

Lors de la "révolution culturelle" en Chine, ce mouvement a atteint son point culminant et suicidaire. Mais partout ailleurs, la suspicion à l'endroit des sciences occidental-coloniales était très forte.

Cette "reprise" des sciences coloniales fera l'objet d'un brillant exposé d'un chercheur saoudien, lors du séminaire de Bahrein, Abou Bakr Ahmed : "Les méthodes anthropologiques occidentales et l'étude des sociétés du Moyen-Orient."

CHAPTER 2 KNOWLEDGE IN THE ARAB COUNTRIES: THE CASE OF EGYPT

Ahmed A. Zayed
Cairo University, Egypt

In the last two decades several discourses on crisis of sociology (expressed by several texts on science crisis and society crisis), on tradition (expressed by several texts on Islamic sociology or Islamisation of social sciences) and on identity (expressed by several texts on Arab sociology) rose in the horizon of Arab sociology. All these discourses have one thing in common: They raise questions on self, identity and relation with the other (the West). They are no doubt important questions. They often come to answers creating competition for fixing landmarks of the road and reproducing old questions raised by the renaissance thinkers since the beginning of the century without having a clear capability for determining landmarks or reaching absolute answers of the old questions.

Why hasn't Arab sociology raised different questions like: What do we know? What is the nature of those restrictions which limit our knowledge or push this knowledge into certain courses? How do we know? Raising such questions might enable us to face ourselves directly without blaming the others as did most of the prementioned discourses. I think that raising questions about the history of Arab sociology, conditions of producing it and how we acquire it enable us to face ourselves in a better way. Thus, we become able to go ahead towards what is better and to decide the bases of our "cultural" existence and consciousness in a better way. In this paper we try to offer answers to these three questions, in an attempt to answer an important question: How far did sociology in the Arab World study its basic subject, i.e. Arab society? Though matters may be similar in Arab countries, the limits of discourses in this text are connected mainly to the development of sociological lessons in Egypt.

What do we Know?

In order to approach an answer to this question we need to know the nature of knowledge published in Arabic. This production comprises the outputs of Arab sociologists since the formal institutionalization of sociology in Egypt in 1925. Measuring this production is in fact a difficult task which is wider than the limits of this paper. It is enough to know the main features of this knowledge within the limits of the Egyptian experience and in the framework of available texts. A

reader of the history of Egyptian sociology can distinguish between three phases. The three phases represent three generations of Egyptian sociologists, each has its own interests and scope. In such analysis I would draw on my two previous works on the history of institutionalization of sociology in Egypt (Zayed 1995, 1996), considering of course overlapping and continuity of phases.

1. The first phase covered the period from 1925 to the middle sixties. It included the generation of pioneer sociologists who studied - with a few exceptions - in France in the twenties and thirties. Their influence extended from the end of the thirties through three decades. In the first phase the pioneer generation was interested in different theoretical matters in which philosophy was mixed with ethics and education influenced by the French school. They were interested in abridging the schools of sociology and pointing out the differences between them, as what was mentioned in Moustafa El-Khashab's book *Sociology and its Schools* (El-Khashab 1960). They were also interested in the history of social thought from ancient civilization till the appearance of sociology, giving attention to the position of Islamic Arab thought within the development of human thought, as what appeared in Hassan Saafan's book *The History of Sociological Thought* (Saafan 1965).

Among the most important branches of sociology in which the writings of the pioneer generation appeared are sociology of family, criminology, sociology of religion and social control. And at a less degree industrial sociology and sociology economic life. The pioneer generation was also interested in reconciling theory and Arab traditional sociological thought. This appeared in paying a clear attention to Ibn Khaldun for whom Ali Abdel Wahed Wafi dedicated a great deal of his academic career (Wafi 1951).

The pioneer generation was contemporary to the rise of July 1952 Revolution that emphasized the role of the state in social life. Thus some of them tended to follow the political discourse of the state. This appeared in the works of Abdel Aziz Ezzat *The Revolution of Liberation and Social Reform, Arab Ideology and Arab Society and Unity Discipline and Labour* (Ezzat 1960, 1961a, 1961b). The trend of the pioneer generation was selective and nearer to establishing the bases of everything and working in every direction. This appeared clearly in the statement quoted from Abdel Aziz Ezzat in which he mentions that his works aimed at "creating various intellectual currents; an ethic current, a social scientific current, a reformist social current, an ethnological current and a socialist Arab current" (Saafan, 1970, p.79).

While the group of the pioneer generation was interested in those theoretical concerns, another group was interested in field research. Thus this theoretical current was parallel to an empirical current which rose independently through the interest of the foreigners at first then the Egyptians. The first field research appeared in 1936. It was on the population problem in Egypt and was done by Cleland (at the Department of Sociology in the American University in Cairo that was founded in 1930). It was followed by another research on poverty in Egypt

in 1938. Then appeared a research interest among the Egyptians which was manifested in a master degree thesis presented by Ali Eissa in 1937 on *The System of Land In West Delta*. Interest in empirical researches were continued through the publication of *Growing Up In An Egyptian Village* by Hamed Ammar in 1953 and *Industrialization And Society* by Hassan El Sa'ati in 1958. These research efforts were crowned with the establishment of the National Centre For Social And Criminal Research in 1955 (It was originally called National Institute For Criminal Research) (Zayed 1995, pp. 66-67).

2. The second phase covered the period from the middle sixties to the end of the seventies. It included that generation of sociologists who graduated in the university since the early sixties (or a little earlier) whose influence in the field of academic work has appeared since the late sixties (in spite of the rise of a new generation and a new phase). This generation is different from the previous one as it was unbought within the confines of a socialist national political discourse. They were taught by different intellectual schools (The American school, the German school, the Russian school, the French school and the school which took its shape in Egypt). Accordingly intellectual discourse began to reflect a plurality of trends, as well as combining interest in both theory and empirical research. The interest in the functional school, within the domain of sociology or anthropology, became clear. A group of academics (in both Cairo and Alexandria universities) began to abridge and present this school in different ways (Cf. Osman 1981). Another team was interested in the issues of historical materialism and presented researches which adopted historical materialism as their ideal frame (Cf. Naeim 1981). A third team was interested in the issues of dependency theory and the perspectives of the international capitalist system and the Asiatic mode of production. They presented researches based on the issue of articulation of modes of production (Cf. Ouda 1979). A fourth team adopted a cultural trend and concentrated on studying folklore offering a chronicle and an abridgement of the German and French schools in the field of studying folk tradition with some attempts to survey and record the Egyptian folklore (Cf. El-Gawhary, M, 1981). Still another group was focussing in the study of rural development. This trend flourished in local universities (Cf. Shawqi 1961 and El Gawhari, A. 1977) Finally a selective current not committed to any clear theoretical frames who uses analytical concepts and frames taken from different schools (Cf. Ibrahim 1982).

In this phase we haven't come across any interest in Ibn Khaldun other than that which is considered a continuation of the interest started by the pioneers. But interest in tradition had a different shape; the old interest in Ibn Khaldun was replaced with an interest in "national culture". This interest in national culture had a distinguished nature connected with seeking what is special and distinct in that national culture. This interest had a clear form inside the academy through works of Anwar Abdel Malik who based his works on the idea of the historical specificity of the Egyptian society in particular and oriental societies in general (Abdel

Malik 1967, 1974, 1983). The most important research issues which worried this generation were limited in the issues of social change, development and culture, with less interest in the issues of women, immigration and population.

Among the yields of this phase, intellectual schools of sociology in Egypt began to have a clear form, though this was not completely clear. This production was not as directed towards - except in very few cases - the production of theory that reflects a clear intellectual trend as it was directed towards abridging the basic ideas of different Western schools or using ready-made analytic frames in researches on subjects in the Egyptian society. Manifestations of difference among influential sociologists in this phase did not completely abolish manifestations of similarity among them as a generation who was contemporary to a certain historic era with which they interacted. This generation witnessed the extension of university education by the government. Its members - with few exceptions - were interested in writing introductions and text books for a growing number of students. Some of them wrote about contradictory specializations, a trend that does not reflect any endeavour towards specialization and accumulation. Such a trend became a clear tradition in the works of most of the students of this generation. On the other side, this generation was not interested in public issues or arousing public issues; if this happened, it would be done differently. Among the most important issues which worried this generation (affected by the dominance of ideology in political discourse) was the issue of the relationship between ideology and social sciences. The notion of "the scientific gathering" or "the academic identity" was a cause for sociologists in that phase. There were attempts to realize that gathering, once by founding groups like "Contemporary Sociology Group" which was interested in translation, another time by founding a scientific magazine like "The Annual Book of Sociology" which was edited by Mohamad El-Gawhary in 1980 (7 issues were published then it stopped) and a third time by calling for founding a league or an association of sociology in Egypt. None of those efforts continued and the association has not come to life yet.

3. The third phase and the second one are clearly overlapping. The third phase includes the generation which was educated at the end of the sixties and in the seventies and whose influence has begun since the eighties. This generation was formed in the circumstances which followed the 1967 setback of Nasser's regime. Thus they were different from the previous generation, as they developed a critical consciousness raising the questions of self, specificity, identity and the relationship with the West. Since entering this phase, crisis discourse has begun to appear in sociology in Egypt and elsewhere in the Arab World. Sociological production took various shapes. An interest in critical and interpretative school appeared in sociology, where the pitch of criticizing the Western tradition was high (Cf. Zayed 1981), and the interest - which began in the previous phase - in dependency relationships and the issues of modes of production, especially the issue of Asian mode of production (influenced by the

writings of Ahmad Sadeq Saad) was emphasized (Saad 1976) as well as the issue of tributary mode of production (Clearly influenced by Samir Amin). On the other hand, this generation - and the previous one - witnessed a sort of convergence between some Arab scholars at a time when the veins of political convergence were getting dry (especially after Camp David Agreements) and scientific gathering seemed an alternative of political convergence in an effort to seek self and to emphasize identity. This convergence produced two kinds of discourses: the first one, which was more or less related to the foundation in early eighties of Arab Association of Sociology, was associated with seeking an Arab formula of sociology (Cf. Hegazi et al 1986) and the second was associated with discussing the issue of methodology (Cf. Khalifa & Lotfi 1984). A group of academics did not like both ways and they preferred being interested in the issues of tradition in an effort to find an Islamic sociology (Cf. El-Samaloti 1981). But in the domain of field research, the interest in the issues of development and transformation which appeared with the previous generation was continued, though new interests such as studying social problems, sociological aspects of literature and social classes were developed.

Thus we can say that there is an Arab accumulation of sociological knowledge. But this production needs to be documented, analyzed and studied to know its strength and weakness points. This production is considered big as far as its volume. Hegazi managed to count 486 Master and Doctorate theses licentiated by Egyptian universities from 1957 to 1987 (Hegazi 1987). This shows the abundance of production as far as quantity. But we need more critical studies before we judge the quality of such production. Nevertheless we could develop some hypotheses on the quality if we tried to deconstruct the process of production itself by researching the conditions associated with it.

Beyond Production of Sociological Knowledge

Raising hypotheses on the conditions in which "mind structure" and "mind formation" take form should in fact enable us to understand our being in the world and to avoid talking about fixed characteristics or fixed structure of mind, or fixed characteristics of Arab self or Arab mind. Such arguments depended on a method based on "external criticism" or "critical criticism" which presents descriptions of Arab mind which implicitly suggests that it has to seek the ideal mind (the European mind). Such interpretations are common in the post defeat texts which are not completely different from Western texts on Oriental mind that produced concepts such as "Oriental disposition", "primitive mentality" and "non-achieving personality".

Replacing the method of internal criticism with the method of external criticism may enable us to approach ourselves so that the very self can become a subject of study by exploring the constructive ties which form mind. The argument here is based on the assumption that the production of texts is not

separated from the context in which these texts are produced. Being aware of the context is the genuine beginning of Reflexivity (Gouldner 1970) that enables a researcher to put his mind and self within the context of the history of his or her society, the history of the science to which he or she belongs and his or her personal history (including the images of success or failure, freedom or coercion, truth or hypocrisy and delinquent involvement or normal involvement). Here the target of criticism becomes the clarification of consciousness on different levels.

From this point I argue - according to the material I presented in the first part of this paper - that the production of sociological knowledge in Arab countries is governed by three variables that the mind has to reconcile or take side. These variables are: Western culture, Islamic tradition and State ideology. These three variables are components of context, i.e. they are not a conclusion of gathering different elements in a certain way, but they belong to the very structure of the context itself. Consequently they belong to the very structure of the self which produces knowledge. They meet and interact within self and shape the way of thinking. Thus they participate in forming the knowledge produced by mind. We do not mean by interaction here that interaction which takes place between equal elements, for there is always a certain weight of a certain component inside self-mind structure, which leads to two correlated results; The first: mind in this case is not a single one of collective nature or of a consensual nature. It is an individual mind. Everyone blend the components in his or her own way (it is too difficult here to talk about a single mind). The second : components are arranged in different ways within different minds and the deciding principle of interaction is an effort of constant adaptation of components which seem to be contradicting or an effort to support a certain component, therefore adaptation turns into resistance or rejection. In fact these processes of adaptation and resistance, though appear clearly on the intellectual level, are the processes which decide the standard of social consciousness in general. We come across them as well at average man in his daily struggles. The "intellectual man " is governed by the same conditions of the social structure in general and is not an autonomous mind in any way.

1. Western culture is no longer the culture of the (distant) other. The West has a structural existence in the weft and warp of the social environment (in social relationships, lifestyles and trends of values and thought). Thus no sociologist can ignore Western achievements in the domain of social sciences. This has been clearly proved in sociological knowledge in Egypt in different phases. Any one considering the development of interest fields can find that each phase reflected Western interests. The French school came first, then came the American empirical school, then appeared an interest in the issues of development and underdevelopment as well as the critical theory. Thus Arab sociological discourse is formed through a dialectic relationship with the Western sociological discourse. The latter even participates in forming it and supplies it with the agenda of priorities and research interests.

If the existence of the West in the consciousness of Arab sociologists is an existential fact, it is not easy to accept the argument that constant "borrowing" of examples or intellectual "dependency" is the main problem of sociological discourse. The fact is that "studying" Western culture - i.e. acquiring and absorbing it and assimilating its mind - is a vital-need for scientific rise. Thus we have to tackle the problem of the relationship with Western culture and Western mind in a different way, by raising questions about the ways of "studying" the culture and influences of the West. We can put forth the following remarks on how sociologists study Western culture.

A. Disruption and disagreement, as each group is fanatic to a Western culture in a single Western country such as France, America, England or Germany, referring to this culture as a frame of reference. This reveals a personal identification with a specific Western country which appears in what is said by those who graduated in American universities for example: "At home in America, there is so and so ..." Then those who graduated in Germany answer : " No. at home in Germany, there is so and so ..." This situation leads to creating narrow-minded intellectual clusters where there is no mutual recognition or agreement among them. In this case mind loses its critical abilities as well as its relationship with its context. Then it produces texts interacting with another context. Mind becomes not only a captive mind (Alatas 1974) but also a counterfeit mind that is produced in a counterfeit pattern of modernity. This situation appeared clearly with the development of the theoretical and empirical schools mentioned above, as we found that the more time progresses the more tendencies will vary, and the more contradicting they will be, too. In this way, the Western mind is broken up into fragments while being transported to us. Thus it does not become one mind but various minds made by us. In this case we discuss a context where both the Western mind and the Arab mind are simultaneously absent.

B. The process of "studying" is done in an incomplete way. Every group shrinks within a single pit which it never leaves to another one. This might be useful if those intellectual pits are deeper and more specialized and there is an intellectual integration among them. But this incomplete studying is done in a superficial way; the main lines of theories are taken without deep consideration or understanding their philosophical and intellectual origins. This appears clearly in the huge amount of production represented by introduction books in which theories and ideas are abridged from secondary sources. It also appears in the development of research and theoretical interests which reflect the development of Western research interests.

C. Thirdly, the relationship with the Western theory is based on the dialectic of submission-rejection. Though Arab sociological discourse appears as if it were a distorted replica of the Western discourse, this discourse itself is full of criticizing the Western culture. This does not appear only in the claims for an Islamic sociology or an Arab sociology, but it appears also in the arguments of

the pros of particular intellectual schools like Marxism, functionalism, the critical theory and dependency theory though all these theories are Western.

2. Although the constant emphasis on the autonomy of the "cultural" and on the cultural efforts being without interest, the state - a regime and an ideology - has always a place in the mind of Egyptian sociologists, whether this mind sets up clear bridges with the state discourse or sets a critical stand with it. In both cases the state is there anyhow and the dialogue with it is either explicit or implicit. And even the case of no dialogue or "silence and refraining" is considered a silent dialogue.

In fact we noticed through personal experience and studying scientific production that the relationship between the Egyptian sociologists and the state looks much like the relationship between them and the Western culture. This relationship is also subjected to the dialectic of submission-rejection. Sociologists tend in their daily discourse to criticize the state, and sometimes they do that in their researches, but its media discourse inspires the topics of their researches and they avoid those issues which lie within the areas restricted by the state. This relationship has appeared clearly since 1952 Revolution and with the effort of the revolutionary discourse in the sixties towards public mobilization, including mobilizing the academic institutions. At that time there were many works on Arab society (it was among the university syllabuses) and a pioneer sociologist started writing books whose titles were the slogans of the Revolution like Unity, Discipline and Work and Liberation Revolution. This enthusiasm was less in the second generation whose influence began to appear after the defeat of June 1967. The criticism of the state began to appear indirectly through interest in the issues of class conflict, the Asiatic mode of production and issues of dependency and underdevelopment. But that criticism - in itself - was a reflection of the state's interests and ideologies at a time when the interests of that generation was formed. The articles which were published in ATTALIA magazine in the late sixties - in which some individuals of that generation contributed - on ideology and sociology might have reflected the interests of the two parties (i.e. the state and sociologists). What supports this point of view is that interest in those subjects which reflected indirect criticism of the state did not prevent the members of that generation from seeking higher position in the university. That generation dissolved in the institutional framework of the state in a way that may be either interpreted as a reflection of the post defeat frustration which inflicted the sixties generation or as a constant effort of a fraction of the middle class to acquire strength and power.

The relationship with the state in the third generation had a different nature. Conflicting interests in the critical theory, Islamic theory and Arab sociology appeared in that generation. The second generation shared with the third one those interests which reflected different attitudes towards the state. They manifested direct and indirect self criticism in search for identity in the post defeat era. They also manifested indirect criticism of the state which went west

(for those who adopted critical theory), abandoned Islam and Islamists (for those who adopted Islamic sociology) and which dissolved the idea of Arab Nationalism (for those who adopted Arab sociology claims).

But it is noticed that when those allegations began to decline and to exhaust their aims, that generation began to throw itself completely in the arms of the state by working in the consulting sides of the state policies - mostly implemented by private research bureaus and sometimes by government research centres. This tendency appeared and was supported with the policies of structural adjustment and privatization, including privatization of sociological studies (establishing private research centres).

There is a new generation of sociologists being brought up within this direction and there are clear indicators that they see that as a way out of their living crisis (mainly economical). Thus, it is clear that the contradiction relationship between rejection and adaptation appeared clearly in the third generation. Its efforts towards criticism, Islamism or Arabism represent contradicting images of a cultural escape - and an indirect cultural criticism - from the state which betrayed Arabism (Arab sociology) and Islam (Islamic Sociology) and threw itself in the arms of the West (the critical theory). But with the decline of all these allegations, this generation began to throw itself completely in the arms of the state and to train a new generation in this new direction.

3. The relationship with tradition is a third variable in forming sociological knowledge. We do not prefer to understand tradition as a being belonging to the past. It is - as Hassan Hanafi rightly says - "a psychological deposit owned by the masses" or it is "a group of explanations given by each generation according to its needs" (Hanafi 1980). Accordingly tradition has a strong existence in the structure of Arab consciousness. This may be because of many variables at the top of which is that Arab modernity has not broken with tradition. Tradition still interacts with it (it transforms tradition from within and tradition transforms it from within through a continued chain of manifestations of interference, resistance and adaptation) (Zayed 1994).

In this framework interaction with tradition - as a component of consciousness - became one of the most important features of intellectual and cultural production in the Arab World. This has become clear through the development of the intellectual production in sociology. The process of the dialogue with tradition has taken various shapes across the following generations of Egyptian sociologists. The first generation was much interested in Ibn Khaldun and they did their best to spread his ideas. But they made the comparison between the views of Western thinkers and those of Ibn Khaldun a core of discussion and studying. This appeared in their works on history of thought and their works on Ibn Khaldun. It also appeared clearly in the works presented to the conference held by The National Centre of Social and Criminal researches on Ibn Khaldun in 1962.

But the second generation was not interested in these comparisons between Ibn Khaldun and Western thinkers. Ibn Khaldun did not occupy a space of their interests like that space he occupied in Magrib for example (through the works of Mhamad Aabed Al Jabri, Ali Omleel and Abdullah Al Orwi). The reason may be the supremacy of "Arab state" which dominated the consciousness of the second generation. Nevertheless, there are some references to Ibn Khaldun in some of the theses of only one member of that generation; Saad El Din Ibrahim. Let's look at an example from his article on "Sources of Legitimacy in Arab Regimes" in which he depended on the types of authorities as classified by Weber (traditional authority, charismatic authority and legal authority) and on the definitions of Al Bai'a system by Ibn Khaldun as a basis of traditional Arab legitimacy and of rational politics as a basis of this legitimacy in a phase of its development. Ibrahim presented in this article an analysis of Arab regimes in their development from traditional systems to modern ones, emphasizing variation of legitimacy bases - legal basis, traditional basis and charismatic basis - which he considered as an indicator of legitimacy crisis in the Arab World (Ibrahim 1984).

This trend of dealing with the theories of Ibn Khaldun continued in the third generation, but some members of that generation tended to transform sociology as a whole into a traditional science by calling for Islamic sociology and their explicit call for Islamizing it, and they even accused a few sociologists of secularism and Western dependency. Then theses and studies began to include chapters on the view of Islam towards the issues tackled by those theses and studies. And even introduction books began to make a framework for the Islamic attitude.

It is obvious that the Islamic Arab intellectual tradition has formed a corner in consciousness and was a deciding condition for sociological production throughout its various periods, though there was a noticed difference from a generation to another. But the remarkable notice in this context is that none of Egyptian sociologists who were enthusiastic to Arab-Islamic tradition had an obvious critical attitude towards Ibn Khaldun's tradition or the Islamic sociological intellectual tradition. Their attitude ranged from reconciliation (first generation) to rejection or ignoring (most of the second generation) and complete conversion into tradition (a few of the third generation). Those contradicting attitudes, while failed to develop the thought of Ibn Khaldun in the light of a methodological critical discourse (like what was done by Mohamad Aabed El Jabri or Ali Omleel in Maghrib for example), led to the lack of maximum use of Ibn Khaldun's tradition on one hand, and accordingly helped to emphasize the power of the fundamentalist tradition in the Egyptian sociological thought on the other.

How do we Know ?

The point here is how agents who produce academic thought in Egyptian universities in general and in sociology departments in particular are formed. The way to knowledge in the context of counterfeit modernity is not a way which submits to values of freedom, equality and science. But relationships of power and knowledge are so diffused that the final output is some forms of imitation, inability to invent and grouping around "poor" issues. We tried in a previous article (Zayed 1995) on scientific socialization to hypothesize that the diffusion of knowledge - whether existing or hypothetical - and power in the relationships of professors and students does not lead to creating mentoric relationships in which both student and professor grow through mutual scientific challenge, constant self criticism and constant correction of course in order to achieve the highest degree of scientific efficiency. On the contrary, diffusion of knowledge and power leads to creating clientelist relationships in which a professor becomes a patron and the student becomes a client. We noticed that this relationship is obvious in some indicators like complete dependence of a student on his senior professors and his or her inability to form an independent character with its own ideas and creation. Professors - too - are keen on having students in this position which is reflected in some behaviours and symbols like keenness of a professor to accompany his students wherever he goes, where he precedes them in different places. And if he went to some important places they stay waiting for him outside. On the other hand a professor may be keen on emphasizing constantly the favours he does to his students and the horizons he opens to them, which would have been closed for them unless he had been there. Students themselves assert- in an exaggerated way - the importance of a professor in their lives (This is often said in front of him or in front of those who would tell him this assertion). In this case the relationship between a professor and a student converted into a formal relationship which is full of conformity and hypocrisy. Given these circumstances creation looks as if it were behavioural creation. It is creativity in developing new behaviours and symbols to serve this relationship. Thus scientific creation is lost. There is no need to it!

This relationship is full of forms of intellectual dominion which compels students to adopt the intellectual attitudes of professors and to read certain books or even to write in a certain manner. Thus knowledge is afflicted with arteriosclerosis and freezing and creation is replaced with imitation and criticism with conformity. The socialization process is also full of forms of dominating students' physical powers and restricting their movements in both time and place besides sucking their work surplus, as junior researchers. And there are a lot of forms of imposing discourse power which makes a junior researcher less able to interact, argue and express his or her views. His or her role becomes emphasizing the power of seniors' discourse.

Conclusion

1. Sociological knowledge has no doubt accumulated along about seventy years since the academic establishment of sociology in Egypt. But the deciding conditions of producing that knowledge lead to some difficulties which make sociology unable to genuinely grasp its original subject; society. Theoretical contributions that include genuine theorization on the Egyptian or Arab society is so rare. Even empirical researches - though many - tackle incomplete subjects and shows no obvious knowledge accumulation. Neither have they any trace of research agenda expressing certain academic or theoretical concerns.

2. Sociologists produce their sociological knowledge while arguing with West, tradition and the state. Thus knowledge appears fragmented, as every group takes a shelter behind the barricades of the school in which they learned without approaching any other school. They even consider other schools as "no science". No sooner a researcher is planted within daily concerns of academic life that he or she then reproduces what was reproduced by somebody else: subjects in which he or she imitates the discourse of the state or the authority or imitates an Arab, Western or traditional "fashion" or series of introduction books. The conclusion is the main subject matter runs away from sociology, or sociology runs away from it.

3. The styles through which knowledge is transferred suffer a lot of difficulties. They reproduce intellectual domination and exploitation. This leads to obvious freezing, an obvious tendency to repetition and imitation, refraining from exploring new horizons and inability to create according to theoretical and methodological levels. This situation leads also to the absence of interest in the original subject of the science or being occupied with research concerns, as creative academic competition is replaced with minor conflicts and competition over manners of the "relationship service".

In spite of all those problems, we are in need of more studying history of sociology in Egypt. We are in need of organized efforts to collect and document intellectual production and to recognize its weakness and strength and the manifestations of its success and failure. We are also in need of more critical efforts to analyse this tradition and extracting its intellectual and methodical contents. On the other hand, we need to look closely into ourselves and to decide the nature of those influences which form our consciousness, options, the ways we acquire knowledge, the styles we follow to employ this knowledge and the manifestations of our failure and fall. This reflexive perspective is capable of clearing the way and of illuminating the future. We also need to generate consensus (through a local association of those who are working in this science) which would organize efforts and to replace conflicts created by intellectual domination with creative competition which is based on the values of science, freedom and equality.

Bibliography

- Abdel Malek, A. (1967), *Studies in National Culture*, Beirut: Dar El Tall'a. (in Arabic).
- Abdel Malek, A. (1974), *Egyptian Society and the Army*, 2nd edition, Beirut: Dar El Tali'a.(in Arabic).
- Abdel Malek, A. (1983), *East Wend*, Beirut : Dar El Tali'a. (in Arabic).
- Alatas, Sh. (1974), "The Captive Mind and Creative Development", *International Social Sciences Journal*, Vol. 4.
- El Gawhary, Abdelhady (1977), " Popular participation and Development", *Community Development*, n°.4.
- El Gawhary, Mohamad (1981), *Folklore as Science*, vol. I. Cairo: Dar El Ma'arif. (in Arabic)
- El Khashab, M. (1969), *Sociology and its Schools*, Cairo: El-Dar El- Qawmiyd Lil Tiba'a Wal Nashr.(in Arabic)
- El Samaloti, N. (1981), *Structure and Institutions of Islamic Society*, Jeddah : Dar El Shoroque. (in Arabic)
- Ezzat, A. (1960), *Unity, Discipline and Labour from Sociological Perspective*, Cairo. (in Arabic)
- Ezzat, A. (1961a), *Revolution of Liberation and Social Reform*, Cairo. (In Arabic)
- Ezzat, A. (1961b), *Arab Ideology and Arab Society*, Cairo. (in Arabic)
- Gouldner, A. (1970), *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*, New York: Basic Books.
- Hanafi, H. (1980), *Tradition and Change*, Cairo: Arab Center for Research and Publication. (in Arabic)
- Hegazi, E. et.al. (1986), *Towards Arab Sociology*, Beirut: Centre for Arab Unity Studies. (in Arabic)
- Hegazi, E. (1987), *Bibliography on Sociology Dissertations in Egypt*, Cairo: Centre for Social and Criminal research. (in Arabic)
- Ibrahim, S.El Din (1982), *The New Arab Social Order*, Beirut: Centre for Arab Unity Studies.(in Arabic)
- Ibrahim, S.El Din (1984), "Sources of Legitimacy in Arab Regimes", *Al Mostaqbal Al Arabi*, No, 62 (in Arabic).
- Khalifa, A. and Lotfi, S.(eds) (1984), *Problematic of Social Sciences in Arab World*, Beirut: Dar El Tanwir.(in Arabic)

- Naeim, S. (1981), *Sociological Theory*, Cairo: Maktabat Nahdet Misr. (in Arabic)
- Osman, M.A. (1981), *Society Within A Functional Perspective*, Cairo: Maktabat El Anglo El Masriya. (in Arabic)
- Ouda, M. (1981), *Peasants and State*, Cairo: Dar El Saqafa Lil Tiba'a Wal Nashr. (in Arabic)
- Saad, A.S. (1976), *Social and Economic History of Egypt*, Beirut: Dar Ibn Khaldun. (in Arabic)
- Sa'fan, H.S. (1965), *History of Social Thought*, 3rd edition, Cairo: Dar El Nahda. (in Arabic)
- Sa'fan, H.S. (1970), *Brief History of Sociology in Egypt*, Cairo: The Supreme Council for Art, Literature and Social Science. (in Arabic)
- Shawqi, A. (1961), *Development of Society and Its Organization*, Cairo: Maktabat El Qahira El Hadissa. (in Arabic)
- Wafi, A. (1951), *The Social Philosophy of Ibn Khaldun and Auguste Comte*, Cairo. (in Arabic)
- Zayed, A.A. (1981), *Sociology: Classical and Critical Trends*, Cairo: Dar El Ma'arif. (in Arabic)
- Zayed, A.A. (1994), "Islam and Contradictions of Modernity", *National Review of Social Sciences*, vol. XXXI No.1. (in Arabic)
- Zayed, A.A. (1995), "Knowledge and Power: Towards a Moral Model for Scientific Socialization" in Nahid Saleh (ed.) *Ethics of Scientific Social Research*, vol. I, Cairo: Centre for Social and Criminal Research.
- Zayed, A.A. (1995b), "Seventy Years of Sociology in Egypt", *Cairo Papers*, (AUC Cairo) vol. III, No.3. 32.
- Zayed, A.A. (1996) "Departments of Sociology in Egypt: History, Regulations and Programmes", a paper presented to conference on Sociology in Egypt 18 - 19 December 1996, Higher Council of Culture, Cairo, Egypt. (in Arabic).

CHAPTER 3 THE STATE OF ARAB SOCIOLOGY AS SEEN BY AN ARAB SOCIOLOGIST

Abubaker A. Bagader
King Abdulaziz University
Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

This study tries to present the views and concerns of a sociologist from the Arab World by reconstructing his experiences in the field of sociology in the last two decades. The study will review the evolution of sociological thought and writings in institutions of higher learning and research in the Arab world and it will discuss the impact and extent of the influence of Western sociological and anthropological writings on Arab sociology in general. Also, the study understanding sociology.

This review is experiences of debatable, but reality (1) find out the extent to which sociology helps in the Arab world and to consider the hoped future of Arab colored by the biographical, political and cultural of the author. Therefore, the views presented, may be it is hoped, reflective at least in part, of my experiences with sociology started only during my graduate studies in the U.S., as my undergraduate studies were in Mathematics and Physics. (2) Therefore, my early exposure and readings in the social sciences were basically in American and European sociological and anthropological literature. (3) I did not have any sound knowledge of Arabic sociological literature until I returned home from my graduate studies. During my graduate studies, whatever I read on Arab society and culture was in English.

I expected that my educational experience, sound in Western sociological thought, would enable me to teach sociology in Saudi Arabia with ease. But since I had to teach in Arabic, and I did not even know the Arabic equivalents of most sociological terms, I found that I had a lot to catch up. Also, the situation meant that I had to read what was available in Arabic, relearn the scope and limits of being a sociologist, what texts to teach and to what theories, concepts and ideas students were supposed to be exposed. Unfortunately, only texts in Arabic could be used, since the students knew only Arabic. It was very difficult, if not impossible, for most of them to read anything not in Arabic.

Sociological Textbooks

When I started teaching, I was forced to decide what would constitute sociological texts to be presented to students. Did I have to consider as