

in Muslim hands. This is not due to any ill intentions on the part of Kumar but is indicative of larger problems within historical studies of India. As a result of the colonial education system, the promotion of English, and the formation of the very religious identities that Kumar highlights as part of the unexpected results of the colonial educational system, Indian intellectuals were also divorced from any connection to their past. Persian and Arabic texts became foreign and representative of Muslim culture alone, not indicative of wider Indian history. Numerous historians, therefore, still spend most of their time delving over English-language sources, with other languages taking a back seat. *Politics of Education in Colonial India* is no different, and almost all the sources used by Kumar are English or Hindi. Naturally, this clouds discussions of pre-colonial India and leaves academics such as Kumar reaching back thousands of years to find Indian history once again.

Despite these shortcomings, Krishna Kumar's work remains important and is an indispensable text for all students and observers of educational and colonial history.

Brian Wright
Post-Doctoral Fellow
American Research Centre in Egypt
Cairo, Egypt

DOI: 10.2979/jems.1.2.04



Field Notes: The Making of Middle East Studies in the United States

ZACHARY LOCKMAN

Stanford University Press, 2016, 376 pages.

The burst of need and enthusiasm to know about other regions and peoples of the world is not coincidental. Problematizing the emergence of area studies, Zachary Lockman, a historian of the modern Middle East, meticulously explores the factors that influenced and shaped the production and dissemination of knowledge on the Middle East in the United States from the 1920s to the 1980s in his *Field Notes: The Making of Middle East Studies in the United States*, a companion volume to his other notable work, *Contending Visions of the Middle East: The History and Politics of Orientalism* (Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Drawing on extensive archival research, Lockman presents detailed accounts of the involvement of the Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Ford foundations and leadership of specialized institutions (Social Science Research Council, American Council of Learned Societies, Committee on Arabic and Islamic Studies, Middle East Studies Association, and others) in the transformation of the content and vision of Middle East Studies in the United States. Although these foundations regarded themselves as altruists, their funding of area studies, embracing of an internationalist perspective, and projecting of the United States as a rising power with global responsibilities were also viewed as part of their efforts to combat the rising tide of resistance to the enormous economic and political power now concentrated in the hands of the owners and managers of the giant corporations and banks (pp. 2–3). Lockman argues that the proliferation of Middle East Studies in particular and area studies in general was a result of the temporal or gradual shifts in the humanities and social sciences invigorated by foundations and specialized institutions.

In contrast to the main argument of the book, the dominant narrative in the history of the study of the Middle East is that national security concerns after World War II caused Middle East Studies to flourish like other area studies. For example, Osamah Khalil, another historian of the modern Middle East and the author of *America's Dream Palace: Middle East Expertise and the Rise of the National Security State* (Harvard University Press, 2016), maintains that professional expertise in Middle Eastern affairs was mainly required by Washington's national security establishment during the Cold War and helped cultivate a mutually beneficial relationship between academic institutions and the security establishment. Khalil and Lockman draw the same conclusion of the ever-widening gap between the intellectuals and influencers of the field. However, Khalil ascribes the gap to the alignment between the state and non-state institutions driven by the Cold War power dynamics, whereas Lockman highlights the independent role of private philanthropies in instilling an internationalist perspective in academic institutions. In addition, Lockman's explanations on the relationship between changes in social sciences and area studies resonate with Timothy Mitchell's argument in his *The Middle East in the Past and Future of Social Science* (University of California Press, 2003) that the ebbs and flows of the Middle East Studies were reflections of the changes in the broader social science project.

In the first and second chapters, Lockman focuses on the materialization of the need for the regional knowledge in the United States. He notes that the study of the Near East was rudimentary and that until the early

20th century the subject matter of Near Eastern Studies was ancient and classical times. Nascent academic interests in studying the history of the region after the advent of Islam emerged in the context of wars as part of the strategic impulse to “know your enemy” to support the country’s war efforts (p. 10). One of the main challenges that characterized the development of area studies was defining “area” as the central concept and proposing unique theoretical and empirical frameworks to the study of areas distinct from what other social science disciplines (anthropology, history, sociology, linguistics, and political science) were already employing to improve understanding of the same phenomena. Defining “area” is a political issue rather than a geographical one, especially within the context of the Middle East; the concept of the “Middle East” is rather a fluid and loaded one invented by the American military and popularized by the British government to designate the majority-Muslim lands to be partitioned after the demise of the Ottoman Empire. It has remained the semantic hallmark of the imperial legacy over the region.

Lockman attributes the burgeoning of area studies in the postwar period to the vast structural change that universities and colleges underwent in the United States. This era, known as “the Golden Age of American Higher Education,” was characterized by an exponential growth in government funding for educational institutions and the number of students enrolled in universities and colleges. The traditional American universities modeled on German research institutions were eventually replaced by new institutions launched and sustained by large-scale foundations. This rapid transformation was viewed as corporatization of higher education and labeled as the “military-academic-industrial complex” by students and scholars on the left (pp. 54–55).

The criticisms on the interpenetration among universities, area programs, and information-gathering government agencies, Office of Strategic Services (OSS) in particular, were challenged by other scholars such as anthropologist Charles Wagley (1913–1991). For Wagley, the primary function of area studies was to understand the world rather than serve military objectives, and sound research was in the best interest of the government as well as academia as stated by the head of the Near East division of R&A, E. A. Speiser (pp. 60–61). This structural change in higher education combined with the linguistic turn in social sciences in the 1980s, which resulted in an increased interest in the study of languages and cultures, contributed to the expansion of area studies in the United States. With the formation of AAMES (American Association for Middle East Studies), an organization

that quickly lost its credibility due to the controversies surrounding its alleged political agenda, and MESA (Middle East Studies Association), the regular contact and intellectual exchanges among the scholars of the Middle East took on an institutionalized nature. Nonetheless, these institutions periodically ran the risk of being infected by the larger political disputes and debates of the field, such as the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the U.S. foreign policy toward the Middle East, especially in the post-9/11 era.

Although Lockman's book primarily focuses on a specific field of area studies, the central issues it covers are highly important if not deeply concerning for the current state of education. The most important of these issues is the heavy reliance on external funding and the role of private philanthropies. The outcomes of the reliance on external funding are manifold. First of all, it brings scientific objectivity and independence into question. Secondly, it undermines intellectual agency and alienates the intellectual from the work they conduct. Nowadays, the authority to decide on what to study (and increasingly how to study) is transferred to non-academic institutions—namely foundations and corporations whose *modus operandi* might be driven by a different set of principles and not constrained by the ethics of scientific research. As Lockman aptly describes in his *Contending Visions of the Middle East*, this has led to a situation in the field of Middle East Studies in the United States where the institutional builders are not the intellectuals of the field—which in one sense may be viewed as a Marxist critique of the historical development of Middle East Studies. Finally, although Lockman and other cited works make important contributions to the understanding of the development of the study of the Middle East, a narrative or a thread of narratives on how statesmen, intellectuals, and societies in the area perceived and responded to the intellectual and institutional changes in the study of the Middle East in the United States is missing. Studies that portray the making of Middle East Studies from an interactive perspective by documenting the area's reactions as well may further develop our understanding of the historical transformation of the study of the Middle East.

Sefa Secen
Ph.D. candidate
Maxwell School of Syracuse University
Syracuse, NY

