. Cf. R. Bayly Windsor, "Arabic and Islamic Studies in the U.S." (in *Middle East Forum*, No. 31, June 1956, 19-22).

30. "An Interpretation of Islamic History," *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale*, I, 1953, 39-62.

31. "Pour l'étude des sociétés orientales contemporaines," in *Colloque sur la sociologie musulmane—Actes, 11-14 Septembre 1961* (Brussels, 1962): "The fact that we have congregated here to speak of Oriental societies in the absence of our Oriental colleagues is an anomaly (...), which must be meditated upon. Since our interpretations lead us, I think, beyond the political state of affairs, bringing us to a questioning of the methods of our discipline, and, perhaps of its object." (p. 85): "The regrettable absence of our Oriental colleagues among us does not correspond, as might be thought, to a political situation, but to a profound uneasiness, corresponding to the nature itself of the society we are studying, in its relations with ours;" yet "we are not wrong in being such as I describe us." (p. 457).

32. "Arâ'wa chata'hât 'annâ wa 'an târikhinâ," *Al-Abram*, Dec. 21, 1962.

33. It must be pointed out, notably: "Le problème des échanges culturels," in *Etudes Lévi-Provençal...*, I, 141-51, which gives a résumé of the theses of the volumes edited by the author, particularly *Unity and Variety in Moslem Civilization* (Chicago, 1955), and, with W. Hartner, *Klassizismus und Kulturverfall* (Frankfurt, 1960): "An Analysis of Islamic Civilization and Cultural Anthropology," in *Actes Coll. Bruxelles*, 21-71.

34. In one page alone—where the author laments: "Alas! the semantic anarchy is only too real. And the escape, far from the facts, into verbalism, all too frequent..." The following errors may be pointed out: *al-'biyâd al-'igâbi* (positive neutralism), which since 1959 has been substituted by *'adam al-in'biyâz* (non-commitment), has not been made to disappear because the first expression was "judged obsolete" and the second "considered to be more satisfactory," but rather because of the new orientation of Egyptian policies, after the Bandoeng period, at the moment of the repression of 1959 (cf. our *Egypte...*, 219-42); "cadres," translated by *isârât* in North Africa, is not called *milâk* in the Orient, but simply, *kâdr*; "structure," as every philosophy student, every intellectual from the Arab countries knows, is called *tarkîb* in philosophical terminology, but never *haykal*, *gibâz* or *nizâm*; one learns, with the greatest stupefaction, that it was the speech by M. Abdallah Ibrahim, on April 6, 1959, which opened "the road to a modern Arab language in which words correspond to reality" (and before?); and to quote *niqâbât* (trade unions), in use since 1908, in Cairo, *al-gibâz al-assâsi* (infrastructure), in Egypt, *al-tarkîb al-assâsi*, while *al-tarkîb al-'ilwî* designates "superstructure," these two last terms have been in use since 1940-1945, among Marxist intellectuals of the Orient, engaged in the struggle for liberation and national edification (*L'arabe moderne*, Paris 1960, 360). Cf. n. c. by M. Rodinson in *Cahiers de l'Orient contemporain*, No. 50, 1952.

35. "Those countries that intend to accede to history and make history—says J. Berque—probably have not even now chairs of modern history in their

faculties." (*Dialogue...*, p. 1508). This text, which dates from 1960, seems to ignore the work in modern and contemporary history carried on at the University of Cairo for the past two generations, as well as in Damascus, Bagdad and Alexandria. In just one issue of the *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Historical Studies* (Cairo, I, 1951, publ. in 1952), 77 pages in 194 are devoted to contemporary history (article by M. M. Safwat and by G. E. al-Chayyâl). Chairs of modern and contemporary history exist in the faculties of letters and political science, in particular. These, of course, are examples, without pretending to exhaust the subject. Cf. criticism of contemporary Arab historiography by A. G. Chejne, "The Use of History by Modern Arab Writers," in *Middle East Journ.*, XIV (1960, 4, 382-96).

Let us point to the fact that a great effort at understanding was made in European countries not directly engaged in traditional colonialism: in Germany, cf. L. Rathmann, "Zur Widerspiegelung des antiimperialistischen Befreiungsbewegung der arabischen Völker in der bürgerlichen deutschen Historiographie," *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, Berlin, X, 1962, No. 3, 548-74; in Spain, F. Cantera Burgos, "Los estudios orientales en la España actual," *Oriente Moderno*, XXXV, 1955, No. 1, 236-47, etc.

36. *Perspectives de l'Orientalisme...*, 218-32. Same theme, at the Conference of Brussels: "Orientalist sociology should aim at integrating itself in the oriental societies, not by knowledge formerly tied to colonial expansion, but through a contribution to the analysis, that is, to the construction from within." (*Actes...*, 458-9); H. Kruse-Elbeshausen, "Islamic Studies in Post-War Germany," *Islamic Culture*, XXVI, 1952, No. 2, 51-6; on Spain, F. Cantera Burgos, "Los estudios orientales en la España actual," in *Oriente Moderno*, XXXV, 1955, No. 1. 236-47; on Belgium, G. Ryckmans, "L'orientalisme en Belgique," *Revue gén. Belge*, 1947, No. 23, 724-38; on Italy, E. Rossi, "Near Eastern Studies in Italy," *Middle Eastern Affairs*, VIII, 1957, No. 2, 57-60; on Finland, P. Aalto, "Les études orientales en Finlande," *Archiv Orientalny*, 1951, No. 19, 79-84; A. Abel, "Approches critiques d'une étude sociologique du monde musulman contemporain," *Etudes* (Brussels), I, 1962, Nos. 1-2, 3-16; etc.

37. *Islam and Modern History*, Princeton, 1960; in the same spirit: "A great number of Christians, in addition to the author, would be profoundly happy if a Moslem writer should undertake a similar study on contemporary Christianity." This book overflows with interesting analyses and gives an overall view of Islamic reality in Africa as well as in Asia.

38. The budget of one sole university institute in the United States—the "Near Eastern Center" of the University of California in Los Angeles—is six times the annual budget of a particular small European country.

39. Several Arab professors hold teaching positions in various American universities, while others direct research departments.

40. The analysis of the "articles and studies" of the "table of contents for years 1957-1962" of the new modernist review *Orient* gives clear indications about this subject: four autochthonous authors out of nearly seventy-five; it is true that a good part is constituted by the presentation of texts on the literature, thought, religion and politics of our countries. But these are materials of study for an analyst who remains transcendent.

41. "Problems of Middle Eastern History" (Washington, 1956), in *Studies*

Notes and Discussion

on the *Civilization of Islam* (London, 1962, 342-3); the author does not want to take into consideration the historical and sociological research work carried out in the Middle East (p. 339-40), except *Introduction to the History of Education in Modern Egypt*, by J. Heyworth-Dunne (London, 1938). The important work of W. Montgomery Watt, *Islam and the Integration of Society* (London, 1961), based on the theories of K. Mannheim, is silent on recent Arab works; M. Rodinson points out the most serious in his "Bilan des études mohammadiennes" (in *Rev. Historique*, fasc. 465, Jan-Mar., 1963), 169-220.

42. On the academic level, two works by J. Austruy, who theorizes on the *homo Islamicus*, on the basis of a total ignorance of the Arab language and culture: *Structure économique et civilisation—l'Égypte et le destin économique de l'Islam* (th. Dr., 1960), then *L'Islam face au développement économique* (Paris, 1961). On the side of journalism, J. and S. Lacouture decree in the matter of culture and religion: "May the author be forgiven for having approached this subject, not reading Arabic?"; then, referring to certain omissions: "We are dealing here only with 'national' culture"... (*L'Égypte en mouvement*, 2d. ed., Paris, 1962, 306-343); yet, the work abounds in good pieces. At the same time, S. Lacouture publishes an *Égypte* (coll. "Petite Planète," Paris, 1962), in which literature, thought, esthetics, etc., are judged peremptorily, which singles out foreign writers living in Egypt who are totally unknown to the public. Of course, these examples could be multiplied... "Consider only the question of literatures. A non-European, who might visit the great reading room of the British Museum or the Bibliothèque Nationale, and ask himself what this enormous mass of books is good for, would be considered a dreadful barbarian. But there are in the world other literatures of more or less equal span, such as, for instance, Chinese literature, of which the average European, even the educated, does not understand a single word. Is he not in his turn a barbarian?" (J. Needham, *Le dialogue...*, p. 3, n. 1). C. Bremond, in a quick study on "Les Communications de masse dans les pays en voie de développement" (in *Communications*, II, 1962, 56-67), judges the overall problem on the basis of reports of European experts, without any reference to an autochthonous work, of any country whatsoever.

43. A first selection of his studies and essays will be published soon: *Islam, idéologie, marxisme*.

44. "When at this date (1950) I decided to orient my research towards the history of the Chinese proletariat and the Chinese working-class movement in the wake of the October Revolution and World War I, it was essentially a sort of Pascalian bet for me, expressing the conviction that it was possible and necessary at the same time to constitute in a truly scientific discipline the study of the contemporary history of China ("Recherches sur l'histoire du mouvement ouvrier chinois," in *Mouvement Social*, No. 41, Oct. 1962, 1-12). The choice of the central theme of research "the workers' movement" and not "the national movement" issued from the problematic of European Marxism.

45. The author disposes both of a library unique in the world of works and documents relating to science and technology, as well as of groups of collaborators who surround him at the "Caius and Gonville College," of which he is the principal: Wang-Ching-Ning, Lu-Gwei-Djen, Ho Ping-Yü, Kenneth Robinson, Rs'ao T'ien-Ch'in. The following volumes have already been published: vol. I: *Introductory Orientations* (Cambridge-London, 1954); II: *History of Scientific*

Thought (1956); III: *Mathematics and Sciences of the Heavens and the Earth* (1959); IV (A): *Physics and Physical Technology-Physics* (1963).

46. W. Z. Laqueur notes that the new central periodical of Soviet orientalism *Sovetskoe Vostokvedenie*, appeared in April 1955, the month of Bandoeng; he points out the decisive role of A. I. Mikoyan, B. G. Gafurov (at the same time member of the Academy of Sciences and the Central Committee of the C. P.), N. A. Mukhtidinov and A. F. Sultanov, all of them leaders of non-European origin, and he designates some publications that he thinks important, namely: *Contemporary Persia, Contemporary Syria*, the book by E. A. Lebedev on Jordan (1956), that of A. N. Kotlov on the Iraqi Revolution (1958), of I. P. Belaev, *American Imperialism in Saudi Arabia* (1957), and of M. F. Gataulin, *Agrarian Relations in Syria* (1957), etc. (*The Soviet Union and the Middle East*, London, 1959, 168-86). The most important publications on neo-orientalism in the socialist countries are: M. Perlmann, "The Study of the Islamic Middle East in the Soviet Union 1940-1956" (in *Report on Current Research*, 1957, 17-26); B. G. Gafurov, "Immediate Tasks of Soviet Oriental Studies" (in *Vestnik Akademii Nauk*, 9, 1957); A. N. Mukhtidinov, *K novym uspekhkam sovetskogo vostokovedenia* (Moscow, 1957); M. Guboglu, "40 ans d'études orientales en U.R.S.S. 1917-1957" (in *Studia et Acta Orientalia*, I, 1958, 281-316), in which he speaks of the "crushing in the Trotzkyite manner of the 'mode of Asian production,' in 1934" (p. 295); "La prima conferenza Pansovietica degli Orientalisti, Tashkent, 4-11 June 1957" (in *Or. Mod.* 38, Feb. 1958, 202); W. Z. Laqueur, "The Shifting Line in Soviet Orientalology (in *Problems of Communism*, 5, 1956, 20-6); R. Loewenthal, "Russian materials on Islam and Islamic Institutions, a Selective Bibliography (in *Der Islam*, XXXIII, 1958, Nos. 1-2, 280-309); then: "Russian Materials on Arabs and Arab Countries, a Select. Bibl." (in *idem*, XXXIV, 1959, 174-87); "Dix ans d'études orientales en Pologne" (in *Rocz. Orj.*, 20, 1956, 7-14); D. Sinor, "Dix années d'orientalisme hongrois" (in *Journal Asiatique*, 239, 1951, 211-37); *Les actes des journées scientifiques d'orientalisme, Praha-Dobříš*, 20-25 June 1949; J. Reychman, "Les études orientales (islamiques) en Pologne" (in *Stud. et Acta Orient.*, II, 1959, 161-87); J. Kabrda, "Les études orientales en Yougoslavie" (in *Arch. Or.* 25, 1957, 146-55); J. Blaskovic, "Les buts, l'organisation et l'activité de l'école orientalistique Tchécoslovaque" (in *Stud. et Acta Or.*, 2, 1959, 61-9); K. Petráček, "Les études arabes et islamiques et la sémitologie en Tchécoslovaquie" (in *Arch. Or.*, 19, 1951, 98-107); J. Rypka, "L'Orientalisme en Tchécoslovaquie" (in *Arch. Or.* 19, 1951, 15-26); M. Guboglu, "Contributions roumaines aux études orientales" (in *Arch. Or.*, 24, 1956, 459-75); D. Zbaritel, *Die Orientalistik in der Tschechoslovakiei*, Prague, 1959; etc.

47. "Christianity and the Asian Cultures" (in *Theology*, LXV, 1962, 1-8).

48. "There were long centuries of preparation during which Europe was assimilating Arab teaching, Indian thought and Chinese technology;" "Europe is not interested in the inventions which have made these voyages (of the explorers) possible. The compass and the stern-post rudder, originally from China; the multiple masts, from India and Indonesia; the latin artimon sails due to the sailors of Islam;" "frequently one hears talk to the effect that the Europeans alone had discovered the whole rest of the world. A limited conception, and not at all true before the Renaissance. Bactrian Greeks did not discover the Chinese; on the contrary, it was the Chinese who discovered the Greeks (in the person

Notes and Discussion

of Tchang Tchien about 125 B.C.). Two centuries later, Kan Ying penetrated as far as the Persian Gulf, that is, a lot farther West than any Roman had traveled East. At the end of the Ming dynasty, the Chinese flag could be seen flown everywhere, in the Pacific and the Indian Ocean, from Zanzibar to Borneo, and Borneo to Kamchatka;" "The idea one hears expressed quite frequently, namely, that it is due to European civilization that the true historic sense was developed, is altogether inadmissible. The honor rather reverts to Chinese civilization, whose 24 historic dynasties, beginning in 90 B.C., form a body of work by historians without equal anywhere. (...) Even if one persists in considering 'historical sense' as 'philosophy of history,' the European contributions were also not the first, since Ibn Kaldoun lived three centuries before Vico;" "One cannot accept the thesis, according to which it was from Europe that the idea of making one single society of the human race radiated. The Confucian proposition, 'between the four seas all men are brothers,' dates back to the fourth century B.C. In India, Kabir was only one of the voices in the choir of poets and prophets of human solidarity;" "Certain European scholars consider that modern science and technology, in their victorious radiation across the whole world, have been accompanied by a secularized form, which has branched out, mutilated, from European civilization. They assert, not without sadness, that the European system of religious values has been rejected by all the national independence movements of Asia and Africa. Since, for these thinkers, Christianity is inseparable from the spirit of modern science; it provided, so to speak, the intellectual climate for its evolution. In accepting such theories, one was not far from admitting the predication for a new crusade, in order to impose European religious ideas on other cultures. Its flags could well bear the sign of the cross, but they would be born by capitalism and imperialism. But what precisely are the philosophical elements inseparable from science and technology, this is what no one has as yet been able to determine." (*Le dialogues...*) Since then the deeply human encyclica, *Pacem in terris*, of John XXIII has marked the will of catholicism to put an end to this vision of things.

49. "A. I. Mikoyan's Speech at the 25th International Congress of Orientalists" (in *Problemi Vostokvedenia*, 1950, No. 5, 3-6). The (disinterested) aim of orientalism is that of "the military engineer studying the offensive or defensive works of the enemy: its destruction," said Goguyer in his translation of Ibn Mâlik's *Alfiyya* (quoted by L. Massignon, *Mardis de Dar el-Salâm*, IX, 1958, 59); etc.

50. K. Mueller, "Der Ostblok und die Entwicklungsländer," *Das Parlament*, July 12, 1961, 397-411.

51. Exposé in *Colloque sur les recherches des instituts français de sciences humaines en Asie*, org. by the Foundation Singer-Polignac, 23-31 Oct. 1959 (Paris, 1960), 39-41.

52. The theses established in *Oriental Despotism* have been severely criticized, particularly by E. E. Leach, "Hydraulic Society in Ceylon" (in *Past and Present*, 1959, No. 15, 2-29); J. Needham, "The Past in China's Present" (in *Centennial Review*, IV, 1960, No. 2, 164-5); J. Chesneaux, *La recherche...*, 12, No. 5. A recent lecture by the Hungarian scholar F. Tokei, *Sur le "mode de production asiatique,"* at C.E.R.M. (Paris, June 1962, 35 pages), on the basis of a recent text by Marx, *Formen, die der kapitalistischen Produktion vorgehen: Grundrisse der*

Kritik der politischen Oekonomie. Rohentwurf (Berlin, 1953), inaugurates a new moment of Marxist research on this problem.

53. Marx-Engels, *The First Indian War of Independence*, Moscow, 1960, 36-37. It is an entirely different problem than "mutual fault" based on the theory called the "reciprocity of perspectives"...

54. Remarkable theoretical report by F. Althusser, "Contradiction et surdetermination," then "Sur la dialectique matérialiste," *La Pensée*, No. 106, 1962, 3-20, and No. 116, 1963, 5-46. Several studies, to be published in 1963-64, formulate the first lines of our concept of civilization, national-cultural, of social evolution in the Arab world; the first, "Problematica del socialismo nel mondo arabo," in *Nuovi Argomenti* (61-66, 1963-64, 141-83).

55. According to our opinion, the *theoretical* basis of the Sino-Soviet divergencies consists in the refusal as a matter of principle by the Chinese leaders of any kind of perpetuation of "eurocentrism" in Marxist theory and in revolutionary strategy. Already, in 1955, Georg Lukács wrote: "In the course of their march towards modern civilization, in their effort to liquidate the residues of their own Middle Ages, countries such as India follow a road which gives a place at least partially to socialism. It is entirely conceivable that the original characteristics of these social transformations will express themselves through new literary forms, which could not be reduced to abstract schemata." (*Die Gegenwartsbedeutung des kritischen Realismus*, 1955, Hamburg, sub. *Wider den missverständenen Realismus*, Fr. trans. by de Gandillac, Paris, 1960, 137).

56. J. Chesneaux, *La recherche...*, 11-16.

57. "The 21st Congress of the C.P.S.U. and the Tasks of Orientalology" (in *Probl. Vostokv.*, I, 1959, 18-25); also M. Mancall, "The 21st Party Congress and Soviet Orientalology" (in *J. Asian Studies*, XIX, 1960, No. 2, 18-25).

58. Enrica Collotti-Pischel, in *Cina, India ed Egitto e la "fase di transizione,"* rightly points out the geographic and historical affinities of the Arab and Moslem researchers with their European colleagues, while the gap deepens as soon as China is approached (*Problemi del Socialismo*, VI, 1963, No. 2, 193-213). Her book, *La rivoluzione ininterrotta* (Turin, 1962) constitutes the most sympathetic effort undertaken by European Marxism to understand the Chinese vision of history.

59. *Colloque sur la recherche*, cf. note 51.

60. The latter, in his remarkable lectures at the Sorbonne, namely: *L'Orient philosophique: généralités, définitions; Missionnaires et philosophes; Sinophiles et Sinophobes* (stencilled issues, Paris, 1960-62).

61. Fung Yeou Lan, *History of Chinese Philosophy*, Peking, 1937, Princeton, 2 vol. (1952-3) and J. Needham, *Science and Civilization...*, vol. II.

62. Under the impetus of the rector Cheikh Moustapha 'Abd al-Râziq (1882-1947), the method of history of Moslem philosophy was renovated, particularly in his *Tamhid li târikh al-falsafâ al-Islâmiyya*, Cairo, 1944. Cf. works by 'Abd al-Rahmân Badawî, 'Abbâs al'Aqqâd, 'Osmân Amin, Mohammad Youssef Moussa, Ibrahim Madkoûr, Isma'il Mazhar, Mohammad 'Abd al-Hâdi Abou Rida, 'Omar Farroukh, etc. Cf. *Al-fikr al-falsafi fi mi'at 'âm* (Amer. Univ., Beyrouth, 1962), pp. 9-70, 102-241, 298-392; our review of "How Greek Science Passed to the Arabs," by De Lacy O'Leary (London, 1951), in *Al-Magalla*, I, 1957, No. 4, 125-7, etc.

63. Paul Sweezy, *The Present as History*, New York, 1953.

64. Cf. Acts of the conference *Probleme des Neokolonialismus und die Politik*

Notes and Discussion

der beiden deutschen Staaten gegenüber dem nationalen Befreiungskampf der Völker April 5-8 1961, Leipzig), 2 vol. The text quoted is from the article by Mancall.

65. J. Chesneaux established (in *La recherche...*, 10-11) the following approximate table from the 20th Congress of Orientalists (Paris, 1948), to the 25th, held in Moscow, in 1960:

NUMBER OF COMMUNICATIONS	TOTAL	"MODERN" SUBJECTS	AFRICAN OR ASIAN AUTHORS
Paris	299	23	37
Istambul	185	17	51
Cambridge	404	55	62
Munich	438	80	86
Moscow	767	287	197

66. *The Past...* (in *Centennial Review*, IV, 1960, No. 3, 308).

67. *La Revue d'histoire économique et sociale de l'Orient*, dir. by Cl. Cahen (in Leyden since 1957), deals primarily with the classical periods. In the summary of the main Marxist or near-Marxist historical journals of Western Europe—*Past and Present* (Oxford), *Recherches internationales* (Paris), *Studi Storici* (Rome)—the contemporary Orient continues to occupy a largely secondary place. The English Marxists (namely Lawrence and Wishart Publishers) devote much more attention to it, notably R. Palme Dutt, *The Crisis of Britain and the British Empire* (London, 1957), *Problems of Contemporary History* (1963), the works of J. Woddis on Africa, etc.

68. Quoted several times in the preceding notes.

69. On this institute, cf. *Probl. Vostokv.*, 1960, No. 6, 221 sqq.

70. *Colloque sur les recherches...*

71. H. Passin, *China's Cultural Diplomacy*, London, 1962, 107-15.

72. In the United States, it is interesting to note that the "main emphasis has been put on six 'critical' languages, which are Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Japanese, Portuguese and Russian; however, eighteen other Slav and Asian languages have been selected to receive attention," says the *Hayter Report* (p. 55), which formulates its own conclusions for Great Britain, p. 92-99.