

## **Orientalism Revisited: Bernard Lewis' School of Political Islamography**

**Ataullah Bogdan Kopanski\***

**Abstract:** *This paper aims at examining the writings of a group of "political Islamographists" mainly headed by Bernard Lewis, who are engaged in promoting the idea of "Islamic threat" to the Western civilization. Since this group includes the most venerated counsellors of the American and British political establishment on the Middle Eastern affairs, their post-modern Islamography has radically changed the contemporary relations between the Islamic revivalists and the Western powers.*

In the late 1980s emerged a new proclivity of writing the history of Islam initiated by Bernard Lewis. Many Islamographers, quickly responded to the political demands of the Western elites concerned with the phenomenon of the grass-root movements of Islamic revivalism. Prolific research works of Daniel Pipes, Raphael Patai, Joel Carmichael, Gilles Kepel, Benjamin Kadar, Martin Kramer, Nehemia Levitzon, Barnett Rubin, Yehuda Haim, Elie Kedourie, Amnon Cohen, Judith Miller, David Ayalon, Ira Lapidus, Miron Rezun, Bernard Weiss, Arthur Goldschmidt, Adam Garfinkle and others, created a genuine glut of literature in the field previously recognized as politically peripheral and academically a very exclusive lodge.

While the members of this group may have diverging opinions on various issues, they seem to agree that Islam is one of those religions that were stimulated by Jewish savants, who were the true sponsors and benefactors of the civilizations of both the Islamic Orient and the Christian Occident. They are also deeply concerned with, what they call "the militant Islam" and inclination towards armed struggle against the opponents of Muslim sovereignty.

---

\*Dr. Ataullah Bogdan Kopansky is Professor of History and Civilization, International Islamic University Malaysia. E-mail <ataullahss@yahoo.com>

## Bernard Lewis

Bernard Lewis, author of numerous books and articles, is currently the Cleveland F. Dodge Professor Emeritus of Near Eastern Studies and a senior member of the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton. He is also a Director of the Annenberg Research Institute in Philadelphia. Before his settlement in the USA, he was lecturing at the University of London, and was associated with the British Royal Institute of International Affairs. Professor Lewis is not only interested in the history of the medieval Islam; he actively participates in the shaping of the global strategy regarding Islam in USA, Britain, France and Israel. He stimulates the policy of actual power-brokers by the recollection of the medieval *gestae* of Jews who in his books are always the wise rabbis, courageous navigators, great thinkers and men of letters, and, of course, the unrelenting victims of chronic “anti-Semitism.”

*The New York Times Book Review* acclaimed Bernard Lewis as “the doyen of modern Middle Eastern studies.” Hugh Trevor-Roper from the British *Sunday Times* declared that “no one writes on Muslim history with greater authority, or intelligence, or literary charm than Professor Bernard Lewis.” But the literary charm of Lewis’ venerated books as well as the fidelity of his devotees in the highly commercialized world of book reviews cannot conceal foibles in his hermeneutics of the history of Islam.

His English translations and quotations of Arabic, Persian and Turkish documents follow the trail of works edited and annotated by E. Levi-Provençal, J. Sauvaget, F. Gise, N. Atsiz, M.J. Kister, S. D.F. Goitein, M.J. de Goeje, L. Krehl, P. A. Van der Lith, C.J. Thornberg, C. Defremery, B.R. Sanguinetti, A. Bombaci, D. S. Margoliouth, J. Hammer, *et alii*. Every historical document quoted by Lewis is well known to historians of Islamic civilization with the exception of some documents of Turkish modern history locked up in the archives of Ankara and Istanbul. Definitely, he does not discover Islam for the historians of Islamic civilization. But for sure, Lewis’ works on the medieval Islam better describe the historical reality of the Muslim-Judeo-Christian relations in the *Osmanli Devlet* than his divinations on the tedious “Islamic threat.” Unfortunately, the old Lewis abandoned the advanced medieval studies of the young Lewis.

Bernard Lewis says that Islam “like other religions, inspired in some of its followers a mood of hatred and violence. It is our misfortune that part of the Muslim world is now going through such a period.”<sup>1</sup> He believes that Islam is regulated at various stages of its maturation by two cycles: the long season of hatred directed against the non-Muslims, the

“Muslim rage” and the short period of cultural tranquillity (modernist autocracy). In his vista of the history of Islam, the oriental dualism—which according to him inspired the Qur’anic monotheism—explains the ongoing historical conflict between the anti-Islamic secular despotism and the “Islamic populism.” In Lewis’ model, the struggle of the Islamic extremists against the secular pro-Western timocratic oligarchies in the Muslim world, which is reflecting the historical pulsation of tolerance and violence, persists since the hostility of the Quraishite regime in Makkah towards the Prophet Muhammad (SAS) and his followers.

It has consisted of a long series of attacks and counterattacks, jihads and crusades, conquests and re-conquests. For the first thousand years Islam was advancing, Christendom was in a retreat and under threat. The new faith conquered the old Christian lands of the Levant and North Africa, and invaded Europe, ruling for a while in Sicily, Spain, Portugal, and even parts of France. The attempt by the Crusaders to recover the lost lands of Christendom in the east was held and thrown back, and even the Muslim’s loss of southwestern Europe to the Reconquista was amply compensated by the Islamic advance into southeastern Europe, which twice reached as far as Vienna. For the past three hundred years, since the failure of the second Turkish siege of Vienna in 1683 and the rise of the European colonial empires in Asia and Africa, Islam has been on the defensive, and the Christian and post Christian civilization of Europe and her daughters has brought the whole world, including Islam within its orbit.<sup>2</sup>

In his historical evaluation of the rise and decline of the Muslim states in Europe, Bernard Lewis grossly overlooked the civilizational presence of Islam in Sicily and Iberian Peninsula. What he calls “ruling for a while in Spain” was actually an eight hundred-year-long era of mass conversion of the native German and the Ibero-Roman population to Islam.<sup>3</sup> Between 711 and 1492 CE, the religious *convivencia* was promoted by the Arab and Berber elites until the Christian invasion of the last Islamic state in the South-western Europe in 1492. The century of systematic extermination of the Muslim minority ended with the final expulsion of the Crypto-Muslim survivors from re-Catholicized Spain in 1608, concluding the almost nine hundred-years-long existence of the Islamic civilization in the European Far West. In Sicily the Islamic civilization endured five centuries and was eradicated between 15 and 24 August 1300CE, when Pope Boniface VIII (Benedetto Caetani) and Charles II d’Anjou ordered the massacre of the last Muslim Sicilian community deported by the emperor Fredrick II Hohenstaufen to their “safe haven” in Lucera (Apulia).<sup>4</sup>

Lewis' "a while" of the Islamic civilization in Western Europe was also a period of two hundred years of the Muslim settlement in the Italian provinces of Calabria, Apulia and Campania, southern Gaul, Crete and the Swiss valleys (712-912 CE). The Muslim settlers had often been called by the native warlords (Lombard, Visigothic and Roman) for military aid against the invading Franks, Avars, Hungarians (Magyars) and the local opponents.<sup>5</sup>

It is hard to believe that a scholar of Lewis' calibre and knowledge could reduce the cycle of long continuity of Euro-Islamic civilization to "a while" without some ideological reason. Bernard Lewis is usually very careful in selecting words in his works. His is neither a rabid Islamophobe nor an extremist author of the anti-Arab hate-literature. He did not ravish Islam in its religious and cultural identity. Nor did he fall into the arrogant Orientalist routine of denigration of the "fundamentalist" *'ulamā'* and *fuqahā'*. Lewis recognizes Islam's great contribution to the global civilization and he does not distort its history more than other venerated Western "experts" on Islam. However, he is an impassioned champion of the Western secularism in the Muslim world. Lewis' secularist bias and his Turkish studies made him a great luminary among the narrow but still powerful anti-Islamic group in Turkey.

Like other Orientalists, Lewis acting in the name of pure science, in the words of Hichem Djait, "lays a brutal hand, sometimes even a malicious one, on something that is not simply an inert object of knowledge but a living reality that people have loved, committed themselves to, loaded down with their suffering and their fidelity, in the most intimate sense."<sup>6</sup>

In his numerous books on history of Muslims, Jews and Christians, Lewis paints an unflattering picture of Islam, treating the message of the Holy Qur'ān as some sort of less original version of Judaism, that, he skilfully suggests, produced Christianity also.

Lewis maintains, as do Goldziher, Snouck-Hurgronje, Arthur Balfour, Lord Cromer (Evelyn Baring), and other apostles of political Orientalism, that Islam is an aggressive religion *ex natura*, the product of the mentality of the Arabs, and their tribal despotism, intolerant as well as incapable of grasping the non-utilitarian nature of knowledge. But unlike the nineteenth century colonial Orientalists, Bernard Lewis castigates the contemporary orthodoxy and militancy of the Islamic revivalist movements in the name of the alleged plurality of Islamic faith of the classic era identified with the reign of Judeophilous sultans,

amirs and caliphs. The colonial Orientalists always chided the "rigid and stagnant medieval Islam."

Such obtrusive denunciation stimulates the ideological and theological chimeras of many occidentalised Muslim "reformers," who while being less educated in the history of their own civilizations but obsessively inclined to the so-called critical reinterpretation of the Qurʾān and, without rigorous education in the Islamic revealed knowledge, are proclaimed by the western Orientalist circles as the evangelists of the new Islamic theology of liberation.<sup>7</sup>

### Post-Modern Orientalism

As a former officer of the British intelligence service in the Middle East, who served in the British Foreign Office during the World War II, and as an ardent supporter of the Zionist movement, Bernard Lewis knows very well the arcane of the psychological war and the principles of modern propaganda. The most effective propaganda rests on an exaction that some historical and political characterizations are untrue which may actually be true but are difficult to prove. Certain facts are well-established truths, so that, based on them, the mechanism of suggestion can work exquisitely. The American newsmakers call this technique *innuendo*. The historical truth becomes a mere tool of political manipulation and the great majority of consumers of the manipulated "well-established facts" come to conclusions suggested by the Orientalists well-trenched in the Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies. Political and missionary Orientalism was never a guileless craft of examination of the old manuscripts. It was always closely associated with the policy of de-Islamization of the Muslims. The contemporary postmodernist Orientalism is associated closely with a *kulturkampf* waged by the crusading alliance of Old Left-New Right and divulged in their political manifestos of "empowerment of women," left-wing liberal absolutism, globalisation of the Western values as well as in the vicious campaigns against "the strict version of Islam." The Communist Orientalists who preached the Marxist dogmas of "class struggle" to the subjugated Muslims lost the Seventy Years' War against "religious superstition" in the Balkans, Caucasus, Kipchak and Central Asia.

Despite the great reformation of the new-fangled Islamic studies in the western braineries, the main objective of the paleo-Orientalism of the colonial era is not revised. According to Raphael Patai, the Arab mind is unqualified to understand the higher, i.e., the Judeo-Occidental ideas, due to the Qurʾānic teachings, hence, the "Muslim rage" must be constantly contained and the geopolitical hubs of Islamic revivalism

culturally and economically isolated from the rest of the world.

A true war-monger never expresses an explicit declaration of war. He manages to get a declaration of war from his impotent antagonist and he gives many lectures about his desire for peace and the peaceful settlement of all problems. He will not accuse his opponent of just any misbehaviour, he will accuse him of the plan that he himself has, and of trying to commit the crime that he himself is about to commit. British and Soviet governments who established their own concentration and death camps for the colonized peoples accused Hitler's Third Reich of using it. The secular oligarchies in the Muslim world always insist that their Islamist opponents are bent on tyranny. At the time of the Persian Gulf War II, the Anglo-American and Zionist war-propaganda was particularly successful. The White House's military intentions and Tel-Aviv's political agendas were skilfully hidden behind the fully exhibited intentions of Saddam..

The hidden factor of Lewis' silken distortion of history of Islam is that he naturally cannot expose the political intention of the headmaster for whom he acts. The historical school of Bernard Lewis never reveals its true research to his readers, but Lewis' obsession with "Islamic threat" and his constant concern for the security of the state of Israel, reveals the concerns of the Near Eastern Studies at Princeton University, the Hebrew University at West Jerusalem, and *midrashas* of Mossad or Shin Beth.

### Islamic Threat

In his description of Muslims, Bernard Lewis retreats to the Talmudic dichotomy, placing Muslims on the side of *ummoth ha'olam* of the medieval rabbis. Lewis's Muslims are Maimonides' *ger toshav*, i.e., "the strangers who observe the Decalogue of Moses." He aspires to present objectively the unbridgeable gulf between the Jews and *goyim* marvellously epitomized by Maurice Samuel in his manifesto *You Gentiles*,

Ours is one life—yours another. The primal difference is not reconcilable. It is abysmal...Our Jewishness is not a creed, it is our totality. A Jew is a Jew in everything. We cannot conceive of a duality—religion and life... We Jews pay little attention to the afterlife. We thank God for having made us different from you...Repudiation of the Jewish religion does not alter the Jew...We are a homeless mass seeking satisfaction. We cannot find it. Jews will remain destroyers for ever.<sup>8</sup>

Bernard Lewis is a faithful apostle of the Elders of modern Orientalism who emigrated to America from Germany and Austria after

the victories of the National Socialists in 1930s. One of them, Gustave von Grunebaum, founded his own school of the anti-Islamic craft based on "the canonical pseudoscientific prejudices of French, British and Italian Orientalism."<sup>9</sup> He declared the Islamic civilization as a cultural phenomenon of anti-humanism that does not share Judeo-Christian "primary aspirations."<sup>10</sup>

Bernard Lewis accepts Grunebaum's "objectivity" with the greatest veneration, and states that the concepts of political liberties as well as the rights to resist tyranny are essentially alien to the Islamized mind. He deliberately confuses the Islamic tradition which censures conspiracy and sacrilegious revolt against the righteous Caliph with the modern Oriental and often ferociously secular despotism in *dar-al-Islam*, so that all acts of resistance (*thawrah, ghazwah, jihād, intifādah*) against any oppressive but pro-western, secular, or Zionist regime (*zulm, tāghūt*) are not a genuine indication of Muslim spirit of enfranchisement but only the manifestation of the anarcho-totalitarian "Islamic threat."

The Dangerous Muslim Man must be discouraged "from practising the duty of resistance to bad government" by all means.<sup>11</sup> Lewis teaches that:

The issues on which the so-called fundamentalist Muslims differ from mainstream Muslims are not all the same as those that divided American fundamentalists from mainstream Protestants...The issues which divide the fundamentalists from other Muslims are legal and, in a sense, political... They want to restore what they call an Islamic state, that is to say, one governed according to Islamic law and not according to what they see as the alien, secular, neo-pagan legal systems that have been introduced in most if not all Muslim countries...Some people simply want to call them Islamists. That's the one that they like themselves to call, that suggests that these movements are something central, typical, characteristic of Islam. That is how they wish to be seen, obviously, but I don't think that is how they should be seen, least of all by us who are outside of Islam.<sup>12</sup>

Lewis declares all Muslim opponents of the secular Orientalist doctrine and the Oriental despotism as the adherents of "religious deviation and political anomaly."<sup>13</sup> According to Lewis-Grunebaum's perception of Islam, all secular despots in the Muslim world represent the politically correct Islam, but the populist or Islamist governments which declared *Shari'ah* as the supreme law of their countries are not representatives of "mainstream Islam." Also the nationalist and leftist dictatorships hostile to the Zionist state in Palestine are the bad "Muslim

extremists,” even if they ruthlessly eradicate the Islamic revivalism in their own countries. The best Islam for the majority of western Orientalists is the dead Islam or the ideology propagated by the Muslim modernists in the context of Lord Cromer’s famous catch phrase, “reformed Islam is no longer Islam”. Not without reason Bernard Lewis received many awards and medals from the Turkish Ministry of Education, the *antemurale ordini novi seculari in Asia Minor*. He is an example of the British enlightened liberalism. Eric Arthur Blair (George Orwell) wrote that the “enlightened liberal is almost always hypocrite. We all live by robbing Asiatic coolies, and those of us who are ‘enlightened’ all maintain that those coolies ought to be set free, but our standard of living, and hence our ‘enlightenment’ demands that the robbery shall continue.”<sup>14</sup>

Edward Said, demolished the myth of Bernard Lewis’ authority in the field of Islamic and Arabic studies. Professor Said describes Lewis’ works as,

... aggressively ideological, despite his various attempts at subtlety and irony...It is only the latest and in the West, the most uncriticised—of the scandals of so-called “scholarship”... Lewis will publish a chapter called ‘The Revolt of Islam’ in a book in 1964, then republish much of the same material twelve years later, slightly altered to suit the new place of publication in ‘Commentary’ (Zionist mouthpiece in USA) and retitled ‘The Return of Islam.’<sup>15</sup>

Lewis published again his “Return of Islam” in a book *Religion and Politics in the Middle East*, edited by Michael Curtis in 1981.

After the return of Ayatollah Khomeini to Iran, Bernard Lewis was understandably consumed by the fear of the return of medieval stamina of Islam to the realm of his strategic research. Like other Western experts on Islamic world, Lewis miscalculated and underestimated the grass-root mass movements of *al-sahwa al-Islamiyyah*.<sup>16</sup>

However, denying a just cause of the radical Muslim response to the challenge of the militant secularism, he had not failed, like many of his collaborators, to assess the political and cultural tilt of the coercively Westernised Muslim populations towards the pre-colonial *dawlah al-Islamiyyah*. After the fall of Shah Reza Pahlavi’s secular fundamentalism and the victories of the Afghan *mudjāhidīn* over the Soviet armies, it became abundantly clear that many Orientalists were embarking upon the policy of confrontation with the Islamic movements in the co-called “Crescent of Crisis.”

The RAND Corporation is a California-based institute which carries



out classified research for the US Military and Defence department. RAND planning documents and political analyses are not accessible to the ordinary scholar. The sanitized versions of RAND studies are published in *Foreign Affairs*, the quarterly of the New York Council of Foreign Relations. In the last decade of the 20th century, RAND papers as well as articles in *Foreign Affairs* have been concerned with two issues; the “leadership crisis” and the “Islamic extremism” in the Muslim world. Bernard Lewis and Daniel Pipes offered their own doctrines of the clash of Islamic and Judeo-Christian politics, less transparent than Samuel Huntington’s survey of the contesting contemporary civilizations.<sup>17</sup>

### **Balkanization and Lebanonization**

Lewis represents the old British imperial school of Orientalism originated by Lord Cromer (Evelyn Baring) and William Gladstone; and Daniel Pipes Americanizes the anti-Muslim doctrine presented by Sir Arthur James Balfour during his lecture on “The Islamic Threat for the British Pashas” delivered on June 13, 1910.

Bernard Lewis advocates “Lebanonization” of the Muslim world as a response to challenge of the global *intifādah* of the Muslims. He believes that any direct military intervention of the armies of the Judeo-Christian West in the Muslim world will only radicalise the already insurgent Muslim masses. Any crusade-style invasion of the Muslim world is geopolitically doomed. Every Orientalist knows the end of all anti-Islamic crusades in the past. Sooner or later several Muslim countries will produce or buy the ABC weapons. Lewis recognizes painstakingly that the so-called “Islamic fundamentalism” did not wither away after waves of the police terror, air-bombing, economic embargo, and constant intimidation of the Islamic activists by the mass media. He believes that the only way to protect the strategic interests of the plutocratic elites is the policy of “Balkanization” of the Muslim world. “Lewis’ Doctrine” of the containment of Islamic revivalism can be said to include the following suggestions for the American policy-makers:

1. Political and cultural fragmentation of all Muslim countries along the ethnic, national, racial, tribal, religious and linguistic lines;
2. Proxy wars, air-strikes, ‘pre-emptive’ bombings, economic embargos;
3. Scholarship and financial support for the feminists, militant secularists and opponents of the Islamic Revivalism in the Muslim world;
4. Demilitarization, disarmament and de-industrialization of the Muslim states;
5. Security and supremacy of the Jewish state in Palestine;

6. Covert operations in the Muslim countries (assassinations of the prominent leaders of the Islamic movements, establishment of the phoney "Islamic" militant groups and anti-Islamic militias, psychological war, brain-washing, disinformation, etc.).

This doctrine is designed to grant autonomy to the squabbling and politically powerless ethnic fiefs of the tribal autocrats over which USA, NATO and even Israel can wield its military strength without obstacles. The autocrats or military juntas of these new Muslim protectorates of the Western powers will have a limited freedom of rule as long as they will effectively intimidate the Islamic revivalist movements. In his article "Rethinking the Middle East," published in the *Foreign Affairs* in 1992, Lewis described the Gulf War II as a conclusion of the myth of pan-Arabic unity and "perhaps even of the Arab world as political entity."<sup>18</sup> He is satisfied that the Second Gulf War was neither an American-Arab war nor the subsequent episode of the Israeli-Arab conflict, "but a war between Arab rulers."<sup>19</sup>

But like many other Western politicians, Lewis is deeply worried about Western supremacy in the Middle East,

If the prophets of doom are right, if Western civilization declines and decays, the center of gravity of the world will shift from the Atlantic to the Pacific, then perhaps the Middle East might be contested by Far Eastern powers, i.e., Japan and China, as it was contested once by the powers of Europe.<sup>20</sup>

Even if such scenario is not for the immediate future, Lewis suggests some pre-emptive measures.

Since Russia cannot, and America will not, play imperial role due to their own internal turmoil; the absolutist monarchies, repressive oriental democracies and the autocracies in the Muslim world "will face a frightening prospect of having to take responsibility for their own affairs. It may be a while before they realize that they can no longer compel foreign aid, nor plausibly blame foreign domination when things go wrong."<sup>21</sup> He foretells that the reunited but devitalized Europe, and technologically potent but politically isolated America will remain indifferent to "whatever happened, to wars, disasters and upheavals" in the Muslim Crescent of Crisis.<sup>22</sup> Lewis foresees "possibility of which we are acutely aware at the present time; Islamic Fundamentalism, a loose and inaccurate term that designates a number of different, and sometimes contrasting forms of Islamic religious militancy."<sup>23</sup>

He writes that:

The eclipse of pan-Arabism has left Islamic Fundamentalism as the most

attractive alternative to all those who feel that there has to be something better, truer and more hopeful than the inept tyrannies of their rulers and the bankrupt ideologies foisted on them from outside...As seen by many in the Middle East and North Africa, both western and eastern models produced only poverty and tyranny... As a consequence much of their anger is directed against the Westerner...and the Westerner, seen as a tool or accomplice of the West and as a traitor to his own people. Religious fundamentalism enjoys several advantages against competing ideologies...The more oppressive the regime, the greater the help it gives to the fundamentalism... In program of aggression and expansion these movements would enjoy, like their Jacobin and Bolshevik predecessors, the advantage of fifth columns in every country and community with which they share a common universe of discourse. There is also the possibility that they might have nuclear weapons, either for terrorist or for regular military use... Another possibility, which could even be precipitated by fundamentalism, is what has of late become fashionable to call 'Lebanonization'... If the central power is sufficiently weakened, there is no real civil society to hold the polity together, no real sense of common national identity or overriding allegiance to the nation-state. The state then disintegrated—as happened in Lebanon, into chaos of squabbling, feuding, fighting sects, tribes, regions and parties. If things go badly and central government falter and collapse, the same could happen, not only in the countries of the existing Middle East, but also in the newly independent Soviet republics, where the artificial frontiers drawn by the former imperial masters left each republic with a mosaic of minorities."<sup>24</sup>

Lewis' Declaration neither condemns the Arab and Turkic autocratic regimes with bad records in the Amnesty International's repositories, nor censures the cronyism and nepotism in the Muslim-dominated countries. Lewis' *angst* comes out against the determination of the Muslims. In 1992, their *vox populi* was expressed by Dr. Abbasi Madani, spiritual leader of the Islamic Salvation Front in Algeria that won the first democratic election in the Arab world which was cancelled by the secularist military junta in Algeria.<sup>25</sup>

Bernard Lewis is also troubled by the growing isolationist trends in the USA, which frustrate the Zionist lobby in the Capitol Hill.

The United States will no doubt seek to remain the predominant outside power in the Middle East, but the operative word is 'outside.' Any attempt to get more closely involved inside the region would be bitterly and probably effectively opposed at home...Today the only serious restraints on the American administration is American public opinion.<sup>26</sup>

The growing American isolationism and populism would be a lethal blow for the survival of the expansionist policy of the Zionist

fundamentalists in the Israeli-occupied Arab lands. Being a joyous commentator of the “Lebanonization” of the Muslim countries in the Middle East, North Africa, and Central Asia, Professor Lewis does not support the fragmentation of the post-Communist Balkans and Eastern Europe where the Muslim Bosniaks, Albanians, Pomaks, Turbeshis, Chechens, Ingushis, Daghestanis, Tatars, Avars and Turks try to establish their own national and ethnic homelands. According to Lewis the post-Communist Eastern Europe must remain a bulwark of the First World.

### Anti-Germanism

Lewis believes that the anti-Americanism among the Muslims has something to do with Germany, the conventional axis of the Zionist demonology.

Where a negative view of America formed part of a school of thought by no means limited to the Nazis but including writers as diverse as Rainer Maria Rilke, Ernst Junger, and Martin Heidegger...German philosophy, and particularly the philosophy of education, enjoyed a considerable vogue among Arabs and some other Muslim intellectuals in the thirties and early forties, and this philosophic anti-Americanism was part of the message.<sup>27</sup>

This assertion should be declared a jewel in the crown of Bernard Lewis’s orientalist studies!

His candid anti-Germanism nourished generously on the Zionist myths is compatible with his obsessive anti-Islamism *à outrance*. Why is Professor Lewis outraged by the famous German poet from Prague (who had died in 1926)? Perhaps Lewis discovered in Rilke’s marvellous *Muhammeds Berufung* (a sonnet on the Revelation of Islam to the Prophet Muhammad, SAS), a bacillus of the proto-Hamas anti-Zionism. Martin Heidegger, a renowned philosopher who wrote about *Dasein und Wachsein* certainly annoyed Bernard Lewis very much by his NSDAP membership, but he was not, for sure, an instigator of the *intifadah* in the Muslim Mind.

Lewis like the other Zionist politicians easily identifies the legitimate opposition to the Jewish occupation of the Arab lands with “anti-Americanism” and “Anti-Semitism.”

His anti-German bias is obvious and his discovery of the Teutonic roots of the contemporary Muslim rage is as accurate as a report of a cricket match by a baseball correspondent (Lewis’s favoured verbum). Surprisingly, Bernard Lewis has not yet discovered the germ of

“Islamic extremism” in Goethe’s magnificent *Divan of the West and East*, where the famous Romantic German poet expressed his almost Muslim faith.

Historically, German-Muslim relations have always been excellent; and this provides fuel to Lewis’ Islamophobia. The Germans were the only Europeans who openly supported the Muslim Turks, Arabs, Tatars and Caucasians against their European foes. The German emperor Wilhelm II declared himself a “friend of Islam” and his generals led the Ottoman *askaris* in the Middle East against the British colonial troops. Even the Third Reich supported the anti-colonial struggle of the Muslim peoples. Germany has no record of aggression against Islam, and in the past it was the enemy of Islam’s enemies. Muhammad Iqbal was educated in Germany where he was influenced by Oswald Spengler’s morphology of history. Tunisian intellectual Hashem Djait is quite correct in his statement that, “the Germans have shown a special inclination to understand and appreciate Islam.”<sup>28</sup> Claude Gustave Levi-Strauss wrote his sarcastic comments on the “two sociologically remarkable species, i.e., the Germanophile Muslims and the Islamicized Germans.”<sup>29</sup> Despite the decent history of the Muslim-German relationship, there is no reason to follow Lewis’ school of orientalist education and to believe that Rilke’s poems and Heidegger’s metaphysics motivated profoundly the recent Islamic revivalists. The Muslims express their anti-American sentiments not because the German intellectuals inspired them, but because the ruling American Judeo-Christian plutocracy constantly defends the war crimes of Israelis and denigrates Muslims through its mass media.

Lewis who will not hesitate to vilify the cultural, political and religious aspirations of the Muslim revivalists, always tries to humanize the barbarity of the colonial rule of the West.

The French have left Algeria, the British have left Egypt, the western oil companies have left their oil wells, the westernized Shah has left Iran—yet the generalized resentment of the fundamentalists and other extremists against the West and its friends remains, grows, and is not appeased.<sup>30</sup>

The French colonists “left” Algeria after nearly twelve years of The Dirty War inaugurated by the horrible massacre of the Muslims of Setif in 1945. The French soldiers and OAS terrorists killed more than 400,000 Muslims.<sup>31</sup> The British were ousted from Egypt after the popular anti-colonial revolution. The Western oil companies and “their” oil wells in the Arabian Peninsula are still well protected by US army,

navy, marines and air forces stationed in Oman, Bahrain and Dhahran. Despot Shah Reza Pahlavi "left" his palaces in Iran but not voluntarily: he was dethroned by the popular revolution. Between 1970 and 1979, more than two hundred thousand Iranians were slaughtered by the atrocious secret police SAVAK under the supervision of Uri Lubrani, the Israeli officer of Mossad, and Gen. Nassiri "The Butcher of Teheran."<sup>32</sup>

### The Western Scenarios of the Future War of Religions

Bernard Lewis's political Islamography is very useful for the military and missionary analysts of the future wars in the "Islamic Arc of Crisis." They hope that the Muslim nations will be consumed by endless conflicts of social classes, tribal altercations and clashes between political parties. They anticipate continuous modernist-traditionalist dichotomy, sectarian wars and theological dissensions. But their main concern is the military prowess of the Muslim states and the capacity of the grass-root Islamic movements to seize the political and economic power. The radical anti-Islamic Orientalists suggest a psychological "cold war" and several small "hot wars" which will "contain" the development of the Islamic States in the pivotal regions of Europe, Asia and Africa.<sup>33</sup> James Blackwell, an American military analyst, divides the Muslim states of Western Asia and North Africa into four Swiftian classes of military power: the *Gullivers*, the *Aspirants*, the *Worries* and the *Lilliputians*. Egypt, Iraq and Syria are the *Gullivers* who dominate the Fertile Crescent.<sup>34</sup> Collectively they are strong enough to defeat Israel in a true long war, thus, they have to be disarmed, pauperized and alienated from the rest of Muslim world. According to the rule of the infamous *Game of Nations*, the Syrians, Egyptians and Iraqis must be tamed by the charismatic nationalist secularist dictator of the Gamal Abdel Nasser-type who is able to survive and rule after the lost wars.<sup>35</sup>

The *Aspirants* are the North African police states, who pine for a role as regional power-brokers. But the radical anti-Islamic Orientalists warn that the young, aggressive and jobless societies of the Maghreb are very Islamotropic and ready to replace the secular tyrannies with the strictly Islamic states.<sup>36</sup> The *Worries* are the "conservative and moderate" absolute monarchies of the Arabian Peninsula with their well-armed armies, which are not strong enough to defend themselves. The *Lilliputians* are the moneyed emirates of the Persian Gulf, too small to win any war, but who possess a pecuniary influence in the Muslim world. Blackwell ignored in his evaluation the very poor but bellicose Yemenis, Somalis and Mauritians. He believes that they are not an

imminent and direct "threat to the security of Israel." Palestinians, the *Helots* of the Jewish *Gulliver*, are people from a different book on the Orient.

Martti Ahtisaari, Under Secretary General of U.N, who led the first mission to post-war Iraq, reported that the oil-rich and highly industrialized Muslim *Gulliver* "has been relegated to the pre-industrial age."<sup>37</sup> The Persian Gulf War II of 1991 was a live ammunition test of the coming hyper-wars of the 21st century, in which the Middle East conflicts over shrinking natural resources and water reservoirs will be resolved by the high-tech carnage of the low-tech population.<sup>38</sup>

According to the prepared war scenario devised by the American Research Institute of RAND Corporation, NATO would intervene militarily in the coming "Water War" between Turkey and the Syrian-Iraqi coalition. The RAND polemologists predict the initial Arab victory and the bombing of the Ataturk Dam near Urfa. The US-European troops will invade Mesopotamia under Article Five of the NATO Treaty. The Euro-American forces "would win the Water War but their casualties would be enormous due to the topography and possibility of use of ABC weapons by the Arabs."<sup>39</sup> Additionally, the victory of NATO troops will be complicated by the "Algerianization" of post-Kemalist Turkey, the civil war between the military junta and the Islamic Liberation Front, the Kurdish nationalist uprising and the final fall of secular absolutism in Ankara. The RAND prognosticators also predicted the unavoidable victory of the Islamic revivalist parties in Algeria, and even "Talibanization" of the entire Maghreb and Turkistan.<sup>40</sup>

The relationship between the dominant plutocracies of the West and the subordinated races of Asia and Africa is still shaped by the old Eastern Question, or the policy formulated by the British Liberal Herbert John Gladstone, a man who had coined the term "Turk, the Sick Man of Europe." This political tradition was continued by Bertrand Russell and his circle of the Neo-Malthusianists during the Cold War era, is today again, revitalized by the anti-Islamic coalition of the Judeo-Christian fundamentalists and the postmodernist Left.

In 1923, Bertrand Russell wrote in his *Prospect of Industrial Civilization*,

The White population of the world will soon cease to increase. The Asiatic races will be longer, and the Negroes still longer, before their birth rate falls sufficiently to make their numbers stable without help of war and pestilence... The less prolific races will have to defend

themselves against the more prolific by methods which are disgusting even if they are necessary.<sup>41</sup>

At the Second Pugwash Conference in Quebec, in 1958, Bertrand Russell's closest friend Leo Shilard, declared the regional conflicts in the Third World not only inevitable but also desirable. The so-called Club of Rome, a forum of scholars founded by Alexander King and Lord Solly Zuckerman, as well as its sister organization, the Vienna-based International Institute for Applied System Analysis (IIASA), promoted in the early 1970s a drastic reduction of the Mediterranean and Afro-Asian populations. But the high-tech wars are extremely expensive, and the examples of total control of the "hostile skies" over "rogue states," as well as the economic devolution of the "tigers and dragons" did not change the geopolitical and demographic dynamics of the modern world.

The allied armed forces swept through Kuwait and bombed Iraq with glittering panache, and then withdrew rather more speedily than they had managed to arrive. What they have left behind is a host of political questions which threaten to endanger the stability of the region.<sup>42</sup>

Another geographical area where war is possible is the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent. Trevor Dupuy, an American military historian speculates on the sum of casualties during "the coming fourth war between Pakistan and India." In his book *The Future Wars* he computes "the human cost of the war" and analyses a result of the detonation of Hindu A-bomb over Karachi. According to his calculation, 101,343 Indian soldiers (8,181 daily loses) and 4,763 Pakistani troops (403 daily loses) will die in the first week of the Indian invasion. More than 67,000 civilians will perish during the initial Indian air strikes against the Pakistani cities and about 800,000 Muslims will die in the blast of the Indian nuclear warhead.<sup>43</sup>

### **Containment of Islamic Revivalism**

There are many scenarios of the containment of Islamic revivalism contemplated by the anti-Islamic lobbyists. David Pryce-Jones, a British "expert" on Islam advises an educational and technological embargo against the Muslims "who do not conform to the western notion of modernity" and he suggests the "preventive war against a Muslim country which was able to produce or buy the nuclear arms". He recognizes the Anglo-American "Operation Desert Storm" as a model future war and "the first of a series of several police actions in the years ahead."<sup>44</sup> Daniel Pipes, Lewis' closest collaborator and Director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute in Philadelphia describes the "friendly



tyrants” as the most proficient allies of the West in the crusade against “political” or “radical” Islam. Some of them were declared “Hitlers,” when they become too hostile to the Jewish state in Palestine, or jeopardized the “economic and strategic interests of the western world.” He portrays the “friendly tyrants” as,

Politically regressive, avoiding public accountability and denying the majority of their citizens any real political participation. Many if not most are military governments and have long records of human rights abuses. They rig elections, censor the press, corrupt the rule of law, discriminate against the disenfranchised and imprison dissidents. Their corruption is rampant, their cynicism limitless...<sup>45</sup>

However, he openly advocates the unconditional support of their repressive measures against the “Islamic fundamentalism,”

The United States should neither assist fundamentalist movements that oppose friendly governments nor encourage its friends to appease them. Contact with radical fundamentalists is necessary, of course, to understand their views and to monitor their influence, but no assistance should be provided... The moderates, whose views more closely correspond to America’s policy, might be destroyed in the process... The conservative fundamentalists promote their ideas in peaceable ways, through missionary work, education and personal virtue. They believe in evolutionary change. Though inclined to blame current problems - poverty, military defeat, injustice, moral laxness—on the state’s divergence from the sacred law, they do not rebel against the authorities. To enhance their popularity, shaky rulers sometimes appeal to conservative fundamentalists by applying the Sharī‘ah where it can be done conveniently... In one way, conservative fundamentalists threaten American interests more than radicals, for they make their influence felt within regimes friendly to the United States.<sup>46</sup>

The antinomy of the “Islamic fundamentalism” (the ally of the “Free World” in the end of the Cold War, and foe of *pax americana* after the fall of the Soviet empire) influenced the foreign policy of four American governments. The Carter Doctrine was formulated in response to the Iranian Revolution. The Reagan Doctrine was designed to punish Colonel Muammar Kaddafi’s “Muslim” socialism and to support the Afghan anti-Communist *mudjāhidīn*. The Bush Doctrine emerged from Saddam Hussein’s invasion of Kuwait and the collapse of Communist control over Muslim-dominated Central Asia. The Clinton Doctrine is definitely influenced by the emergence of Muslim nationalism of Bosniaks and Albanians, the Palestinian Islamic radicalism, the “Talibanization” of Central Asia and Caucasus, as well as the crumbling secular order in several Muslim countries, which are likely to determine

the future doctrine of the new president of USA.

The "Friends of Israel" in USA have discovered more "Hitlers" in the Middle East than in any other part of the world.<sup>47</sup> Paul Jabber, a Senior Fellow in charge of the Middle East program at the Council on Foreign Relations and author of the book *Security and Arms Control in the Middle East*, talking about the Muslim countries, anticipates "uncontrollable troubles triggered by religious turmoil and a new leadership with strong Islamic leaning which should come to power before the end of the last decade of the 20th century."<sup>48</sup>

Judith Miller, a radical anti-Islamic feminist writer for *The New York Times* and a Fellow at the Twentieth Century Fund is obsessed with the existence of the Islamic conspiracy of "Khomeintern." She writes that the peaceful political Islamic movement "may take roots in the Muslim world" but such a movement is a "contradiction in terms because to attract the young Muslims, Islam must be fierce and militant, opposed to the existing order." According to her, the American Government should be sceptical of those who seek to "liberate Arabs through Islam." Judith Miller advocates "a liberal militancy, or a militant liberalism" in the White House.<sup>49</sup>

Chaim Herzog, the president of Israel did not restrain his blind hatred of Islam during his official visit to Poland where he declared the revival of the Islamic religion as "the disease which is spreading rapidly and constitutes a danger for the Jewish people as well as for the mankind. The Green Peril is the main danger facing the world."<sup>50</sup>

Edward Said wrote that "if the knowledge of Orientalists has any meaning, it is in being a reminder of the seductive degradation of knowledge, of any knowledge anywhere, at any time. Now more than before."<sup>51</sup> Lewis's school of Orientalism had begun to refurbish the stereotypical image of Islam as the alien and menacing force. The "experts" on Islam contributed significantly to the contemporary anti-Muslim crusades by providing an academic evaluation of the "Islamic threat" to the Western and Russian policy-makers. They make the war crimes of Israelis and the Russian atrocities against Caucasian Muslims ethically permissible and the Anglo-American bombing of Iraq intellectually acceptable.<sup>52</sup> Their scholarly correct anti-Islamic hate-literature encourages the Oriental despots to act belligerently against the popular Islamic movements. The political Islamographers promote themselves as champions of militant secularism and pro-Western "friendly tyrants" in the Muslim world, while suppressing any academic evaluation of the anti-Islamic hate-literature and the Israeli state terrorism by denouncing it as an amplification of the so-called "anti-

Semitism.”

Adam Garfinkle, a senior fellow of the American Foreign Policy Research Institute and the former executive editor of the *National Interest* writes with a characteristic Machiavellian frankness of the postmodernist Islamographers that,

U.S. interests are liable to be better served by Iranian-Taliban conflict, the more wasteful and ferocious the better, than by letting Mullah Omar set up shop at his ease...So let us be humble in wishing trouble on two of the West's adversaries, and pray (as the local protagonists are not doubt doing) that God's will be done.<sup>53</sup>

After decades of the secular wishful thinking, the return of the Islamophobic Orientalists to prayer for war indicates rather the end of godlessness among them than the advent of secularist resurgence. In the spring of 1997, Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott disclosed a new amendment to the Clinton Doctrine that gives a higher priority to the policy of containment of the Islamic revivalism in Central Asia. The Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan, which until 1998 received only the attention of the western agitated suffragists, obtained more serious attention because of Pakistan's nuclear capacity, a rapidly deteriorating situation in Kashmir and the political gains of the Islamic opposition in Tajikistan. The ruling Taliban coalition ostracized by the western powers defeated the heavily armed bands of Russian-backed renegades and established the first totally independent Islamic state. Bad news for Lewis' school of Islamography.

---

#### Notes

1. B. Lewis, "The Roots of Muslim Rage" *The Atlantic* (September 1990):48.
2. *Ibid.*, 49
3. Vide, R. W. Bulliet, *Conversion to Islam in the Medieval Period. An Essay in Quantitative-History* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979), 114-127; and T. W. Arnold, *The Preaching of Islam. A History of the Propagation of the Muslim Faith* (Lahore: Sh. M. Ashraf, 1979), 133-207.
4. Vide P. Egidi, *La Colonia Saracena di Lucera e la sua distruzione* (Naples 1912); also; Ibn Jubair, *Rihla* (Beirut: Al-Kalam, 1964); M. Amari, *Storia dei Muslmani di Sicilia, e cura di C.A. Nallino* (Catania 1933), 39; A.G. Petroni, *Storia della citta di Bari*, (Naples, 1857); A. Ahmad, *A History of Sicily* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1975).
5. Vide S. Arslan, *Tārīkh ghazwāt al-Arab fī Faransā wa-Swisrā wa-Italyā wa-jazā'ir al-Baḥr al-Mutawassiṭ* (Cairo: Al-Maktabat al-Tijariya, 1933) ; C. Famin, *Histoire des invasions des Sarrazins en Italie du VIIe au Xie siecle*

(Paris, 1843), J. T. Reinaud, *Invasions des Sarrazins en France et de France en Savoie, en Piemont et dans la Suisse* (Paris: Librairie Orient, 1964) ; G. Musca, *L'Emirato di Bari* (Bari: Biblioteca Bariana, 1964).

6. H. Djait, *Europe and Islam* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), 52.

7. For example, the "matriarchal" gospel of Islam according to Rifat Hasan (the latest celebrity of the Dutch Orientalists), Fatima Mernissi's feminist fundamentalism, Muhammad Arkoun's postmodernist deconstructionism of Muslim thought, the radical Islamoclasm of Nasr Abu Zaid, and other less revered post-Muslim "free-thinkers." Murad Hoffman, a German Muslim writer and *nota bene* modernist himself, described Fatima Mernissi as "the Moroccan author not competent in Islamic history, philosophy and theology who dabbles in all these fields." See; M. Hoffman, *Islam 2000* (Beltsville, Maryland: Amanah Publications, 1417/1996), 69. See also, F. Mernissi, *La harem politique: Le Prophet et les femmes* (Paris: Maspro, 1987). Rifat Hasan's knowledge of history and Qur'anic studies are much more controversial than Fatima Mernissi's, the Francophonie Moroccan feminist is at least able to read the Arabic texts. Edward Said describes "the Muslim native informant of the Western Orientalist as "a despised heretic" who must constantly "endure the entirely thankless position of being known" in the dominion of the Middle East studies establishment, "a pool of interest," "old boy" and "expert" networks linking the foundations, the missions, the foreign service, the intelligence community together with the academic world, where there are grants, and other rewards, hierarchies, institutes, centers, faculties, departments of deliberately marginal specialists as well as a small minority of academic power brokers, all devoted to legitimizing and maintaining the authority of a handful of basic, basically unchanging ideas about Islam, the Orient, and the Arabs." Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Book, 1979), 301-302. Abdullah Schleifer, a Jewish-born Muslim author of *The Fall of Jerusalem* describes "the post-Christian secular humanism ranged from a Marxian-derived left-liberalism to a more diffused relatively apolitical consumerist ideology backed by the western mass-media establishment as the most serious challenge to the Muslims." See his, "Post-Marxian Political Thought: Toward a Peaceful World Order," (lecture), *The Seminar on Postmodernist Political Thought*, September 28-29, 1992, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Abdullah Schleifer, a former BBC correspondent from Cairo embraced Islam when Moshe Dayan's troops sacked the Arab Muslim Jerusalem abandoned by king Hussein's regiments on June 7, 1967. Mariam Jameelah (former Margaret Marcus), a Jewish-born *pardah*-observing Muslim writer and a former Zionist *Mizrachi Hatzar* activist from New York, writes that "the primary goal of modern Orientalism is to incite Muslim-named scholars through the linguistic conjectures and textual deconstructionist techniques, to distinguish at least the strictly historical parts of our holy verses of Islam, which they allege were meant solely for the "primitive

Arabic society" of the Prophet's days and, consequently irrelevant for the present age." See her, *Islam and Modernism* (Lahore: Muhammad Yusuf Khan, 1977), 105-106.

8. M. Samuel, *You Gentiles* (New York: Jewish Press, 1924) 5-6.

9. Edward Said on von Grunebaum's Orientalism: "A typical page of his, on the Islamic self-image, will jam together half-a-dozen references to Islamic texts drawn from as many periods as possible, references as well as to Husserl and the pre-Socratic, references to Levi-Strauss and various American social scientists. All this, nevertheless, does not obscure von Grunebaum's almost virulent dislike of Islam." Said, *Orientalism*, 296.

10. G. Von Grunebaum, *Modern Islam: The Search for Cultural Identity* (New York: Vintage Books, 1973), 55-56, & 260-261.

11. Vide B. Lewis, "Islamic Concept of Revolution," in *Revolution in the Middle East and Other Case Studies*, (ed.) P.J. Vatikiotis (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1972), 33.

12. B. Lewis, "Understanding Fundamentalism," (interview with P. Sands), *New Straits Times*, January 11, 1994, p.32

13. In his preface to G. Kepel's book on Muslim "extremism," Lewis writes that "to modern Western observer, the political role of Islam in the world today appears to be something of an anomaly," see G. Kepel, *The Prophet and Pharaoh: Muslim Extremism in Egypt* (tr.) J. Rothschild (New York: Al Saqi Books (Zed) 1985), 9.

14. G. Orwell's introductory essay in *The Works of R. Kipling* (Wordsworth: The Wordsworth Poetry Library, 1994), XIX.

15. Said, *Orientalism*, 316. Cf. B. Lewis, *The Revolt of Islam: The Middle East and the West* (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1964) and his "The Return of Islam" *Commentary* (no. 1) January 1976.

16. Akbar S. Ahmed, *Postmodernism and Islam* (London: Routledge, 1992).

17. "According to Lewis, Islam does not develop, and neither do Muslims, they merely are, and they are to be watched...Muslims, like most other former colonial peoples, are incapable to telling the truth or even seeing it...The core of Lewis's ideology about Islam is that it never changes and his whole mission is now to inform the Jewish reading public, and anyone else who cares to listen, that any political, historical and scholarly account of Muslims must begin and end with the fact that Muslims are Muslims." Said, *Orientalism*, 317-318. Like Karl Marx wrote in his, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* "they cannot represent themselves, they must be represented" (in our case; of course by the enlightened "experts on Islam" and the Orientalists). Edward Said selected Marx's phrase as a motto to his refutation of the Orientalism. Also see, Samuel Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996), and his later contribution, "When Cultures Collide," *Civilization* (June-July 1999):76-77.

18. B. Lewis, "Rethinking the Middle East," *Foreign Affairs* 70 (Fall 1992): 100.

19. *Ibid.*, 101.

20. Ibid., 108.
21. Ibid., 109.
22. Ibid., 114-115.
23. Ibid., 116-117.
24. Ibid.
25. Abbas Madani said, "I swear by Allah Almighty, that if a single drop of blood is shed by the military, we will combat them until its complete destruction." See, *Le Monde*, April 17, 1991. p.1. More details on the Islamic Revival and anti-Islamic despotism in Algeria, see Y. H. Zubir, "The Painful Transition from Authoritarianism in Algeria," *Arab Studies Quarterly* 15 (Summer 1993)3: 83-110.
26. Lewis, "Rethinking," 107-108.
27. Ibid., 52.
28. H. Djait, *Europe and Islam: Culture and Modernity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), 75. For more details on the Muslim-German historical relationship, see F. Nicosia, *The Third Reich and the Palestinian Question* (London: Routledge, 1985). Also see G. Hopp, "Arab in Berlin: The Political and Journalistic Activities of Arab Anti-Colonialists in the Capital of the Reich, 1918-1928," in *Asian and North African Studies in GDR- Traditions, Positions and Findings*, (eds.) G. Bartel, L. Rathman, & M. Robbe (Berlin: Verlag, 1986), 94-110.
29. C. Levi-Strauss, *Tristes Tropiques* (New York: Atheneum, 1975), 403.
30. B. Lewis, "The Roots of Rage," 52.
31. "On May 8, 1945, the French air force under the political direction of a Communist minister, Charles Tillon, went into action against Algerian villages and the town Setif. Medium and heavy bombers, flying up to 300 sorties a day, flattened entire communities. Senegalese troops and units of the French Foreign Legion were allowed a free hand in the area, and they killed, burned, and looted at leisure. Independent American sources put the number of killed Algerians at seventeen thousand. The nationalists said the figure was nearer forty-five thousand... At Setif what the Governor General described as 'Hitlerian elements' attacked the population while it was celebrating V-Day...On August 22, 1955, George Chassagne, a French cameraman employed by Fox Movietone, was taken by the French authorities to see some Algerian prisoners. While Chassagne was filming, an auxiliary policeman dragged one of the prisoners away and, in front of camera, shot him dead...at village Zef-Zef, soldiers had executed fifty Algerians, including old people, women and children...the ditch outside the village, along the Roman road, contained a thousand corpses, George of *Le Monde* wrote; "here the hour of repression has sounded...This has become a war of race and religion... The Algerian revolt, following the French defeat in Indo-China, marked the dying gasp of France as a colonial power, the ultimate stage in a pattern of serious decline that had begun in the years before 1939. Algeria was a bloody, brutal and racist war, with torture, atrocities and the killing of civilians on a large scale." P. Knightley, *The First Casualty: From the Crimea*

to Vietnam: *The War Correspondent as Hero, Propagandist and Myth Maker* (New York: Harvest Book, 1976), 357-373.

32. More details on the fall of Shah of Iran, see M. Heikal, *The Return of the Ayatollah* (London: A. Deutch, 1983), 155.

33. J. Brewda, "New Bernard Lewis Plan will Carve up the Middle East," *Frontier Post* (Peshawar), December 2, 1992, p.11.

34. Cited by A.P. Capps, "Gullivers and Lilliputians in the Mideast," *Defense Journal* (Karachi) 18(1992)1-2: 33.

35. Cynical Miles Copeland, an American ex-diplomat writes: "When we come to the Afro-Asian countries, the predicting was more difficult and we had to rely more and more on human sensitivities and instincts which we hadn't yet worked out how to programme into a computer...In general, though, it can be said that the best known methods of intelligence analysis—the Game, the CIA, the State Department, or whatever—have not proved up to predicting the actions of leaders of those countries of Africa and Asia where the people are frustrated, and where the leaders, if they are to stay in power, must either resort to demagoguery or discover new ways of squeezing more aid from the rich countries or both...Certain leaders *are* in the Game, whether we like them or not, situations sometimes arise when we cannot "win" with this or that leader, and where "loss" to him would gravely damage our (i.e. USA and Israel) national interests. In such circumstances we might seek to bring about the removal of that leader, and his replacement by another leader to whom we have better chance of accommodating. The American view, and to some extent the British, has been that of all alternative types of leader which might arise in the Afro-Asian world the Nasser type is the one with whom we have the best—or least bad—chance of winning our Game," M. Copeland, *The Game of Nations. The Amorality of Power Politics* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970), 18-19, 23,49-50.

36. Vide, F. Burqat and W. Dowell, *The Islamic Movement in North Africa* (Austin: University of Texas Press, Center of the Middle Eastern Studies, 1993); & A. N. Haddam, "The Political Experiment of the Algerian Islamic Movement and the New World Order," in *Power-Sharing Islam?*, ed. A. Tamimi (London: Liberty for Muslim World Publication 1993), *The Rape of Nation: The Hidden Face of Algeria* ( Livre blanc sur la repression en Algerie, 1991-1994, Report on the Repression in Algeria), Algerian Committee of Campaigners for the Human Dignity and Human Rights, ed. Haggar 1995, also; A. Azzam (ed.), *Algeria: Revolution Revisited* (London: A.Azzam 1996).

37. Quoted by Prof. Bernard Lown, the Noble Prize-winner from Harvard University in his "Reflections on the Aftermath of Gulf War," *Defence Journal*, vol.XVIII (1983)1-2: .39.

38. Within a forty-three day-long period, 88,500 tons of bombs, the equivalent of seven Hiroshima size A-bombs were dropped on Iraq. The radar-elusive F-117 Stealth, F-111, F-15 E and the strategic B-52 warplanes supported by the intelligence satellites demonstrated the "precision bombing"

of the military and industrial targets. The laser-guided 15,000 pound BLU-82 bombs and 'Tomahawk' cruise missiles devastated administrative centers, underground shelters and bridges. The Iraqi tank crews were burned alive by the depleted uranium armor-piercing shells. The survivors suffered from its radioactive effects. As in Vietnam, the Americans used the napalm and FAE. After the cease-fire, the economical embargo reduced the formerly most advanced Arab country to the land of peddlers and hungry children. The pilot of Apache helicopter, Col. Richard White described his night mission in Iraq: "It almost like you flipped on the light in the kitchen at night and the cockroaches start scurrying and we're killin' em...". See, J. Pilger, "The Great Cover-up," *Third World Resurgence* 7 (1991):10. More details on the racist war propaganda and American fun of mass-killing during the Persian Gulf War II, see, R. Clark, *The Fire This Time* (New York: Thunder's Mouth Press, 1992).

39. Vide, Turkish ultra-secularist daily *Sabah*, September 17, 1992, and AFP, September 19, 1992.

40. Vide, G. E. Fuller, *Algeria. The Next Fundamentalist State*. Report Prepared for the US Army by RAND Corporation (Santa Monica, CA: Rand Co, 1996), ix-xi. Also; A. Lahouari, "Islam politique et democratisation en Algerie," *Esprit* (August 1992), and M. Kusserov, "Islam in Algeria; Past and Future?" *Swiss Review of World Affairs* 51 (April 1994): 2121.

41. B. Russell, *Prospects of Industrial Civilization* (London: Wilmer Bros, 1923), 273.

42. "The confrontation to come. Gulf War Anniversary," *The Middle East* (March 1992):.5.

43. "The Fourth India-Pakistan War," *The Friday Times*, Pakistan, (May 2, 1993), 22-23.

44. Vide, D. Pryce-Jones, *At War with Modernity: Islam's Challenge to the West* (London : Institute for European Defence & Strategic Studies, 1992), 36, 47.

45. D. Pipes and A. Garfinkle (eds.) *Friendly Tyrants: An American Dilemma* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), xv.

46. D. Pipes, "Fundamentalist Muslims between America and Russia," *Foreign Affairs* (Summer 1986): 944, 958.

47. The Iranian nationalist Muhammed Mossadegh who nationalized the British Oil Company in 1953 was the first to be depicted as "Hitler" by the Anglo-American propaganda. The next "Hitler" was Abdel Nasser of Egypt. Until his surprise visit to Israel and a separate peace treaty with it, Anwar Sadat was presented as a Nazi-styled fuehrer. So was Yasser Arafat. Ayatollah Khomeini's book was described by the US media as *Mein Kampf*. The latest "worst than Hitler" (George Bush's words) is of course Saddam Hussein of Iraq.

48. P. Jabber, "Egypt's Crisis, America's Dilemma," *Foreign Affairs* 64 (Summer 1986) 5: 975.

49. J. Miller, "The Challenge of Radical Islam," *Foreign Affairs*. 72 (Spring



1993)2: 50 & 55.

50. *Herald Tribune International*, May 29, 1992. (Friedrich Nietzsche wrote that "the liberal institutions straightway cease from being liberal in the moment they are soundly established" [Die liberalen Institutionen horen alsbald auf, liberal zu sein, sobald sie erreicht sind], see his *Twilight of the Idols*, written in 1888).

51. Said, *Orientalism*, 328.

52. See N. Cigar, "Serbia's Orientalists and Islam: Making Genocide Intellectually Respectable," *The Islamic Quarterly* 38 (1994) 3: 147-170.

53. A. Garfinkle, "Afghanstanding," *Orbis* 43 (Summer 1999)3: 418. This is a journal of world affairs published by the Foreign Policy Research Institute, Greenwich, Conn. and London.