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ABSTRACT

This thesis examines Lord Cromer’s aspirations for developing the ‘native mind’ in occupied Egypt, 1882 - 1907. From March 1877 to May 1879, and again from September 1879 until April 1880, Evelyn Baring\(^1\) served as a financial adviser to the Khedival regime. After spending the spring of 1883 in India on the Viceroy’s council as Finance Minister, Lord Cromer returned to Egypt in September 1883. He was appointed Consul General and remained until May, 1907, as the virtual ruler of Egypt. As an Orientalist, Cromer manipulates the Egyptian’s ‘mind’ by representing it in his works. As Consul General, he attempts to manipulate that ‘mind’ through reforms. Lord Cromer perceives the ‘Egyptian mind’ as deficient, which he considers to be a formidable obstacle to the ‘imperial mission’. It will be seen throughout this thesis that the ‘flawed Egyptian mind’ is a contributing factor to the extended British Occupation: Britain needs to stay until it is reformed. Cromer writes about the need to reform the ‘native mind’ in accordance with the British-European ‘type’. The ‘native mind’ has to be ‘developed’, ‘trained’ and ‘civilized’, and the entire ‘subject population’ has to learn how to ‘think’. Cromer sought to construct a new and better ‘collective mind’ for ‘the Egyptian’. While this paper is not about developing Egypt, it will be proven that Cromer considered developing ‘the Egyptian’ tantamount to developing Egypt.
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INTRODUCTION

The historiography of Lord Cromer's Administration in Egypt has been predominantly political, economic and diplomatic. Cromer's successes in fiscal and administrative reforms are generally acknowledged to his credit. This thesis addresses two aspects of Cromer's regime that have not been systematically studied by imperial historians: his Orientalist perceptions of the 'Egyptian mind', and his prescriptions for its reform. Cromer's descriptions of 'Orientals' stand out in his writings as an important and pervasive theme, especially in his three-volume work, Modern Egypt (1907). Why has this theme been relegated to secondary importance in the historiography? Imperial historians have treated Cromer's often negative opinions of 'the Oriental' as the standard line of a nineteenth century Pro-Consul; equally 'commonplace' are his comments on the need to reform the 'backward mind'. Both of these conventional attitudes place Cromer within the vast literature on imperial mission and 'noblesse oblige' that examines the imperial aspirations for 'civilizing the backward peoples' of the Earth. Within the 'mission school' Cromer has been relegated to a place beside other great Consuls such as Curzon and Milner. Cromer has taken a back seat to his more renowned contemporaries due in part to the destruction of his private papers. His published works have not been analyzed for their important insight into his imperial aspirations. If one were to read histories of Cromer's administration without consulting his own works, the importance of his preoccupation with the 'Oriental mind' as an obstacle to effective administration would be lost. This thesis suggests that Lord Cromer's perceptions of the 'Egyptian mind' and his prescriptions for its reform are important historical problems for understanding the nature of his administration that have received scant attention.
Theories of domination over subject populations have helped to clarify the implications between Cromer's lines for this thesis, which is essentially about 'domination'. Cromer attempts to dominate 'the Egyptian mind' by analyzing it and then trying to change it. He appears to follow a pattern of intellectual subjugation of 'the Oriental' in his own mind, which he then transfers to his imperial relationships. Intellectual domination is achieved by justifying why 'the Oriental' should be subjugated. In Cromer's case, 'the Oriental' is perceived as deficient, which legitimates his domination and reform. 'The Oriental's deficiency' is based on the 'fact' that his 'mind' is different from that of the European.¹ To understand and explain Cromer's analyses and conclusions, Victorian attitudes to 'character' and 'race' have also been consulted for this thesis. The guidelines to proper behavior in Samuel Smiles' classics, entitled *Character* (1907 rpt.) and *Self-Help* (1958 rpt.), have been used to analyze Cromer's comments on 'the Egyptian character'. Four sources on imperial domination have also been of special importance: *No Country for a Gentleman* (1988) by William Welch Jr., Philip Mason's *Patterns of Dominance* (1970), *Orientalism* (1979) by Edward Said, and Timothy Mitchell's *Colonizing Egypt* (1988). Although Welch's work is not a theory of domination his scope of analysis, being Anglo-Egyptian 'perceptions' of Egyptians and their society, is within the same theme because Egyptians are 'dominated' by their rulers according to how they are perceived. They are perceived as 'deficient', and require subjugation. Mason, Mitchell and Said examine the issue of 'difference' between East and West as a justification for imperial control. Mason's general conclusions of how imperialists dominate their subjects are used throughout this thesis to interpret Cromer's works. Said and Mitchell's studies concentrate on *Orientalist* methods of domination. Cromer's works are examined in Chapters One and Two of this thesis to determine his proximity to the typical 'Orientalist' portrayed by Said and Mitchell.
According to the abovementioned historians, imperial 'realities' are constructed by the imperialists as an effective method for domination. These 'realities' consist of the imperialist's perceptions of his subjects and of their society. Cromer considers his version of 'the Oriental' to be real, to exist in fact, which means that he intends upon describing 'reality'. An 'imperial reality' is a version of truth that is communicated by the imperialist. Mitchell argues that imperialists established 'modes of reality' that were mere "re-presentations", instead of the true 'Western reality' where Europeans could determine for themselves what is 'real'.

Welch identifies the roots of imperial 'realities' to be in the "preconceptions" that are cultivated in the home society. He argues that preconceptions of the foreign society are "the starting point for imperial relations...". They are the first step to creating an 'Oriental reality' because preconceptions are located within the mind of future imperialists, as are the perceptions of 'men on the spot'. Said also believes in the importance of Orientalist preconceptions for justifying expansion.

To summarize this argument, imperial realities consist of the imperial agent's preconceptions and perceptions of his subjects.

'Reality' is also interpreted by Said and Mitchell as the foundation of all knowledge within and about the subject societies. They argue that the colonizer and orientalist marginalize 'the Oriental', forcing him to exist outside of the discourse of knowledge in his own society. 'Knowledge' is employed as a broad term for power, morality, ethics, etc., and especially important for this thesis, the un-touchable 'English character' would be included. Establishing knowledge as outside of the grasp of 'Orientals' is the foundation of imperial domination. This system for domination and order, Said concludes, perpetuated the existence of 'the Oriental' by perpetuating the differences between East and West. 'The Oriental' only exists because he is different and without knowledge.
This thesis focuses on the domination of one component of 'the Oriental': his 'mind'. Historians have traditionally concentrated on imperial manipulation of the native's body in the form of manual labour, etc., as opposed to his 'mind'. Timothy Mitchell's *Colonizing Egypt* is an exception. Mitchell depicts an imperial program of first "capturing the bodies" of 'Orientals', and then "capturing their minds". He argues that the body was perceived as "mechanical", and therefore separate from the "mind or mentality", both of which served different functions for the colonizing power. The body could work, but the 'mind' told the body what to do, and therefore should be cultivated properly. This deceptively simple concept has not received adequate attention in the historiography of the Egyptian Occupation. Domination of the colonial 'mind' has been communicated as another assumption of imperialist behavior by historians: controlling the society and its inhabitants implies the attempted subjugation of their 'mind'. Timothy Mitchell analyzes this implication and his work is truly unique in drawing the distinction between the 'mind' and body in imperial control.

This thesis identifies and analyzes Cromer's theoretical division of the Egyptian into his mind and his body as a method for control. He seeks to control the 'native mind' in order to reform it. There are several components of 'the Egyptian mind' that Cromer identifies as deficient and in need of reform. A main priority is the 'national character' of Egypt. Cromer notes that 'character' is a combination of intellect and morals. The Egyptian's intellectual ability and his morality are formulated in and by his 'mind', as is his 'character'. There are other aspects of the 'native mind' that Cromer identifies as flawed. For example, 'native habits of thought' are problematic. On the moral side, the 'native' value system or 'moral code' is another area for reform. The Egyptian 'spirit' also requires Western inspiration. 'The mind' includes 'character', intellect, morals, spirit, thought, and habits of thought. Cromer discusses all of these in terms of
reform, occasionally linking some together and at other times analyzing them individually.

Cromer's thoughts on reforming the 'native mind' has also not been treated adequately in the historiography. This is made clear by the fact that there are no systematic studies of Cromer's aspirations to develop 'the Egyptian intellect and character'. The only acknowledgement of this concept is within the context of other historical problems concerning Egypt. Cromer's "official" biographer, the Marquesse of Zetland, includes the following quote on his Title Page:

The Egyptians whom ye have seen to-day, ye shall see them again no more for ever.8

The author implies that 'the Egyptians' will be changed by Cromer's administration, but does not pursue the topic. Edward Said notes Cromer's preference for creating 'character' instead of training the 'mind', but is more concerned with the "sexual innuendoes" of Cromer's descriptions of France and Britain.9 Said conducts a literary criticism of Cromer's texts at the expense of historical analysis.

Histories of imperialism in Egypt generally acknowledge Cromer's desire to reform 'the Egyptian character' within the context of structural reforms. Peter Mansfield notes the perceived necessity of reforming 'the Egyptian mind' and argues that for Cromer 'native' moral development was to be achieved through economic renewal.10 Afaf Lutfi al-Sayyid points out that according to Cromer, the necessities of 'good character' are "integrity and efficiency", which could emerge only after many years of good government.11 Robinson and Gallagher make a similar argument for structural reform as a prerequisite to moral reform in their classic interpretation of imperial expansion, Africa and the Victorians (1961):

Baring could find no hope of a stable government in Egypt, short of reforming on western lines the whole structure and spirit of the society.12
However, Robinson and Gallagher are more concerned with the 'structure' than the 'spirit' of Cromerian Egypt. In the next paragraph Cromer is called a "matter-of fact man" who characteristically does not know how to effect these two reforms "except by honest administration over many generations."  

Cromer claims to know how to effect reform and is more explicit in his prescriptions than they admit. They do specify that 'honest administration' means 'administrative and material' improvements. There is no real discussion of the relationship between these 'structural' reforms and the Egyptian 'spirit' except to say that "political order was obviously the first requirement for the improvement of character."  

They also conclude from Cromer's writings that a good fiscal policy is a prerequisite to 'the Oriental's' "moral and material progress". Robinson and Gallagher do not consolidate these comments on developing the native's 'spirit', 'character', and 'morality' to show the crucial role of the 'native mind' in Cromer's administration. This omission is consistent in the historiography.

The more recent publications of Welch and Mitchell examine the importance of the 'native mind' in imperial domination in a way that is unique to their predecessors. Welch and Mitchell indicate a paradigm shift, or a trend, towards cultural and intellectual interests within British imperialism in Egypt. However, their analyses are too broad to be completely compatible with this thesis. Timothy Mitchell argues that

Power now sought to work not only upon the exterior of the body, but also 'from the inside out' - by shaping the individual mind.  

While Mitchell discusses many attempts at shaping the 'Egyptian mind', these are lost within other discussions of imperial domination. Mitchell's analysis is also often obscured by abstract logic similar to that of Edward Said. For example he discusses gender identification of inanimate objects within 'Eastern societies', which were allegedly intentional and widespread. He contends that building a house symbolized the union between the sexes since male and female parts of the house were ultimately
joined together. Mitchell discusses symbolism and opposite concepts such as "the bitterness of gall and the bitterness of wormwood...[and] the seed that swells in the ground and that which swells in the woman's womb." There are other references to 'fertility and the womb' in this work, but one suffices to illustrate that Mitchell often wanders into areas that are quite outside the scope of colonization. Mitchell examines the complexities of imperial domination mainly in theory. He surprisingly does not concentrate on Cromer, the highest 'European Official' in control of the imperial apparatus in Egypt.

William Welch also fails to focus on Cromer, and specifically on Cromer's perceptions of 'the Egyptian mind'. Welch explores what Anglo-Egyptians in general thought about many different aspects of Egypt. He does state several times that Anglo-Egyptians needed to cultivate the 'Egyptian mind' as part of their program for reforming the country. For example, Welch concludes: "To reconstruct Egypt meant rehabilitating the Egyptian." He also notes that there was much talk, especially in public, about creating a modern Egyptian, one equipped to cope in the twentieth century. There was much comment on this very subject in Cromer's writings that Welch could have used to support these conclusions, but this is conspicuously absent. Welch even acknowledges the alleged urgency of intellectual and moral reform:

A priori evidence suggested that serious defects existed that, if not corrected, would prove ruinous to Egyptian civilization.

While this study has been useful for the present thesis, its scope of analysis is still too broad and Cromer's thoughts are hidden behind other arguments. Cromer's perceptions are also relegated to a place beside those of his Anglo-Egyptian colleagues, and thus appear to be commonplace Anglo-Egyptian complaints. Even specialized studies of Egypt, such as those of Welch and Mitchell fail to establish the importance of his
thoughts on ‘the Oriental mind’. This omission has left Cromer’s thoughts wide open for others to explore.

This thesis analyzes Cromer as a political agent and an Orientalist. Chapters One and Two discuss Cromer as an Orientalist due to his methodology for analyzing his subject people. Chapter Three examines Cromer’s prescriptions for reforming ‘the Egyptian mind’ based on his Orientalist epistemology. Although initially restricted to academic circles, Orientalism was transformed into "an imperial institution" during the nineteenth century. This enabled Agents such as Cromer to assume the dual roles of ‘Orientalist’ and ‘imperialist’. The most neutral definition of an ‘Orientalist’ is someone with an enduring interest in the East that is effectively communicated. Cromer fills both of these qualifications and hopes to add to the existing knowledge of ‘Orientals’ and of the Anglo-Egyptian administration. In his works, Cromer presents ‘the Oriental mind’ for Westerners and especially potential imperial agents in the East by analyzing its alleged deficiencies. His analyses of the ‘Egyptian mind’ and prescriptions for its reform are communicated in books, letters, articles, speeches and official correspondence, much of which has been researched for this thesis. In portraying ‘the Oriental mind’ as deficient through his writings, Cromer’s Orientalism is "intellectual power" for domination. He establishes himself and his regime as superior, and also as an authority on the subject. The accuracy or even legitimacy of Cromer’s comments on ‘the Oriental mind’ are not important in this thesis; his words are not evaluated according to some standard of ‘historical truth’. What matters is Cromer’s perception of ‘truth’ or ‘reality’. 
Unless otherwise stated, the term ‘European’ will be used in this paper to include Englishmen and continental Europeans. Cromer uses European and also ‘Western’; the latter is used when applicable.
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CHAPTER 1: LORD CROMER'S EPISTEMOLOGY

PERSPECTIVE

This chapter examines Lord Cromer's epistemology for understanding the 'Egyptian mind'. Cromer states that he has portrayed Egyptians "as they appear in the eyes of an educated European." He perceives them from a biased perspective, rather than trying to understand them on their own level. He is incapable of looking at Egyptians through their own 'eyes', because the 'educated European' vision is considered to be the only source of accuracy or 'knowledge'. In section two of this chapter, Victorian theories of 'character' and 'race' are analyzed in relation to Cromer's writings. To understand Cromer's "educated European" perceptions, it is necessary to examine those sectors of the Victorian intellectual climate that dealt with 'other' peoples. Cromer's concept of the 'British mission' in its religious and secular-paternalist forms is also discussed to show his justification for the Occupation. In the final section Cromer's methodology for analyzing 'the Oriental' is discussed in detail.

Cromer perceives 'the Oriental mind' as different from the European. This is the foundation from which all of his judgements on how to deal with, or dominate, his subjects are made. The first step in dominating 'the Oriental' is to isolate him as something separate from the ruling group. This Orientalist technique institutionalizes a gulf between the 'Eastern' and 'European' that serves as the base from which Cromer can theorize. 'Oriental society' is portrayed as divided between East and West, where the European and 'Oriental' are at odds. Other divisions such as 'England' and 'Egypt' are made according to context. Inter-European differences are irrelevant when compared with the peculiarities of 'the East'. Cromer states
are made according to context. Inter-European differences are irrelevant when compared with the peculiarities of 'the East'. Cromer states

But the Englishman is a Western, albeit an Anglo-Saxon Western, and, from the point of view of all processes of reasoning, the gulf which separates any one member of the European family from another is infinitely less wide than that which divides all Westerns from all Orientals.³

By acknowledging the basic difference between East and West, 'Eastern inferiority' and 'Western superiority' are also established. The West is 'progressive', 'good', 'positive', and since the East is 'different', it must be 'backward', 'bad' and 'negative'. Mason labels the 'explanation' of British superiority a "myth" that imperialists supported within their own "compulsive oblivion" in order to help them oppress their subjects. ⁴ The 'oblivion' connotes the divided society, where ideas about 'Orientals' are admitted through a filter, and also where ideas from home are protected and reinforced. One imagines Cromer observing 'the Oriental' from his insular world, or 'oblivion'.

'The Oriental' is marginalised both physically and intellectually: by establishing exclusive clubs, working conditions, and residential districts, imperialists transplanted their home societies to Egypt, which perpetually reinforced their cultural differences from 'Orientals'. Cromer was further confined to the European position outside of the 'Oriental reality' by not learning Arabic; he relied on his interpreter and Private Secretary, Harry Boyle, for communication with his subjects. 'Oriental' isolation allows imperialists such as Cromer to claim 'detachment' from their subjects. Detachment is important because it allows for observation, which leads to understanding, which is synonymous with domination and effective rule. Detachment and other "disciplinary mechanisms" contribute to what Mitchell terms the "panoptic principle", where administrators could view their subjects from every direction. ⁵ Cromer and other imperialists 'observed and controlled' the physical imperial world, while their subjects, or Egyptians, were within that world as objects for control. ⁶
Cromer considers all 'Easterns' to be basically the same, regardless of ethnic, cultural or even religious background. Although there are many 'racial' divisions within 'the Orient', Cromer argues that they are all driven by the same 'Oriental mind'. ‘The Oriental's elusive nature’ is further complicated by his changing appellations in Cromer’s works: Egyptian, ‘Eastern’, ‘Mohammedan’, ‘Eastern Christian’. There are so many ethnic and racial divisions in Egyptian society that Cromer describes the population as 'The Dwellers' in his most provocative chapter of Modern Egypt. Each label or category is considered a different variation of the 'Oriental mind'. To Cromer, they are all simply 'Orientals'. The terms 'Oriental', 'native', Egyptian, 'subject' and 'Eastern' are used interchangeably in this paper and are synonymous. Unless otherwise stated, these terms refer to an artificial 'Oriental mind' that Cromer analyzes and then attempts to reform.

Cromer emphasizes the fact that the dwellers are outside of the bounds of Western 'knowledge' by establishing them all as 'Orientals'. Progression out of the 'Oriental' state requires the dwellers to extinguish their inter-racial prejudices and see themselves as 'the same'. Cromer already views them as 'the same' by categorizing them as 'Oriental', but argues that they should be identified as 'Egyptian'. In this sense, 'Egyptian' is better than 'Oriental'. Cromer argues that at present, there are no true 'Egyptians'.

‘The Egyptians are not a nation they are a fortuitous agglomeration of a number of miscellaneous and hybrid elements’. In an attempt to create a new 'Egyptian mind', Cromer proposes a completely new meaning for the term 'Egyptian'. He argues that 'Egyptian' should include all of the 'dwellers' to form an "Egyptian nationality" and spirit. These should converge to form an 'Egyptian national spirit'. Allegiances to racial ancestry would be surpassed and the various 'Oriental minds' would be replaced by a new 'Egyptian mind'. The absence of 'Egyptians' justifies 'the mission': Cromer must replace the 'backward Oriental mind'
with a new ‘Egyptian mind’. The former is potentially hostile to British interests, while the latter should be friendly. Hostility and deficiency in a group indicates its great distance from the ‘Western mind’; a new, friendly ‘Egyptian’ would be getting closer.

Creating an ‘Egyptian nationality’ would be difficult. In his last Report on Egypt, Cromer argues that this amalgamation can only occur by abolishing the Capitulations and creating an International Legislative Council that would ignore the former Egyptian-foreigner, and also inter-European disputes. He speculates that

‘...it will be a first step towards the formation of an Egyptian national spirit in the only sense in which that spirit can be invoked without detriment to the true interests of the country.’

Cromer also discusses the necessity for a new ‘Egyptian national spirit’ devoid of racial differences. Most importantly, Cromer re-defines ‘Egyptian’ to mean anyone who resides in Egypt:

The real future of Egypt, therefore, lies not in the direction of a narrow nationalism, which will only embrace native Egyptians, nor in that of any endeavor to convert Egypt into a British possession on the model of India or Ceylon, but rather in that of an enlarged cosmopolitanism, which, whilst discarding all the obstructive fetters of the cumbersome old international system, will tend to amalgamate all the inhabitants of the Nile Valley and enable them all alike to share in the government of their native or adopted country.

The old ‘Egyptian mind’ must change his self-perception; likewise, all ‘Oriental dwellers’ must also look at themselves in a new light. They must see themselves as ‘Egyptian’, instead of Syrian, Ottoman, etc. This is necessary so that all can fit into the new international system. Cromer suggests a government where Egyptians and Europeans work together in a unicameral chamber. He stipulates that the viability of this chamber depends mainly "on the conduct of the Egyptians themselves." For example, the present "native Egyptians" must drop their prejudices against different classes, ethnic groups and religions. They must also demonstrate that they can be relied upon to cooperate with the new organization. Cromer advocates the conscious
redefinition of ‘Egyptian nationality’. He speculates that the new ‘Egyptian’ could more readily accept moral and intellectual reform because his old ‘habits of thought’ would slowly vanish. It will be seen in the last section of this chapter that Cromer’s ideal of a new ‘Egyptian’ was not quite as progressive and intellectually independent as he portrays here.

Are some ‘Dwellers’ more important than others for Cromer’s plan to create a new ‘Egyptian’? In Modern Egypt Cromer identifies two different types of ‘Oriental’ as his main targets for reform: the governing elite and the ‘average Egyptian’. The context of his proposal is a discussion of the Nubar-Wilson Ministry of April 1878 to November 1878. A Commission of Inquiry was established to determine the extent of Egypt’s problems and also to suggest appropriate reforms. Cromer commends the propositions and also the Commissioners on their difficult task. Success would depend, however, on time and the placement of "capable administrators" in government. Egypt needs

above all, a gradual change in the habits of thought, both of the Egyptian officials and of the people themselves, which would enable them in some degree to assimilate a system of administration, based on principles which, since the days of the Pharaohs, had been unfamiliar to the people of Egypt.

Structural reform is not enough. The official and also the ‘public mind’, specifically the ‘habits of thought’, must also be ‘gradually changed’. The new structure and the new ‘mind’ must complement each other, and be able to work together for an efficient administration. The pre-Occupation administration was marred by the deficient ‘minds’ of local administrators and other Egyptians, and their combination was destructive. The fact that they could never work together made matters worse as the former only oppressed the latter. Cromer also points out that reforming these ‘minds’ will be especially difficult because the existing ‘habits of thought’ are centuries old.
THE 'IMPERIAL MISSION'

Lord Cromer is inspired by the 'facts' of 'British superiority' and 'Egyptian inferiority'. He argues that the British Occupation is necessary for Egyptian progress. Egypt requires Western 'knowledge' in order to join the community of 'civilized' nations. Cromer portrays the 'imperial mission' in humanitarian terms: Egypt will be rescued from her self-inflicted ruin. 'The mission' is also highly personalized, as the 'British imperialist' appears to be more important than the concept of 'British imperialism'. The imperial agent is the embodiment of imperial theory; he translates theory into action by infusing 'uncivilized' societies with 'new life'. Cromer believes that 'the Englishman' "came not as a conqueror, but in the familiar garb of a saviour of society." This is an extremely ambitious programme. Cromer demands confidence in the imperial role, its legitimacy and also its viability as prerequisites for imperial service, all of which he believes are generally fulfilled. It will be seen in this section that Cromer's confidence is further "enhanced by the Christian faith, itself a source of inspiration, so necessary in confirming the nation's direction." Cromer is driven by the spirit of 'noblesse oblige' to improve 'backward peoples'. Europeans, and especially 'the Englishman' in Cromer's writings are on a 'civilizing mission' to lead and reform the 'uncivilized Egyptian'.

An official justification for expansion was paternalism: subject races were supposed to benefit from having rulers of 'superior quality' for protection and guidance. 'Orientals' in Egypt proved that they were incapable of looking after themselves; they needed to be shown how to 'think properly', which would enable them to 'live properly'. The modern observer is not alone in questioning paternal integrity, as Cromer mentions its rather "suspicious" past record. As for himself, Cromer proudly writes:

one of the first qualifications necessary in order to play the part of a saviour of society is that the saviour should believe in himself and in his
mission. This the Englishman did. He was convinced that his mission was to save Egyptian society, and, moreover, that he was able to save it. Cromer portrays himself as the archetypal 'Englishman'. Victorians had perceived themselves to have reached the peak of evolutionary development, and therefore a turning point in history when they were obliged to venture out and spread their knowledge. Images of a 'chosen' people are vivid in Cromer's works, where 'the Englishman' is raised to an almost super-human level, thus widening the gap between the different races. On three occasions in Modern Egypt, Cromer refers to the Middle Eastern tale, Eothen, as prophetic, and considers its author, Alexander William Kinglake (1808-81), as "a man of literary genius". Kinglake writes that "The Englishman planted a firm foot on the banks of the Nile, and sat in the seats of the faithful." In one sense it was Cromer's firm foot in 1883; but he also shares the credit with Major Watson, R.E. and his men who captured the Alexandria Citadel on September 14 1882 during the bombardment. The invasion was a fine example of 'English superiority' applied to the military.

Cromer also discusses his mission in religious terms. Christianity is a powerful force in Cromer's division of Egyptian society. Communicating the 'differences' between East and West as Moslem and Christian gave the appearance of 'divine ordination', which justified 'the mission'. As Christians, they were allegedly inspired by God to spread their 'knowledge'; as 'Englishmen', they were only sanctioned by the state. According to Cromer, England is of course the best example of religious purity from the West. 'The Englishman' hopes to 'attain a high degree of eminently Christian civilization' in Egypt and is, indeed, guided in this direction by the lights, which have been handed down to him by his forefathers, and by the Puritan blood which still circulates in his veins. Cromer also stirs up religious antagonisms to Catholicism, particularly in his designation of the Turkish Sultan as the 'Mohammedan Pope'. Both temporal rulers
were traditionally considered pretenders to spiritual power, and symbols of religious tyranny. Cromer's mission resembles a continuation of two historical conflicts over religion: England crusaded against the infidels in the Middle Ages and also rebelled against Rome in the Reformation. Now in Egypt, she was again confronting the Moslems and Catholics. Welch argues that the religious impulse was also instrumental in gaining support for the mission. 'The Oriental' was also seen as a 'Moslem', with its attendant themes of 'holy wars' and alleged opposition to Christianity. These preconceptions of Islam were fuelled by such images as the Crusades and re-confirmed with the contemporary Mahdist rebellion in the Sudan against Egyptian domination. During this current 'holy war', a British expedition under Hicks was massacred, Khartoum was captured and General Gordon was martyred in the cause of "religious fanaticism and blind devotion". The Sudanese debacle confirmed Cromer's argument that the Egyptian required intellectual and moral regeneration. Unable to handle the situation according to British standards, the Egyptian had to rely on 'superior', British assistance.

The religious aspect of Cromer's mission is the foundation of his prescriptions for intellectual and moral reform. He asks himself and his readers what kind of new 'moral code' can be introduced to the Moslems, and concludes that it must be British, European, and Christian. According to Zetland, "the touchstone to which he instinctively submitted all his actions was that of the Christian moral code." Cromer also saw "Britain's primary duty in Egypt" to be establishment of the Code within government. Indeed, Cromer attached the utmost importance to a governing race basing its relations with subject peoples on a rigid observance of the moral precepts of the Christian Code.

In Cromer's own words, 'the Englishman' in Egypt "will endeavor to inculcate a distinctly Christian code of morality as the basis for the relations between man and
man."\(^{32}\) The Code apparently offers the egalitarian concepts of respect for others and self-worth for all Egyptians. Unfortunately, Cromer fails to define the ‘Christian code’ beyond noting that it is based on Christianity.\(^{33}\) The main point is that it is Christian, and not Moslem.

Cromer also advocates implementing the Christian Code throughout the Empire for imperial union. Writing in January 1908 after his return from Egypt, Cromer argues that

...the code of Christian morality is the only sure foundation on which the whole of our vast Imperial fabric can be built if it is to be durable.\(^{34}\)

Christian morality, if observed, offers a bond for the diverse peoples of the British empire, as it would for the poly-ethnic ‘dwellers’ of Egypt. Cromer makes a "sweeping generalization" on how to avoid a similar total decline as that of the Roman Empire:

it may be said that the whole, or nearly the whole, of the essential points of a sound Imperial policy admit of being embodied in this one statement, that, whilst steadily avoiding any movement in this direction of official proselytism, our relations with the various races who are subjects of the King of England should be founded on the granite rock of the Christian moral code.\(^{35}\)

A successful bond of ‘Christian morality’ would in turn stabilize British authority because everyone would be guided by the same Code. Cromer concludes that imperial ‘durability’ would be strengthened by the implementation of this moral code. He is concerned with avoiding the fate of the Roman Empire and suggests that the Christian moral code would contribute to British imperial longevity. These comments can also be applied to his own imperial domain: bonding the Egyptian ‘dwellers’ together would stabilize the local population, the administration would be reinforced and British influence preserved even after evacuation. Christianity not only ensured English superiority, but also domination over imperial subjects.
Another distinguishing feature of ‘the Englishman’ was his allegedly unique ‘character’. Cromer’s preoccupation with ‘character’ was apparently common among Victorians, who were notorious for defining their peers and ‘other’ groups by their ‘character type’. Many English publications explained the finer points of ‘good character’, which indicate a general interest in the subject. Some of these sources have been consulted for this thesis in order to place Cromer’s ‘character’ judgements of ‘the Egyptian’ into their nineteenth century context. According to Samuel Smiles, there were ten fundamental prerequisites to effecting ‘good character’: stable home life, companionship with friends, hard work, courage, self-control, duty and honesty, good temper, manners, reading, and companionship in marriage. While there is no evidence that Cromer read Smiles, he obviously subscribed to some general rules of ‘good character’ because he evaluates many individuals and groups by the quality of their ‘character’. Cromer definitely has a model of ‘good character’ in his own mind, even though it is not succinctly defined. Instead, Cromer randomly states his qualifications for ‘good character’, which are quite compatible with those of Smiles. As an alleged authority on ‘English character’, inferences can be made between Smiles’ work and Cromer’s conclusions.36

Cromer and Smiles certainly agree that the ‘English character’ is ‘the best’ in the world. Some historians argue that the insistence on English superiority indicates a latent insecurity and even an identity crisis.37 This apparently subconscious motivation does not seem plausible within Cromer’s reasoning: he appears to be genuinely confident in the superior ‘English character’ and consistently tries to convince his readers of this ‘fact’. Cromer discusses the "sterling national qualities of the Anglo-Saxon race" either directly through descriptions of fellow Agents and the mission, or indirectly by criticizing ‘others’ for flaws that are presumably un-English.38 An example of Cromer’s confidence in the ‘English character’ emphasizes the interrelationship of
‘character’ and ‘superiority’. The ‘English character’ embodied by the acting Consul, Sir Auckland Colvin, saved the Khedival administration during the Arabi Mutiny on September 9, 1881. Cromer concludes that:

The spirit of the Englishman rose high in the presence of danger.... He must endeavor at the risk of his own life to impart to the Khedive some portion of the spirit which animated his own imperial race.

Cromer asserts that Tewfik chose the "wisest" course in summoning Colvin, who describes a dramatic encounter with Arabi and a crowd of discontented soldiers. Arabi approached on horseback, dismounted when ordered, advanced with a group bearing 'fixed bayonets', and finally saluted. Colvin continues: "I said to the Viceroy, 'Now is your moment.' He replied, 'We are between four fires.' I said, 'Have courage.' The situation was resolved diplomatically. This is a splendid example of the 'English character' as part of that intangible 'knowledge' because the unfortunate 'Oriental' Khedive was incapable of really knowing how to handle the situation. In contrast, Colvin knew what to do, and Cromer knew that it was right even though he was absent.

Good morals are synonymous with 'good character' in Cromer's writings. Introducing his concluding chapter in Modern Egypt, Cromer cites W.E.H. Lecky's History of European Morals (1869): "The essential qualities of national greatness are moral, not material." In other discussions, Cromer also attributes English 'greatness' to 'character'. The upright 'Englishman' is portrayed as a positive influence and motivating force for Egyptians to improve themselves. Cromer stresses the importance of proper behavior for his subordinates, who should be examples to 'the natives' of moral goodness. He notes:

it always appeared to me that the first and most important duty of the British representative in Egypt was, by example and precept, to set up a high standard of morality, both in his public and private life, and thus endeavor to raise the standard of those around him.
Success in "public matters" is attributed to Anglo-Egyptian officials who allegedly were examples of good morality and also scrupulous in dealing honestly with everyone.43 Cromer also briefly thanks his first wife for her guidance in Egyptian "social life".44 Many of his Anglo-Egyptian contemporaries argue that Cromer himself was the best exponent of English morality in Egypt.45 According to Cromer, all Englishmen helped inadvertently to upset the moral quagmire in Egypt by their alleged moral superiority that dictated their actions.

Cromer reveals an eclectic theoretical taste by discussing his subjects in terms other than of their 'character'. He also examines the 'Oriental race' and 'Oriental culture'. These more controversial categories were the ethnographic successors to 'character' with the application of science.46 Many nineteenth century human sciences offered biological evidence to 'explain' racial differences and 'confirm' English superiority.47 Although the quality of race studies ranged from serious to ridiculous, their general influence among theorists of empire was "immense", especially because 'paternalism' was considered to be an inadequate justification for expansion.48 Social Darwinism revived traditional prejudices with its theory of the 'survival of the fittest' through the natural evolution of mankind.49 Arguments based on social darwinism were also commonly employed by most major political figures of imperial nations from the 1890's.50 Anthropology proposed "racial types", and eugenics claimed that the intellect was an inherited quality peculiar to each race.51 It was apparently common for Victorians to speak in terms of 'race', and Cromer was no exception.52 For example, he refers to "the dark-skinned Eastern as compared with the fair-skinned Western".53 Victorians generally used metaphors for equating color with human characteristics, such as light with goodness and darkness with corruption.54 While Cromer draws no scientific connections between color and superiority, the symbolic implication is there.
Although Cromer refers to various ‘races’ of the East, the extent of his racist ideas is difficult to determine. Cromer’s ‘explanation’ of Egyptians as inferior is definitely based on racialist justification: because they are Egyptians - and especially because they are not English - they are inferior. The missionary impulse was certainly linked in some form to ‘social darwinism’ because in both cases the ‘weaker race’ is to be replaced by the ‘stronger, superior, British race’. Cromer’s theories are not directly linked to any ‘scientific’ sources. His ideas on race are mainly derived from a collection of Orientalist works, which are cited throughout Modern Egypt. These include: Edward Lane’s Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, and Sir Alfred Lyall’s Asiatic Studies. Cromer’s notions of ‘English superiority’ and ‘noblesse oblige’, both of which are racist, were likely substantiated in other sources that he consulted. These included stories of Eastern exploration, British memoirs, political science treatises, Greek mythology and histories of Britain, the Italian renaissance and the Roman Empire. From his wide range of interests, it can be concluded that Cromer was inspired by many different trends of thought, one of which was the role of ‘race’ in analyzing a foreign people.

Although Cromer judged his subjects by their racial characteristics, he is better described as a ‘paternalist’ rather than a ‘racist’. This conclusion is based on the Philip Mason’s explanation of paternalist and racist ideologies as mutually exclusive. According to Mason, racists believe that a "subject people are inherently different and must be ruled for ever". Cromer believes in the basic difference of ‘Orientals’, but does not think that this difference is entirely permanent, because he argues for reform. He believes that ‘the Oriental’ should not be ruled for ever, by repeatedly pointing out that British forces must evacuate Egypt as soon as the mission is complete. Cromer was in favour of immediate evacuation at the beginning of his Consul Generalship but changed his mind only when he realized that Egypt and ‘the Egyptian’ required
extensive reform: they were not ready for self-government. More in accordance with Cromer's writings is the paternalist view of subject peoples, who "are for the present wards under guardianship, but they will grow up, they will be educated."58 The paternalist establishes a 'father-son relationship' with his subjects, who are nurtured and prepared for independence when the father determines that they are ready.59 As a paternalist, Cromer ultimately seeks to reform 'the Oriental' so that he may grow into an independent and "admiring younger brother."60 According to Mason, 'the Oriental' is elevated from the subordinate position of son to a more equal, yet less experienced because he is 'younger', brother of 'the Englishman'. As will be seen in Chapter Two, Cromer's discussion of his 'wards', and especially his Khedives, is very paternalistic.

CROMER'S METHODOLOGY

This section traces the progression of Cromer's intellectual subjugation of 'the Oriental'. Cromer's methodology is explained within the framework of how the Orientalist attempts to understand, or dominate, subject peoples. The desire to understand 'the native' was common for Orientalists.61 Throughout the nineteenth century, non-Europeans were "made the careful object of European curiosity."62 Once 'the Oriental mind' is understood, it can be conquered by forcing it to appreciate the desirability of reform. Imperial success also depends on the constant replenishment of 'knowledge' about Egyptian society because knowing 'the Oriental' means dominating 'the Oriental'.63 According to Said, as the level of knowledge increases, so must the sophistication of the power structure. Imperial power increases as 'the Oriental mind' is progressively understood; to keep this process going, 'the native mind' must be constantly studied.64
A fundamental aim for Cromer is to understand his subject people, nicely fulfilling the "first duty of an imperial race".65 ‘Understanding’ is necessary before any serious attempt at reform is possible. According to Cromer, sympathy with the subject’s plight will help to clarify ‘Oriental views’. 66 It is also necessary to know the pre-Occupation political system, the legal status of non-Egyptians, and the "national characteristics" of Egypt.67 Cromer advises that

...British officials in Eastern countries should be encouraged by all possible means to learn the views and the requirements of the native population.68

Accurate understanding of the ‘Egyptian mind’, or ‘views’, supposedly would help the imperialist to manipulate his subjects by accommodating his behavior to ‘native’ needs without compromising his position. Cromer constantly describes situations where he carefully weighed his possible alternatives for action, and is often proud of his choices because they appeared to satisfy all parties. This "special aptitude" is the preserve of Englishmen, whom he predictably credits as the best qualified for civilizing ‘Orientals’.69 Cromer judged imperial administrators on their potential for ‘understanding’ according to their adaptability in ‘the East’. For example, Sir Rivers Wilson, the pre-Occupation Finance Minister, is criticized for his purely British experience that Cromer considers useless in the completely different ‘Oriental political climate’.70 Ideally, Cromer required his Agents’ sensitivity to the differences between themselves and ‘the Orientals’ within the context of all working relationships, from building irrigation systems to planning budgets.

Cromer advises Anglo-Egyptians and other imperial agents to study their ‘subjects’ in order to achieve understanding. In Modern Egypt Anglo-Egyptians are recommended to read histories and general studies on ‘Eastern society’. Above all, these should be responsible, objective sources, "based on accurate information and on a careful study of Egyptian facts and of the Egyptian character...."71 In particular,
Cromer suggests reading Sir Alfred Lyall's "brilliant" *Asiatic Studies*. Lyall is renowned for his knowledge of 'Eastern morality', 'habits of thought', and on dealing with the problems of the Eastern and Western 'minds' working together. Aside from individual study, observation, and reliance on that 'knowledge' that every 'Englishman' was blessed with by birth, there was little recourse to the English educational system for supplying information about 'the East'. Cromer argues that a school of Oriental Studies should be established in England to enhance understanding of 'the East' for English residents and also future imperial agents. Cromer stated in the House of Lords on September 27, 1909: "I should be very glad to see lectures given by qualified people on Oriental character and mental processes."

He eventually chaired a planning committee for a School of Oriental Languages in London.

'The Oriental' is further subjugated through the process of study by his ultimate dehumanization. He becomes something that is studied, rather than someone to be merely 'understood'. Dehumanization appears to justify Cromer's prescriptions for intellectual and moral reform: as an object, instead of a person, the Egyptian can be manipulated into something else. There are many examples of 'native' objectification in Cromer's writings. In his introduction, Cromer speaks of his "subject" that he had to study, as opposed to his subjects. While exposing the cruelty of local officials, he refers to the Moudirs, or provincial governors, as specimens of "administrative material". Equating the natives with 'material' is repeated often. In "The Dwellers", Cromer examines 'the Egyptian' in detail and finds many complex deficiencies. He concludes by asking: "In a word, what was the chaotic material out of which the Englishman had to evolve something like order?" On another occasion, Cromer argues that Egyptians were not ready for a British withdrawal. He bases his conclusion on "the existing facts and the material available". Referring to the problem of army reform, Cromer asks himself what type of men would compose the army: "Out of what
material was a new army to be formed?" The fellah was a possible solution. Muhammad Ali apparently saw the fellaheen as "raw material" that could be turned into soldiers, and they were employed with relative success. The Anglo-Egyptian regime also eventually transformed the 'raw' fellaheen into relatively skilled soldiers. Cromer comments on the undisputed British success:

Even hostile critics admitted that the manner in which the British officers had created an efficient army out of very unpromising material was beyond praise.

As 'unpromising material', the fellah is portrayed as little more than a problem to be solved. Cromer's remedy is to 'create' a better human product.

The Egyptian is not only identified as 'material', he is also 'raw material'. In "The Dwellers", Cromer analyzes the polymorphous society. He asks: "Of what was the raw material composed with which the Englishman had to deal?" The adjective 'raw' emphasizes the need for reform. Cromer's reduction of 'the native' into an object such as 'material' is strictly an intellectual process: the material appears stagnant and lifeless. By describing this material as 'raw', Cromer shows that the material is natural, untouched, and can be developed out of its 'raw' condition. Cromer concludes:

In fact, the Englishman will soon find that the Egyptian, whom he wishes to mould into something really useful with a view to his becoming eventually autonomous, is merely the rawest of raw material....

He notes that the process will involve many "tools" provided by other nations, both 'Eastern' and 'Western'. Thanks to these, "the excellence of the finished article" will not be compromised by inadequate local means. Successful reforms, or 'tools', will enable the raw material to be transformed into a new 'finished article'. In a footnote, Cromer points out that he is referring to the abundance of 'raw material' in 1882, and concedes that the 'moral and intellectual' quality of Egyptian civil servants has since greatly improved. Again reflecting on his administration Cromer comments on "the unpromising nature of the raw material on which the English had to work".
the Egyptians were less ‘raw’ and endowed with more useful ‘habits of thought’ when Cromer left Egypt, they were nevertheless still ‘material’.

Dehumanizing the Egyptians enables Cromer to suggest their conversion into automatons. Since the Egyptian has been reduced to the status of an ‘object’, he can be transformed into a person with object-like qualities. Cromer seeks to change the deficient Egyptian ‘material’ into efficient Egyptian ‘automatons’. The Egyptian’s ‘mind’ ideally becomes a receptacle of British knowledge that is expressed through imitating ‘Englishness’. Imitation is the highest achievement of an ‘Oriental’ because it is considered impossible for foreigners to become truly ‘English’, which was the preserve of ‘the Englishman’. Originality of the ‘finished product’ is unimportant:

His civilization may be a veneer, yet he will readily adopt the letter, the catchwords and jargon, if not the spirit of European administrative systems.

Proximity to the British mold is crucial for success. By encouraging him to imitate ‘the Englishman’, the Egyptian can be effectively reformed. According to Cromer, this plan is viable because the ‘Egyptian character’ is naturally inclined towards imitation. Cromer notes one of the Egyptian’s few natural ‘skills’ as being the ability to copy the ‘British character’

Once explain to an Egyptian what he is to do, and he will assimilate the idea rapidly. He is a good imitator, and will make a faithful, even sometimes a too servile copy of the work of his European teacher.

Cromer admits that he is advocating the construction of ‘native robots’. After acknowledging the Egyptian to be a good imitator who can never be truly ‘English’, Cromer points out that

His movements will, it is true, be not unfrequently those of automaton, but a skilfully constructed automaton may do a great deal of useful work.

‘Skilful construction’ is the process of intellectual and moral reform. An example of ‘useful work’ is the fellah who adapts himself to drill exercises because, "true to his
national characteristics, is an admirable automaton." Cromer argues for the fine-tuning of this national characteristic. He is not creating something new, but exploiting the limited potential of existing 'material'. Regardless of the composition of the finished product, the reformed Egyptian is to be a British construction.

Cromer's desire to create automatons can be explained as a re-affirmation of 'British superiority'. Since the Egyptian automaton can not become wholly English, the myth of his latent inferiority would never be entirely extinguished. Said's argument of the necessary preservation of 'the Oriental' is recalled in this situation. As automatons, some form of 'the Oriental character' must be retained. Both the myth of 'the Oriental', and Cromer's 'automaton' are constructed and permanently maintained by the holders of power. The former is through literature and a false 'reality', and the latter is within the imperial society. Like the 'Oriental myth', the automaton will always be an inferior 'other' because it is neither English nor European in essence. 'Western superiority' would therefore ease the conscience of imperialists establishing systems of permanent inequality because subject peoples could never attain the sophistication of their 'advisers'. Mitchell discusses this "paradoxical" scenario in terms of general imperial policy, arguing that the British, although finding 'the Orientals' to be deficient in many ways, needed to maintain this deficiency in order to remind themselves of their own superiority. 'Englishmen' could then define themselves as 'saviours of society', to use Cromer's words, because if there was no one to save, there would have been neither mission, nor honor. Likewise, there would be nothing to create.

While creating automatons is considered to be desirable, it is not to be a permanent condition for the governing Pashas, who must learn to think for themselves as pseudo-Englishmen. Cromer argues that Egypt has always been burdened with an oppressive, and relatively ignorant ruling class. The Pashas must be reformed so that
they could adapt to and eventually manage the new system. Structural reforms are considered worthless without modernization of the administrators. Cromer insists that the Anglo-Egyptian administration was more concerned with reforming these 'native' partners in government, rather than the 'native' system.

The agency believed if such a body of Egyptian officials were not created, Egypt would be left with a 'race of automatons bound hand and foot by a rigid set of bureaucratic formulae.' Clearly the Agency believed that governing Egypt was a question much more of persons than of systems.53

The key word in the above observation is 'created'. The Agency believed in the need to create a new type of local administrator, just as it would create a new administration. Cromer argues that Egyptian administrators must be taught to take initiative, to govern without the strict supervision that is currently necessary with their intellectual and moral degeneracy. Until more freedom is achieved, the local ruling group will act as 'automatons'. It is important to keep in mind that Cromer's ultimate goal is the evacuation of Egypt. Egyptian reform is supposed to facilitate this object. If the Pashas are robotic imitations of 'the Englishman' that require constant maintenance, the British forces would never be able to leave. Cromer must create a cooperative, English-imitation administrator class that would ensure post-occupational British paramountcy.

The significance of Cromer's dehumanization of 'the Oriental' is that he is portrayed not only as an object, but also as a problem. As a problem, 'the Oriental' requires a solution, which Cromer suggests can be achieved by reforming his 'mind'. This identification of 'the Oriental' as problematic is common in Orientalist works, as Said argues:

Orientals were rarely seen or looked at; they were seen through, analyzed not as citizens, or even people, but as problems to be solved or confined or - as the colonial powers openly coveted their territory - taken over.

The inhuman 'native' is often portrayed in Cromer's works as an obstacle that must be surmounted. Indeed, Cromer comments that the 'Oriental spirit',
though it may not always find expression in word or deed, is an obstacle to the reformer of which it is difficult to overrate the importance.95

Deputy Consul Rennell Rodd observes that Cromer saw 'the native mind' as nothing more than "an obstacle to be overcome".96 The human aspect of that 'mind' is considered irrelevant because it is deficient: why preserve something that is perceived as 'inferior'?96

'The Oriental' has emerged as a problem throughout this Chapter. 'The native mind' is portrayed as something to be dominated, understood and finally overcome to ensure Egyptian progress. As Cromer subjugates his 'wards', their problematic qualities are enhanced and used to justify the Occupation. By isolating 'the Oriental' on the 'wrong' half of the divided imperial society, Cromer ensures that this 'other' would have to be dealt with, as one would tackle a problem. Being the objects of a 'mission', 'Orientals' are problems to the 'civilized world' that require development. And as the antithesis of the Christian, Moslem 'Orientals' threaten not only the mission but Christendom. 'The Oriental' is also portrayed as problematic because his 'character' and 'racial qualities' are un-English. These qualities must be understood and studied precisely because they are problematic: why would they require attention if there is nothing wrong with them? The only thing that is not identified as problematic in this Chapter is 'the Englishman', because he is the standard against which all 'others' are measured.
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CHAPTER 2: ANALYZING 'THE ORIENTAL'

DESCRIPTION

This chapter analyzes Cromer's 'imperial reality' that portrays 'the Oriental' as a problem. Through descriptions and comparisons with 'the Westerner', Cromer 'creates the Oriental' for his readers. Cromer lacks a comprehensive definition of 'the Oriental mind', and instead settles for a collection of negative judgements, fitting Mitchell's description of the Orientalist weighed down by "empirical particulars" at the expense of a general impression of "mentality". However, by identifying general characteristics among his subjects, Cromer views all 'dwellers' as the same. According to Said, classification and comparison of 'others' were the precursors to the Orientalist subjugation of 'the individual to the stereotype, of the Eastern to the Oriental'. Section one examines Cromer's detailed descriptions of the 'Egyptian mind'. In section two Cromer compares the Western 'mind' with that of the Egyptian. Through his descriptions and comparisons, the difference between the native and western 'mind' is confirmed.

Cromer analyzes the Egyptian by describing his peculiar characteristics. It was apparently common for nineteenth century Englishmen to indulge in this type of racial identification without being labeled 'racist' if their works were "unsystematic". Although he devotes his chapter on "The Dwellers" to "measurement and classification", many of Cromer's descriptions are also communicated randomly. Said and Mitchell discuss the process of description in terms of 'representation', where the 'detached' Westerner represents 'the Oriental' to the West by speaking for him; 'the Orient' is given 'Oriental qualities' through representation by Western observers. According to Mitchell, writers strove to be 'detached and accurate' in order to describe exactly what
they had seen. Representations are the 'imperial reality' for geographically, culturally, intellectually etc. remote Western readers. Knowledge of 'the Orient' is based on a Western construct of images and ideas of what 'the Orient' should be in relation to the superior Western observers. Cromer is intentionally detached in order to obtain 'objectivity' and produce "accurate" descriptions so that his readers can be aware of the 'facts'. Since the Egyptian could not communicate his own characteristics in Cromer's works, the author 'represents', 'Orientalizes' and dominates him by communicating his "typically Oriental" qualities. Cromer describes 'the Oriental' as inferior by emphasizing those qualities that would be perceived by Western readers as negative.

Cromer analyzes the 'faulty' Khedival 'character' to explain partially the collapse of Egypt and the sustained Occupation. From the first chapter of Modern Egypt Cromer repeatedly finds things 'wrong' with the 'Oriental rulers' of Egypt. Khedival morals, intellect and 'character' are portrayed as deficient beyond repair. The possibility of reforming 'the Khedival mind' is not even discussed. Cromer begins with the first Khedive who broke from Ottoman control, Muhammad Ali. Despite his crudeness, Muhammad Ali is credited with intelligence especially for securing relative independence. In general, he is found to be better than his successors - but still restricted by 'the Eastern mind'. Muhammad Ali was a 'truly Oriental' administrator endowed with peculiarities that confuse Cromer. For example, he tells of how a loyal Admiral is forced to drink poison after a final prayer. It was such "methods" that distinguish Muhammad Ali as an 'Oriental despot'. Cromer truly mis-understands the 'native mind' by failing to comprehend the complexities of this situation. The Khedive and his subordinate appear cruel, arbitrary and even irrational. For them, their behavior is within the confines of custom and tradition. Cromer often complains of the Egyptian's excessive deference to authority. The Admiral's unyielding acceptance of his fate is another example of this servility.
Despotism is a constant theme in Cromer’s descriptions of the remaining Egyptian Khedives. His writing adheres to the unwritten code of Orientalist technique because "despotism" and "cruelty" are often exposed through Orientalism. Muhammad Ali’s successor, Ibrahim, is first acknowledged as a courageous and very famous soldier. This complement is minimized by the next sentence: "It must be added that he was a half-lunatic savage." Cromer substantiates this claim with two stories of Ibrahim’s alleged cruelty against religious groups and also the entourage of Prime Minister Nubar Pasha. Ibrahim’s successor, Abbas, is described as "an Oriental despot of the worst type" who was excessively cruel. Cromer does not elaborate on the capabilities of ‘the worst type’. Instead, he concludes:

There does not appear, as in the case of his predecessors, to have been any redeeming feature in his character. It was altogether odious.

At this point, Cromer indicates his interest in discussing the Khedives mainly in terms of ‘character’. He begins his description of Said by concentrating on his "main defects", which include conceit, incapacity to rule, cruelty, irrationality and other despotic tendencies. Said rewarded a bumbling steersman two hundred ‘sovereigns’ when he expected two hundred ‘lashes’ with the courbash. With this incident, Cromer widens his scope of description to include ‘ordinary Orientals’ by commenting on the general reaction. He finds their ‘mind’ to be strange for being more shocked by the "generosity of the gift than with the cruelty and injustice of the flogging." Again, Cromer misunderstands the ‘native mind’ by applying ‘Western standards’ to an ‘Eastern situation’. For an Egyptian, what Cromer identifies as ‘cruelty and injustice’ through beating is perhaps more commonplace than a large financial reward, hence the greater reaction to the two-hundred sovereigns. Cromer implies that Englishmen are less acquainted with ‘flogging’, which would create more excitement in England than would a gift of ‘sovereigns’.
The only pre-Occupation Khedive with whom Cromer was personally acquainted was Ismail.\(^{18}\) Cromer's observations are allegedly unbiased and based on strictly political criteria.\(^{19}\) He claims that he did not "dislike" Ismail as an individual, but sympathized with him as an inept ruler who could have retained his power if only it had not been abused.\(^{20}\) A few good qualities are acknowledged, such as Ismail's "acute and subtle intellect".\(^{21}\) These are predictably overshadowed by flaws. Cromer was concerned with Ismail's 'inaccurate' political predictions, and also his inability to conceptualize a "broad question of principle".\(^{22}\) Ismail apparently was more adept at handling details - at the expense of generalities. According to Cromer, this sacrifice of the larger picture is a basic handicap of 'the Oriental mind'. Cromer and his superior in London, Lord Salisbury, agreed that Ismail's deficient character constituted a threat to progress. Salisbury argued that Egypt could not be reformed with Ismail as Khedive:

> The sole obstacle to reform appears to lie in the character of its Ruler. His financial embarrassments lead almost inevitably to oppression, and his bad faith frustrates all friendly efforts to apply a remedy. There seems to be no doubt that a change of policy can only be obtained by a change of Ruler.\(^{23}\)

Salisbury was justifying British pressure on Ismail to abdicate. On June 26, 1879, the Sultan deposed Ismail upon Anglo-French pressure.\(^{24}\) Cromer and his superiors in London found it easier to remove a bad character rather than alter it. This would not be necessary for Ismail's son and successor, Tewfik.

Cromer's descriptive style changes with the introduction of Tewfik.\(^{25}\) Positive qualities are more readily acknowledged, probably because he was more malleable. A cooperative Khedive would naturally exude favorable qualities to 'the Englishman'. Among other things, Tewfik is honored for being opposed to cruelty, faithful to his wife, pious, tolerant, sensible, compassionate, humble and brave.\(^{26}\) Aside from the usual bravery and devotion to Islam, Cromer finds these to be unique qualities for an
‘Oriental ruler’. Tewfik is also considered particularly ‘un-Oriental’ in his capacity for
gratitude. Tewfik was allegedly very average, which was at least not negative:

He was morally and intellectually respectable....His character and
class conduct were not of a nature to excite enthusiasm on his behalf. On the
other hand, they rarely formed the subject of severe condemnation. 

However, his uninspiring personality proved to be a negative quality in the eyes of
fellow Egyptians. The attempted coup led by Arabi had also diminished public
confidence in Tewfik’s ability to rule. By February 15, 1886, Cromer wrote to
Rosebery:

The Khedive’s unpopularity is mainly due to his character, or perhaps, I
should say, want of character. I have rarely come across anyone so wholly
devoid of personal characteristics.

Cromer also found Tewfik to be an unsatisfactory administrator. Welch notes: "While
discussing the requirements of constitutional rule, Cromer discovered the Khedive
‘understood about as much as my little boy.” Comparing the intellect of the Khedive
to that of a child, even if it is ‘European’, Cromer indicates that Tewfik was ill-equipped
to govern. Cromer does manage to find some benefit in Tewfik’s flaws. He argues that
had Tewfik been endowed with a stronger character, intellect and sense of
determination, he and his subordinates would have been much more involved in the
administration. Instead, Cromer observes that Tewfik was truly ‘Oriental’ in lacking
initiative and deferring to his British ‘advisers’. Since his character was weak, Egypt
could be reformed without his interference; Tewfik also helped to block native
opposition and smooth Anglo-Egyptian negotiations.

In January 1893 Abbas II succeeded Tewfik and Cromer was impressed with ‘his’
new Khedive. By contrast, teachers from the Austrian college where Abbas had been
educated disapproved of his character and suggested that he was a potential trouble-
maker. Cromer was initially not quite as perceptive, perhaps out of political
necessity. On April 15 1892, he wrote to Salisbury of Abbas' character in familiar terms:

As it is, he resembles a very gentlemanlike and healthily-minded boy fresh from Eton or Harrow - not at all devoid of intelligence, but a good deal bored with el-Azhar, Sheikhs, Ramazan feasts, etc. I really wish he was not quite so civilized.  

Within one year Cromer still acknowledged that Abbas was spirited and 'intelligent' despite a latent despotism and recklessness that is excused by his youth. These positive evaluations were short lived. On April 2 1897 Cromer wrote to Barrington that "The Khedive plays with lunatics and is scarcely sane himself according to his doctor." Recounting his frustration and many clashes with the young Khedive in Abbas II, Cromer had concluded that Abbas would not be manipulated as easily as was his father. He would be receptive to anti-British ideas and would also employ flatterers, which was a ‘typically Oriental’ strategy of government. Furthermore, Cromer notes that "his character was overbearing and arbitrary" and he cared more about his personal reputation and especially his wealth than about the Egyptian population. On the positive side, Cromer still maintains that Abbas "was not only intelligent, but possessed a genuine sense of humor...." Cromer claims to be completely objective in his analysis of Abbas and has avoided publishing his biography until the Khedive was removed from power.

In Chapter XXXV, of Modern Egypt entitled "The Moslems", Cromer divides the Egyptian population into Christians and Moslems. His evaluation of the Moslems is important because they are the main target for intellectual and moral reform. Moslems are broken down into three ethnic groups: Turks and Turko-Egyptians, Egyptians and Bedouins. The first group are the ‘elite’ descendants of Egypt’s conquering race. Turko-Egyptians are known as the ‘Pashas’ at the top of the Egyptian social hierarchy. Cromer notes that there "are now but few pure Turks left." The same ‘habits of thought’ in
contemporary Constantinople are not to be expected in Egypt. Cromer cites two main reasons for the Egyptianization of Turkish thought. Firstly, separation from Ottoman influence over the years has forced thought patterns to adapt to local circumstances. The second catalyst for change is inter-marriage. As Turks and Egyptians married, the 'Turco-Egyptian' had replaced the pure Turk by 1882.\textsuperscript{41} Cromer argues that the extinction of the 'pure Turk' was an important social change for British imperial rule in Egypt. He notes:

as each year of the British occupation passed by, the Turco-Egyptian element in Egyptian society became more Egyptian and less Turkish in character and habits of thought.\textsuperscript{42}

For example, although the Sultan is still recognized as their religious leader, he is viewed increasingly less as their political sovereign. This means that Turco-Egyptian support for anti-British sentiment in Constantinople is steadily dwindling. In fact, Cromer concludes that Turco-Egyptians view the Turks as obstacles to their own progress, as are the Englishmen, both of whom threaten their oppression of the Egyptian.\textsuperscript{43} This hostile attitude is allegedly part of the typical 'Turco-Egyptian character'. Turco-Egyptians are described as the most capable and honest administrators in Egypt; they are also less corrupt and more "manly" than the average Egyptian.\textsuperscript{44} Masculinity is apparently a Turkish by-product, as is the imperial attitude from their Ottoman roots.\textsuperscript{45} Cromer sees the Turco-Egyptians as having more English moral and intellectual qualities than any other Egyptian dwellers. As administrators, they are the best 'Oriental' alternative. Three of the four Prime Ministers who worked with Cromer were Turco-Egyptian. Each Minister's ability to rule is directly linked to his character.

The first Occupational Prime Minister was Cherif Pasha.\textsuperscript{46} Before the Occupation from September through December, 1881, Cherif had attempted to
strengthen the government amid mounting turmoil. In this context Cromer notes that Cherif was inspired by some statesmanlike principles ... but he was wanting in the energy and strength of character necessary to control the turbulent elements which had been let loose. He was also "the least Egyptian of any of the Moslem Prime Ministers of recent times." Cherif was a "pure Turk" from Constantinople "in the first stage of Egyptianization". Observing his good nature, or "bonhomie", Cromer notes that "whatever was not Turkish in his character was French." He concludes with Cherif's main qualities:

He was proud, courageous, honest after his way, and, in his public life, always negligent of detail and sometimes of principle. Occasionally, he would emit flashes of true statesmanship, but he was too careless, too apathetic, and too wanting in persistence to carry out his own principles in practice.

Positives are again cancelled by negatives. There is no doubt that Cherif was brave. Next, he was honest, but this brand of honesty was undoubtedly below British standards. In the same sentence, Cherif was careless of both 'details and even principles'. These three qualities seem to be unconnected. Their relationship is that they are all part of the man's character. In the next sentence, Cromer again begins with a half-compliment by conceding partial 'statesmanship' to Cherif; in the same sentence the reasons why his statesmanship is not consistent are identified. These negatives leave a more lasting impression than does the suggestion that he actually had any statesmanship qualities.

Cromer's description of Riaz Pasha is more positive. Discussing Riaz is apparently difficult because he is still alive at the time of writing, and also because he is an admired "personal friend". Riaz's ministry during the Dual Control was comparatively stable considering the instability produced by the increased foreign presence, the deposition of Ismail and the restless military. Cromer mixes compliments with criticism, even when referring to a 'friend':
Riaz Pasha was thoroughly honest and well-intentioned, but he was incapable of dealing unaided with the perplexing financial questions which at that time presented themselves for solution. Similar to Cherif, Riaz suffered from an inability to handle the pre-Occupation turmoil. Just before the Arabi rebellion, Riaz was faced with increasing problems that he could not handle, "which possibly required higher qualities, and a greater degree of political insight, than any that he possessed."

In general, however, Cromer concludes that Riaz has an average intellect and above average morals compared to other Pashas. Typical to his class, Riaz is 'physically and morally brave' which was evident in his outspoken disgust at Ismail's alleged destruction of Egypt. Cromer argues that Egypt would benefit if there were more patriots endowed with the sterling qualities which are conspicuous in Riaz Pasha's rugged, yet very sympathetic character.

Riaz allegedly preferred his own form of 'justice' to official laws. Although Cromer avoided publishing his disapproval of Riaz's character, it is communicated in private correspondence. Besides being truthful, authoritative and able to command respect, Riaz is also "stupid, obstinate and violent... His manners are barbarous..." Riaz thought that if he was right, then he should prevail regardless of laws. He did not appreciate the legal and administrative changes that had been effected with British rule, and his stubbornness was considered to be an obstacle.

Cromer has little to say about Mustapha Pasha Fehmi, his most agreeable and apparently pro-British Minister. Interestingly, Fehmi also held the longest term in office, undoubtedly due to his British support. With little to complain about, Cromer appears uninterested. He devotes only one small paragraph to Fehmi because his simple "character renders it unnecessary to allude to him at any length." Fehmi was closer than any of his colleagues to being an 'English gentleman'. He was "thoroughly honest, truthful, and courteous" and above all he was loyal to his British 'advisers'. His colleagues are described as opposed to British rule in various ways. Under the Ministry
of Fehmi, Cromer concludes, "Egypt has made greater progress, both moral and material, than at any previous period." Cromer's discussion of this "greater progress" centers entirely around Fehmi's character, which implies that the Minister's character in this case was largely responsible for that 'progress'. Yielding to British interests and control is apparently the sign of 'good character'. Fehmi's 'simplicity of character' also apparently precluded hostility to British agents; simplicity is therefore good.

The next category of Moslems are the 'Egyptians'. The term 'Egyptian' now appears problematic, mainly because one would expect anyone living in Egypt to be called 'Egyptian'. Instead, Cromer asks "Who, in fact, is a true Egyptian?" and concludes from the 1897 census that "a precise definition was impossible." The 1897 census divides Egyptians by racial ancestry into four categories: natives, Ottomans, semi-sedentary Bedouins and Bedouins. Cromer prefers class distinctions: the Hierarchy, Squirearchy and Fellaheen. This eliminates the Bedouins, who are inappropriate for intellectual and moral reform because they have no influence over English policy; they should be tolerated and left alone.

The hierarchy is discussed in terms of its religious significance; it includes the Ulema, or learned men at El-Azhar University, and also lesser religious leaders. Although the hierarchy is involved in government, Cromer does not analyze their 'collective character' in much detail compared to other 'Egyptians' presumably because their intellect and morality is difficult to challenge. Safe in its religious niche of society, the hierarchy is out of Cromer's reach: they control their own sacred legal system that dealt with personal disputes and could not be over-ridden by English intervention. Cromer has no intention of reforming Islam, and would leave its 'authority' alone as much as possible.
Cromer also does not really describe the 'character' of the squirearchy, or village mayors, Omdehs, and Sheikhs. Instead, this group is often included within the general term 'Egyptian'; the squirearchical ability to rule and its "point of knowledge" are identified as close to those of the fellah. As local centers of authority and wealth, these landowners appreciate British rule for its "material benefits" but fear for their own power. Cromer notes that before the Occupation, they were excessively deferential to the Pashas, and at the same time oppressive of the fellaheen. He notes that this hierarchical relationship has significantly diminished with the structural reforms that Britain has encouraged in Egypt.

Cromer occasionally discusses 'the Egyptian' without specifying which type of 'Egyptian' he really means. For example, he mentions the "the generally docile races who inhabit the valley of the Nile." Ismail held complete control over "a docile people." Egyptians have been historically characterized by "habits of obedience" to such despots, which were incidentally disrupted with the deposition of Ismail. Who are the docile races? Docile people? And 'obedient' Egyptians? They are likely the fellaheen, because these are the bulk of the population who are necessarily obedient to their rulers in the squirearchy and hierarchy. The only group that Cromer consistently discusses in terms of being governed is the fellaheen. While other groups had to observe the rules of hierarchical authority, their obedience is usually portrayed as deference to superiors, as in the squirearchy to the Pashas. Being at the bottom of the social scale, the fellaheen are the most likely to be docile and obedient because they could not rule over anybody else. These are the qualities of a group with no opportunity to rule.

Cromer does not describe the fellah's 'character' length because this has already been accomplished in many other books. His occasional comments are consistently
negative enough to indicate that the fellah requires reform. On June 16 1891, Cromer wrote to Milner that

the Egyptian Oriental is quite one of the most stupid ... in the world 
...stupidity, not cunning is his chief characteristic.74

He concludes that Riaz fell from power because Egyptians were too ignorant to realize his excellent governing potential. Similarly, the fellah does not understand the benefits of British rule because he is blinded by a "thick mist of ignorance and misrepresentation" that clouds his judgement.75 Cromer notes that at the beginning of the Occupation the fellaheen were "sunk in the deepest ignorance".76 This is apparently their natural condition. Cromer observes "the general muddle-headedness of the ordinary uneducated Egyptian", in this case referring to the behavior of ‘labourers’.77 Cromer notes that the following are just a few of many examples illustrating ‘ordinary Egyptian’ ignorance. Railroad employees occasionally upset trains by turning the track points when the moving train is still switching lines. Drivers have also confused the brakes with other handles on the instrument panel. Many other workers have slept on the rail so that they can be awakened by the vibrations of an oncoming train, but have been killed because they woke up too late. In another context, ‘Egyptians’ instruct their donkeys to use the sidewalk while they walk in the middle of the streets. This last example is important for showing Cromer’s perception of the Egyptian version of how to use public roadways as ‘ignorant’.

The fellah is also a prime candidate for reform because of his direct effect on English policy: ‘the Englishman’ justifies the Occupation as necessary for liberating the fellah from ignorance and oppression. Cromer argues that the fellah is aware of British ‘good will’:

Ignorant though he be, he is wise enough to know that he is now far better off than he was prior to the British occupation.78
Unfortunately for Cromer, the fellah may understand British intentions, but he does not appreciate what has been done for him. This is not out of malice, but of habit. Cromer notes that

gratitude is not generally speaking, a national virtue. Moreover, many of those who have mixed in native society in Egypt consider ingratitude is one of the predominant features of the Egyptian character.19

Cromer cites the well known Orientalist, Edward Lane, to substantiate his claims on 'fellah characteristics'. On the positive side, "the ordinary fellah is kindly and jovial."80

As for his general ignorance, Cromer reports no progress of reform. The fellah is still illogical, naive, excitable and prone to violent outbursts that are likely regretted afterwards.81 He also has little interest and even less ability to articulate his grievances.82 Of course the fellah would have many complaints about his position in society, but he is used to a tradition of silence; such is the nature of a 'subject race'. Cromer points out that this is unfortunate considering the fact that it is this most oppressed class with whom he claims to sympathize. Those with the most to say about the problems of Egypt do not know how to say it, nor do they feel that they should because they have never been given the opportunity. The fellah is apolitical by nature.

An example of 'Egyptian deficiency' is seen in Cromer's description of the Arabi rebels. He notes two problems with the insurrection: weak leadership and a futile program. The leaders "do not appear to have displayed a single quality worthy of respect or admiration...."83 ‘Character deficiencies’ are emphasized: they were neither respectable nor admirable. Cromer implies that a strong ‘character’ commanding respect and admiration is a prerequisite for aspiring leaders. He also attacks the rebels’ collective intellect when he states that they were "men of such poor ability" that they could not effectively lead the Egyptian masses.84 Had they gained control of the government, disorganization and mayhem would have allegedly prevailed. While their goal of overthrowing foreign rule was agreeable to Cromer, their defective means
precluded success. He argues that Arabi’s policy of "Egypt for the Egyptians" was fundamentally flawed because ‘Egyptians’ are incapable of governing themselves. The Arabi group had little administrative potential while the mass of Egyptians were even less equipped. Arabi’s program is criticized as little more than a slogan because it idealized ‘Egyptian’ abilities. Cromer identifies two obstacles to native self-government: entrenched ‘backwardness’ and ‘subservience’ to foreign rule. He doubts whether there has ever been the assumption of power by "a class so ignorant as the pure Egyptians, such as they were in the year 1882."\(^{85}\) In 1907 Egyptians are still considered unfit to rule:

> Neither, for the present, do they appear to possess the qualities which would render it desirable, either in their own interests, or in those of the civilised world in general, to raise them at a bound to the category of autonomous rulers with full rights of internal sovereignty.\(^{86}\)

The ‘qualities’ of leadership are absent from the ‘Egyptian character’. This is partially explained by the fact that Egyptians are accustomed to playing the role of a ‘subject people’ by historical precedent. Egypt has not been governed by Egyptians since the ancient dynasties, and Cromer even questions the Pharaohs’ racial extraction.\(^{87}\)

The Christian dwellers in Egypt are discussed mainly in terms of their clerical work in government offices. Cromer divides the Christians into groups and discusses the ‘characteristics’ of three main contributors to Egyptian society: Copts, Syrians and Armenians. Copts are the most eligible Christians to deserve the title of ‘Egyptian’: by religion, they are Coptic Christian, while their homeland has traditionally been Egypt. Cromer compares the moral and intellectual qualities of Copts with Egyptian Moslems. Morally speaking, the Copts and Moslems are judged to be quite similar. Moslems are even one step above the Copts with their abstention from alcohol.\(^{88}\) Cromer concludes that Christianity could not elevate the morals of these ‘Eastern Christians’, who are more ‘Eastern’ than they are ‘Christian’.\(^{89}\) Surrounded by Egyptian Moslems, Copts
have adopted many of their habits, customs and 'morals', such as a disrespectful attitude towards women. While the Coptic intellect is not necessarily "superior" to that of the Moslem, Copts are supposedly better equipped by having "developed certain mediocre aptitudes." Cromer is referring to their secretarial skills, which have enabled them to dominate the Egyptian bureaucracy. In particular, Copts are fairly accurate bookkeepers and 'arithmeticians', and are certainly better with numbers than are the Moslems. Copts are eligible for moral and intellectual reform because of their predominance in the bureaucracy and hence their interaction with British officials.

Syrians and Armenians are considered to be morally and intellectually superior to the Copts. These racially distinct Christians are described as 'civilized', logical and cognizant of European actions and motives. Their importance for Cromer is in their capacity as "the intellectual cream of the near East." Syrians and Armenians can not be ignored because, like the other 'dwellers' described above, they affect British policy and must be re-formed into 'Egyptians'. Despite their alleged superiority compared to other 'dwellers', Syrians and Armenians have their own 'Oriental' peculiarities that must be reformed. Cromer notes in a Memorandum that Syrians display the "power of inductive reasoning' and a certain 'strength and virility of character'. An example of a capable, yet flawed, Armenian Christian is Prime Minister Nubar Pasha. Nubar is described as a "brilliant conversationalist" with a "subtle intellect" that was able to understand European concepts. Although he received a European education, he rejected many of the negative aspects of 'Western society' that most 'Orientals' characteristically embrace. Nubar's weakness was in his general 'character':

If he had only recognized the fact that in the government of the world mere intellectual gifts are not all-powerful, and that high character and reputation also exercise a potent influence over mankind, he would have been a really great man.
Cromer reminds his readers that an administrator is not guaranteed success by an advanced intellect; ‘good character’ is equally important. Nubar was a "bad administrator" who was more suited to ‘statesmanship’ than local administration. Despite his advanced intellect compared to other ‘dwellers’, Nubar was still inadequate according to British standards.

Nubar’s flaws reveal that the ‘Oriental mind’ is not considered solely responsible for inefficiency in the East. Negative French influence is another culprit. Egyptians who have received a French education either at home or abroad display problematic ‘character traits’. Cromer argues that Nubar’s French education ingrained two poor qualities into his character: dogmatism and also an inability to motivate others to work. As an administrator, these two traits are considered to be unacceptable. Another example of French corruption is found in the mind of Nubar’s son-in-law, Tigrane Pasha, who served as Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs and also Foreign Minister. While comparable to any European in his morality, his intellect was "Franco-Byzantine, that is to say, the foundation was Byzantine whilst the superstructure was French." In other words, Tigrane had an ‘Oriental mind’ that could not escape from such traditional flaws as emphasizing details at the expense of the main point of an argument. In addition he was driven by a ‘French character’ that "is hypercritical, and which is, moreover, unwilling to adopt a severe process of inductive reasoning." Cromer’s denigration of French influence on the ‘Egyptian mind’ indicates that his discussion of ‘Western’ and ‘European’ superiority over the ‘Oriental mind’ is conditional. In general descriptions, that relationship is unquestioned, but when it comes to prescriptions on how to remedy the deficient ‘Eastern’, in this case through education, English methods are naturally superior.
French influence has also retarded the development of ‘Europeanized Egyptians’, according to Cromer. This group is the initial product of intellectual and moral influence derived from the West. However, their enduring ‘Oriental characteristics’ and also undesirable ‘French qualities’ are portrayed as flaws. Since the reign of Muhammad Ali, most Europeanized Egyptians have been educated in France, where they adopted European ‘intellectual and moral habits’. Cromer notes that Europeanized Egyptians are really ‘Galicized Egyptians’. To his disappointment, they have traditionally absorbed "French habits of thought" as opposed to English. Cromer argues that French administrative methods are unsuitable for the Egyptians. Furthermore, the French system contributes little to proper intellectual and moral regeneration:

...the French bureaucratic and legal systems...are little adapted to the formation of either competent officials or useful citizens in a country such as Egypt.

Cromer describes the Europeanized Egyptian’s natural attraction to French administration. He finds many things in common between French methodology, and the Egyptian personality. Firstly, the Napoleonic code is very detailed, and the Egyptian allegedly pays much attention to detail. Both the system and the Egyptian in this context sacrifice generalities. Egyptians also like the French system for its detailed instructions: following rules leaves little chance for initiative. Cromer argues that ‘the native’ does not like to think for himself, scrupulously avoids responsibility, and "spurns common sense". The Egyptian allegedly prefers theory over practice, even if a deviation is obviously necessary, as in the case of an emergency. Cromer cites different ridiculous situations to show how ‘the native’ follows rules without thinking about them or the situations. He concludes that by adopting French ‘habits of thought’ and systems of administration the Europeanized Egyptian has been "half-educated". This has left him in "his political and intellectual youth" also without religious foundation as a "de-Moslemised Moslem". As a new entity among the ‘dwellers’, he
has much promise for the future. Entrenched in adolescence for nearly one century, the Europeanized Egyptian’s ‘mind’ is portrayed as ripe for intellectual maturation.

**COMPARISON**

Cromer often emphasizes his point in descriptions by comparing the Eastern with the Western ‘mind’ where ‘Eastern flaws’ are emphasized against ‘Western attributes’. The obvious conclusion to be drawn from these comparisons is that the two ‘minds’ are different from each other. Promoting the fact of difference between East and West is central to Orientalism, which

was ultimately a political vision of reality whose structure promoted the difference between the familiar (Europe, the West, ‘us’) and the strange (the Orient, the East, ‘them’).

In *Modern Egypt* Cromer’s ‘catalogue’ of comparisons has been compiled in order to reveal the consistent difference between East and West. This is logical considering the fact that West and East are theoretically ‘familiar and strange’. Cromer states:

I have, however, thought it desirable to make a catalogue - and, I may add, a very incomplete catalogue - of the main points as to which Egyptian and European habits of thought and customs diverge....

He compares in order to reveal that the differences between East and West are actually obstacles to the Anglo-Egyptian administration and eventual native self-government. How are Anglo-Egyptians to advise their ‘subjects’ on the art of ‘civilization’? Intellectual and moral reform of ‘the Eastern mind’ would help to overcome these difficulties of difference. By recommending that the East be reformed, Cromer acknowledges the West as superior. In different contexts of comparison ‘the Western mind’ is portrayed as superior to the ‘Eastern’, which is another Orientalist technique. There is little possibility that ‘the Eastern mind’ will ever be judged ‘better’ than the ‘Western’. Through the process of comparison, Cromer confirms the ‘facts’ of ‘difference’ and also ‘inferiority’ of the ‘Eastern mind’. The remedy of
intellectual and moral reform pits West *against* East, or superior versus inferior, to extinguish the disruptive differences. Cromer portrays a polarized world consisting of right and wrong, good and bad, 'familiar and strange', West and East. The differences are necessary in order to justify reform of the wrong, bad, strange East.

Cromer concludes that the 'Oriental' and 'the Englishman', or 'Western', are opposites. Through comparisons, the former is portrayed as the opposite of the latter. Mitchell argues that this process of comparison is another attempt to confirm the 'self' identity of the imperial power, by identifying its opposite, or 'other'. The imperial state's identity was allegedly achieved through defining its opposite, which embodies those undesirable qualities that the state excludes. Hence the imperial state stands for everything that the 'Oriental state' does not. In this argument, maintaining self-identity requires the maintenance of the opposite. As mentioned in the previous chapter, this idea of Cromer suffering from an identity crisis regarding the 'English character' appears to be unconvincing. However, his insistence on the oppositeness of 'Orientals' can be explained as an attempt to define or explain the English identity. Whether he was trying to secure it or not is difficult to prove. The significance of Cromer's comparisons in this thesis is not whether Cromer is subconsciously trying to resuscitate a lagging English identity for his readers. They are important for showing how he uses comparison as another method for dominating 'the Oriental' by emphasizing him as a *problem* for the imperial administration.

In Cromer's comparisons the standard for a good 'mind' is the 'Western', while 'the Oriental mind' displays the opposite, and therefore deficient traits of 'otherness'. He notes in "The Dwellers" that if one compares the many points of culture "It will be found that on every point they are the poles asunder." On the next page he presses his point by stating that in comparing the "mental and moral attributes" of East and
West, "It will be found that the antitheses are striking."¹¹⁵ Later on in his narrative, Cromer again stresses the fact that "...somehow or other the Oriental generally acts, speaks, and thinks in a manner exactly opposite to the European."¹¹⁶ Having opposite thought processes between East and West is considered an obstacle to good working relations. Particularly problematic for the imperial administration is the further fact that the European and the Oriental, reasoning from the same premises, will often arrive at diametrically opposite conclusions.¹¹⁷

The European has constantly to guard against faulty Egyptian 'conclusions'. Cromer argues that 'the Eastern' appears almost 'impulsively' to follow the 'exactly opposite' course of 'the Western', in any situation. Cromer finds the oppositeness to be "interesting" and notes that it is useful to expand on this theme, which he does through his comparisons. Cromer footnotes an absurd example of how differently an 'Eastern' and a 'Western' conceptualizes:

An Englishman, who was a keen observer of Egyptian manners and customs, told me that, as a test of intelligence, he once asked a fellah to point to his left ear. A European would certainly have taken hold of the lobe of his left ear with his left hand. The Egyptian passed his right hand over the top of his head and with that hand grasped the upper part of his left ear.¹¹⁸

What Cromer perceives as an unusual manner in which the Egyptian grabbed his left ear, emphasizes his difficult task of reforming the Egyptian. 'The Western' can only predict that 'the Eastern mind' will take an opposite direction, but does not actually know what he will do.

Cromer makes a series of general comparisons of the Western and Eastern 'minds'. In each situation, the 'Eastern' is portrayed as the negative of the 'Western'. In his "Introductory" to Modern Egypt Cromer blames the foreigner's difficulty in understanding 'the native mind' on "the want of mental symmetry and precision, which is the chief distinguishing feature between the illogical and picturesque East and the
logical West'. This early comparison is expanded upon in the "The Dwellers". Here he continues the theme of imprecision:

Want of accuracy, which easily degenerates into untruthfulness, is, in fact, the main characteristic of the Oriental mind.

Cromer implies that his 'native' subordinates can not be trusted because they are naturally dishonest. This is further complicated by their pervasive use of "intrigue"; by contrast, Europeans despise 'intrigue' and are "blunt" in their honesty. ‘Orientals’ are categorized as illogical, contradictory, gullible, careless and unable to withstand scrutiny; they have a tendency to complicate simple ideas, a "natural inconsistency and want of rational discrimination". The ‘Oriental mind’ appears to be confused and in desperate need of direction. ‘The Western mind’ is portrayed as accurate, organized, reasonable, easy to understand, logical and symmetrical. Europeans acquire intelligence through study and training and never believe anything without supporting evidence. In power relationships Europeans despise and discourage flattery, while ‘Orientals’ flatter their "superiors" and expect the same from their "inferiors". Cromer finds the near institution of flattery in the East as especially despicable because it hides the ‘truth’. Egyptians flatter the governing classes instead of expressing their political grievances and within the bureaucracy fresh ideas and progress are stifled by the unwritten laws of sycophancy.

Many other ‘native flaws’ are compared with ‘Western attributes’ to emphasize their debilitating effect on the imperial administration. ‘The native’ appears to be generally uninterested in foreign things, intellectually lazy and prone to procrastination, all of which qualify him for the moment as a ‘subject race’. Cromer compares the "grave and silent Eastern, devoid of energy and initiative, stagnant in mind", with the energetic Europeans who are "talkative...bursting with superfluous energy, active in mind, inquisitive" and anxious to overcome obstacles. The ‘Western’ is also intolerant of
society's misery, while the 'Eastern' is patient, which is usually considered a virtue in Western society but in this case is not: 'natives' suffer under injustices quietly because they do not know how to conquer them. Europeans are thrifty, especially the French, while 'Orientals' are spendthrift.

Perhaps there is no point as to which the difference between Eastern and Western habits of thought comes out into stronger relief than in views which are respectively entertained by the Oriental and the European as regards provision for the future in this world. Cromer emphasizes the importance of this point by noting that it is 'perhaps' the best example of divergence between East and West. The average Egyptian is allegedly unable to understand arithmetic and the various uses of numbers because these, along with science, are considered unimportant. Egyptians are allegedly unable to estimate quantity and invariably go to extremes, whether it be a person's age, the strength of an army or the measurement of a cooking ingredient. By contrast, 'Westerns' have a natural aptitude for using numbers.

Cromer's understanding from a religious perspective is portrayed through extensive comparisons of Christians and Moslems, reaffirming the East-West division. Islam is blamed for certain negative aspects of 'the Oriental' which are offset against Christian positives. The Christian allegedly tolerates different religious practices and beliefs. Cromer prescribes reform based on 'the Englishman's' devotion to the Christian Code:

'Rather let us, in Christian charity, make every possible allowance for the moral and intellectual shortcomings of the Egyptians, and do whatever can be done to rectify them.'

'The Englishman' will help others because he behaves according to Christian values of 'charity' and tolerance. By contrast, the Moslem is intolerant to the core. Moslems rely on the state for moral and religious guidance, which the West gave up long ago. Islamic "punishments" are often tortuous by 'Western' standards, which is carried over into everyday society where cruelty is a way of life. Religious customs also
contribute to the 'Oriental mentality'. Christians go to Church, Moslems attend the Mosque; Christians hope to meet with loved ones in heaven, Moslems meet the other worldly Houris; Christians pray daily in private, Moslems pray in public; Christians fast with moderation in the daytime and sleep at night - if they fast at all - and Moslems "indulge without restraint at night". This disdainful lack of "restraint" is reminiscent of Samuel Smiles' point that 'good character' requires 'self control', which Cromer implies is the mark of a good Christian. Arguing that Moslems are essentially driven by their religion, Cromer does not credit them with positive traits because they are recognized as positive, or accomplishing anything for a conscious purpose. For example, Moslems are convinced of God's influence in every situation far more than Christians; also, Christians are clean because it is "healthy" and "comfortable", while Moslem hygiene is dictated by Koranic "tradition". The comparatively secular Englishmen were required to accept these religious differences because they touched every aspect of 'Oriental' life. Cromer points out that the various ceremonies and rituals, such as the fast of Ramazan and the feast of Bairam, were necessarily respected, but in 'reality' probably barely tolerated, depending on the individual Englishman's Christianity.

Moslem attitudes to women are abhorrent to Cromer. The position of Moslem women is sympathetically compared with "that of their European sisters." Moslem women have veiled faces and are secluded in harems, while European women expose themselves and the extent of societal integration is dictated by their own conscience. At Christian marriages, vows are taken for life and are usually observed. Moslems leave their wives when they become bored of them. The result of this disrespect for marriage in the 'Western' sense is that Christians enjoy monogamy and Moslems must endure polygamy. Polygamy creates many disruptions within 'native society' because it lowers the position of women. Cromer argues that
whereas in the West the elevation of women has tended towards the refinement both of literature and of conversation, in the East their degradation has encouraged literary and conversational coarseness. European society cherishes the idea of 'family' and also respects the "ideal of womanhood" above her human station. Cromer argues that

The Moslem, on the other hand, despises women; both his religion and the example of his Prophet ... tend to lower them in his eyes.

Cromer is less concerned with the misery of Moslem women than with the effects of that misery on society as a whole. For example, he considers polygamy to be detrimental because it disrupts the family. The hypotheses of Smiles are recalled: 'companionship in marriage' and 'good home life', where the mother's influence and the power of 'good' women are the most important contribution to civilization - even over the scientific, literary and artistic productions of "great men"!

Cromer expresses the views of a 'typical Englishman' who, in the Empire and at home, saw women's roles as "guardians of family values" and teachers who "trained their children for citizenship."

Family stability was considered a prerequisite to societal stability, neither of which was assured with the degradation of women.

Cromer's descriptions of female oppression reveal that both Moslem women and their male oppressors have corrupted Egyptian society. The significance of Cromer's general descriptions and comparisons is that all Egyptians are confirmed to be problematic. The experiences of religion, history and culture have allegedly combined to form the deficient 'national character' of all 'dwellers'. Cromer discusses the Egyptian's religious practices, historical experiences, culture and "his moral and intellectual attributes". Cromer explains that he has described 'the Egyptian' in detail in order to show his unfitness for survival in a modernized Egypt.

I have attempted to show how little suited the Egyptian is to lie on the bed which, as an incident of modern progress, has been prepared for him.
He notes that at times, he has described Egyptians "harshly." This is for accuracy, not condemnation. By consistently depreciating 'the Egyptian mind', Cromer justifies his goal of intellectual and moral regeneration. Emphasizing 'native deficiency' emphasizes the need for improvement. Cromer concludes that it would be easier to Europeanize the Egyptian, rather than Egyptianize the European because the European is too rigid. Furthermore, why Egyptianize the European if the former is flawed and the latter is superior? Cromer argues:

"Broadly speaking, in spite of every effort, the bed could not be made to fit the Egyptian; the Egyptian had to adapt himself to lying on the bed."

The bed is a reformed society prepared by British 'advisers'. Egypt is being developed, and its inhabitants must follow. Cromer's comment can also be seen as a justification for the Occupation, because emphasizing Egyptian deficiency legitimates the need for British guidance. The following chapter examines the viability of reforming the very 'deficient Egyptian mind'.
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CHAPTER 3: SOCIAL ENGINEERING

'MORAL AND MATERIAL' REFORM

The preceding chapter discussed Cromer's creation of 'the Oriental' through literature. He portrays a deficient and even threatening 'subject'. This chapter examines Cromer's attempts to re-create 'the Oriental' through material, and especially social reforms. This chapter goes beyond the Orientalist analyses of Said, Mitchell and Mason by showing how an Orientalist applies his apparent 'knowledge'. Domination theorists discuss epistemology; this thesis shows how the imperialist uses his Orientalist conclusions to reform 'the Oriental'. Cromer seeks to change, form, or re-form the 'Egyptian mind' into something more useful through the medium of structural reforms. He advocates a process of social engineering where the social system is reformed with the desired effect of reforming Egyptian morality. This domino effect of 'structural' or 'material' reforms is the general theme of this chapter. In section One, the equal importance of 'moral and material' reforms is established. Section Two examines the problems of the existing social system, and those social reforms that Cromer considers to be the most effective for the Egyptian's moral and intellectual development.

While Cromer agrees with Lecky that a country's moral condition is more important than its material, he rates moral and material reforms of equal importance. This is particularly evident in Cromer's references to moral and material reforms in the same phrase. Zetland repeats the turn of phrase by noting that Egypt was a "moral and material desert" before British rule.¹ This would be corrected by Cromer's dedication to 'moral and material' improvement:

Above all other objects of Lord Cromer's conception of Imperialism stood the conferment of 'moral and material blessings' upon others. That was the constant aim and ultimate achievement of his work in Egypt.²
The significance of Cromer's dual objectives is that he bisects his 'subject', 'the Egyptian', according to his needs: the body requires material comfort, while the 'mind' needs moral guidance. Since Cromer seeks to reform the whole 'Egyptian', moral and material reforms are logically of equal importance. William Welch notes the parity of moral and material reform:

Careful reflection led Englishmen to conclude that Egypt's condition was due as much to the weakness of the Egyptian character as to the fragility of indigenous institutions....The Agency, therefore, committed itself to resolving both problems.

The 'Egyptian character' was subject to moral reform, while the 'indigenous institutions' fell within the 'material' sphere. Cromer himself contends that reformers should encourage the "moral and material development of the people." He discusses 'moral and material' reform within the context of augmenting the debt for irrigation investment. In his Annual Report of 1891, Cromer argues that extending credit enabled Egyptian production to increase, which led to eventual solvency and even relative affluence. He states that until financial stability was achieved, "no very serious effort was possible in the direction of moral and material progress." Here moral and material progress are equal goals, while fiscal reform is a necessary prerequisite. In his conclusion, Cromer also notes that among other reasons, the occupation has been extended for the "moral and material interests" of Egyptians. By the 1911 edition of *Modern Egypt*, Cromer observes that the Sudan is also advancing toward "moral and material progress." Cromer advises that moral and material reform should continue long after his departure from Egypt.

Another indication of the equal importance of moral and material reform is the relationship between the Christian Code and structural reforms. Cromer argues that financial and legal rectitude would be undermined without sound Christian principles for guidance. At the beginning of his Consul-Generalship Cromer cites three
necessities for the Egyptian people: prosperity, "justice", and advancement "towards the true civilization of the West based on the principles of the Christian moral code." The Code is really an adjunct to "justice", because it provides a set of rules for responsible government through fair human relations. Referring to the interaction of 'imperial and subject races', Cromer concludes:

...it is important that, in our well-intentioned endeavours to impregnate the Oriental mind with our insular habits of thought, we should proceed with the utmost caution, and that we should remember that our primary duty is, not to introduce a system which, under the spurious cloak of free institutions, will enable a small minority of natives to misgovern their countrymen, but to establish one which will enable the mass of the population to be governed according to the code of Christian morality.

Intellectual and moral regeneration is identified as "impregnating the Oriental mind". The English benefactor gives 'insularity' and a 'system' based on the Christian code that will in turn protect the masses from oppressive elites. The Code-inspired system will establish a social climate where moral reform can flourish. Western-style "justice" will improve the morality of individual Egyptians. Although avoiding this claim, Cromer sounds as though he is attempting to create a 'just society', with his pretensions of superior Christian values that are tenuously linked to "justice". The connection of justice with the code is also identified in Zetland's biography. With the English abandonment of Khartoum in 1885, Cromer was free to devote himself wholeheartedly to the task which he kept steadily before himself throughout his career in Egypt - that of leading the Egyptian people from bankruptcy to affluence, from Khedivial monstrosities to British justice, and from barbarism towards the true civilisation of the West based on the principles of the Christian moral code.

Zetland also stresses Cromer's commitment to financial, legal and moral reform, and hardly deviates from the Consul's own words. He implies that Cromer ranks the Christian moral code, 'British justice' and wealth as interdependent. Relieving financial, legal and moral oppression would open the possibility for a new 'Egyptian' to emerge.
Cromer argues that the fellah has experienced 'moral and material progress'. The fellaheen are the main object of English philanthropy, as they are identified as needing the most 'moral and material' help.

It is for the civilized Englishman to extend to them the hand of fellowship and encouragement, and to raise them, morally and materially, from the abject state in which he finds them.11

On the topic of fiscal and hydraulic improvements, Cromer argues that Egyptian cultivators, many of whom are fellaheen, will profit. A financial "surplus" ensures that cultivators will enjoy some "moral and material improvement."12 Zetland notes that among the British achievements in Egypt, the fellah has been given the opportunity to enjoy a "life richer in material well-being and spiritual content than any that had hitherto come within their ken."13 Spiritual contentment, while not specifically 'moral', is certainly within the fellah's 'mind' as opposed to his body, which enjoys 'material well-being'. For the fellah, "moral progress and elevation of thought" have been among the many gifts of British rule.14 Cromer hopes that the English benefactors will gain their rightful recognition; unfortunately, the fellah has not appreciated English assistance. As part of his imperial duty, Cromer champions the fellah despite the alleged ingratitude.

In any case, whether the Egyptian fellah be capable or incapable of gratitude, there can be no doubt that it was the hand of England which first raised him from the abject moral and material condition in which he had for centuries wallowed.15

The root of ingratitude is in the fellah's alleged Moslem hostility. After describing the benefits that 'the Moslem' has received, Cromer sums them up: "...in a word, his material comfort may be increased, his intellect may be developed, and his moral being elevated under British auspices...."16 The 'Moslem body and mind' has been subjected to material, intellectual and moral regeneration. Despite the alleged improvements, racial and religious differences inevitably preclude successful mental reform. Cromer points out that 'the Moslem' will never forget the differences between himself and his
foreign benefactors. For Muslims, moral and material changes are not necessarily 'progress'.

In discussing the morality of Egyptian administrators, Cromer's terminology slightly changes where 'structural' replaces 'material' reform. Material and structural reforms are synonymous: both combined financial and administrative assistance to revive the political and fiscal system;¹⁷ both are also located within 'native society', and involve the 'native's body', not his 'mind'. Cromer identifies the Department of the Interior as especially impaired by immoral administrators. The reformer faces "perverted morals, and habits of thought with which he was unfamiliar."¹⁸ Admittedly, 'perverted morals' and different thought patterns are not unique to Egyptians. What is unique is that Cromer identifies these as problems that can and should be rectified. Egyptian habits of thought and morals are treated here as workable objects, as components of the local structure, instead of the 'local mind'. Cromer argues that the Department of the Interior could benefit if its 'administrative mind' were improved. He states the reformer's mission: "In order to succeed, he would have to be a moral, even more than an administrative reformer."¹⁹ The object of the moral reformer is the Egyptian administrator, while the object of the administrative reformer would be the administration. Cromer argues that the administrators required more attention than the administration. In this case, moral reform is more important than structural reform: it is not to be the result of administrative reform, but its precursor. The morality of Department officials has to be improved before the Department would benefit. In turn, moral elevation at the top of society would likely trickle down to the masses.

THE DOMINO EFFECT OF STRUCTURAL REFORM

The equal importance of moral and material reforms has been established; the remaining discussion elaborates on this relationship by exploring their sequence.
Reforms were implemented with a domino effect: various administrative changes were to effect improvements in the 'native mind'. As the body becomes stronger, 'the mind' is able to expand. Cromer argues that government and finance should be regulated first, which would allow Egyptians to assimilate the Victorian moral code through a natural progression. Good government, stable finance and economic security should inspire moral and intellectual well-being. At the beginning of this cycle, Governmental reform was crucial. Britain would supervise the development of the administration, and of the administrators' 'character'. Victorians in general believed that 'prosperity and contentment' should lead to political order, which leads to 'character' improvement.

That moral improvement and intellectual enlightenment attended the growth of prosperity, that all three depended upon political and economic freedom, remained their characteristic and passionate beliefs. However stated, material reform was thought by Victorians, and especially Cromer, to encourage intellectual and moral development. William Welch is quite aware of this cycle in Egypt. Instead of using the terms 'material' or 'structural', Welch discusses reforms to the local 'environment'. He notes that

There was a growing belief that some characteristics, though deeply embedded in the popular psyche, could be modified. Together, with the passage of time, a healthier environment might significantly alter the Egyptian character.

'Material', 'structural', and 'environmental' reforms are synonymous. Their common denominator is that they deal with changes to the inanimate world around the Egyptian, as opposed to changes to the Egyptian himself. Cromer outlines the main reforms that should elicit 'good character', which will be discussed for the remainder of this chapter.

Welch identifies five government initiatives that were supposed to contribute to the improvement of 'the Egyptian character'. The Agency sought to reform the judicial system, teach responsible money management, and establish controls on gambling, narcotics and alcohol. With these legal and social advancements, Egyptian society
would be closer to 'civilization' and 'modernity'. Judicial reform had two goals: to improve the system, and to curb the rising crime rate. Cromer believed that most complaints against the system had some merit.\textsuperscript{23} Egyptian magistrates and police were accused of inefficiency, provincial authorities and general sentencing were considered lax, and the Napoleonic Code "was ponderous and inelastic."\textsuperscript{24} Cromer's remedy was a form of "personal government" through a "single judge system" of summary tribunals, and for smaller cases trial by the local omdehs, or village chiefs. Reforms were thought to inspire faith in the system and respect for the law, both of which would contribute to a decreased crime rate. Welch notes that more cases were brought to trial, which implies that crimes of vengeance were replaced with legal recourse. 'Respect' and 'faith' in law were obviously more difficult to measure, as Welch fails to comment on the expected results.

The British Agency sought to protect the fellah from the debilitating effects of illegal drugs and alcohol. Cromer attempted to stop the importation of hashish, which was smuggled through the Suez Canal, the Eastern and Western coast of Alexandria, and the Gulf of Suez.\textsuperscript{25} A camel Corp was stationed at Mersa Matrouk, which was situated in a vulnerable Bedouin controlled area between Tripoli and Alexandria. The Corp was relatively unsuccessful against the skilled Bedouin smugglers; furthermore, decreased quantity forced hashish prices up, which in turn contributed to the already increasing crime problem.\textsuperscript{26} Welch argues that the failure to control the influx of hashish can not be blamed on Cromer, as "the consul could hardly be aware that this was merely the incipient stage of a drug problem that worsened over the next quarter of a century."\textsuperscript{27} Cocaine and also heroin would later supplant the hashish problem. Besides crime, poverty and mental deterioration, other moral corruptions caused by drugs included family instability, and even insanity.\textsuperscript{28} Alcohol was also a negative influence in Egyptian society. Aside from the negative effects that are similar to those
from drug use, alcohol consumption was against Islamic law. Despite religious prohibition, Greek proprietors had traditionally distributed liquor throughout Egypt and incurred Moslem hostility.\(^{29}\) As Westerners, the British did not want to be identified with the alcohol trade. Welch notes that from November 1891 liquor store licences were limited and more closely regulated; European districts of large cities were exempt. The Agency attempted to curb the Egyptian's accessibility to alcohol by direct intervention.

Financial reforms were impeded by international restrictions within the Egyptian government. Under the Capitulations, foreign nationals who were accused of crimes in Egypt had to be arrested and tried by their own compatriots. Besides alcohol, the Greek community largely controlled gambling and moneylending in Egypt, which forced Cromer to confront the Greek consulate in his efforts for suppression. Cromer argues that gambling is a negative influence for Egyptians seeking fast returns, and also a threatening temptation for reckless spending.\(^{30}\) Gambling raids were often undermined by the Greek diplomatic representative who refused to participate. Owing to their obstructive tactics, Cromer "held the Greeks directly responsible" for the endurance of gambling houses.\(^{31}\) Cromer acknowledges the European contribution to increasing crime, because some 'Oriental' criminals were 'corrupted' by poor European influences. He argues that this was the fault of the 'Oriental mind', which is naturally attracted to the worst aspects of the 'European character'. The Greek Consul embodied those very negative aspects of the 'European character' that Cromer was trying to hide from 'the Oriental'. Unfortunately, Cromer not only had to educate 'Orientals' on the destructive effects of gambling, he also had to tackle the source of their corruption: Greek opportunists.
Equally debilitating to the 'Egyptian character' was Greek moneylending. Welch argues that high interest rates and mounting loans to cover old debts contributed to the peasant "fatalism" that Cromer repeatedly observes. Official responses to peasant indebtedness were government loans and the creation of the National Bank in 1898, and the Post Office Savings Bank for fellaheen deposits. Unfortunately, the Savings Bank did not attract as many fellaheen as was projected. The fellaheen were apprehensive about surrendering their wealth to a foreign institution. An Islamic restriction on collecting interest also undermined the effect of the banks. One last effort at financial relief was the revision of land taxes. Cultivated land would be taxed at one-half of the annual rate for the first two years to encourage productivity; land that had to be irrigated by wells instead of Nile flooding was exempt to aid the most oppressed fellaheen. In both situations, incentives and optimism for improved conditions were important objectives.

REFORMING THE SOCIAL SYSTEM

This section examines Cromer's prescriptions for social reform. In Modern Egypt, Cromer states that there are two types of reforms to be instituted in 'backward' countries: structural and 'social'. Both involve changes to the Egyptian 'environment' for the purpose of changing 'the Egyptian'. Although Cromer separates them into structural and social, they are really all within the Egyptian structure; they are tangible components of Egyptian society that affect the Egyptian's body directly, and his 'mind' indirectly. Although social reform is composed of changes to the structure, Cromer discusses the changes that would benefit 'the Egyptian'. Cromer states that social reconstruction attacks long-standing abuses or faulty habits of thought, which are ingrained to such an extent into the minds of the population as to require a social almost as much as an administrative revolution in order to ensure their education.
Social revolution would require changes in the corrupt system and also changes in how ‘the native’ views society. The system must first be reformed before it can be viewed differently, and hopefully positively. Cromer argues that a formidable obstacle is Egyptian ‘habits of thought’, because they have been accustomed to corruption for centuries. This is not easily changed. They need to be shown how to change, and the benefits incurred.

In order to understand why Cromer prescribes moral reform, the fundamentals of Egyptian morality that he finds so objectionable should be analyzed. The source of Egyptian morality is to be found in Islam, which permeates every aspect of society through its ‘social system’. In Egypt ‘character’ was shaped by religion to a much greater extent than in England. Cromer agrees with a renowned Orientalist, Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole, whom he considers a "close observer of the strong and weak parts of Islamism", that the system was a "complete failure". Cromer repeatedly indicts Islam for anachronism, with seventh century rules for the ‘primitive’ Arabian peninsula applied to every facet of ‘modern’ Egyptian society. He even questions the validity of Koranic laws, which he sees as ‘traditions’, ‘customs’, and in some cases ‘perversions’, rather than as interpretations of the Prophet Muhammad. Although his reasons for the social ‘failure’ of Islam are considered to be "manifold", Cromer develops only four theses: the interdependence of secular law and religion, toleration of slavery, religious intolerance, and the mis-treatment of women. Besides their ties to Islam, the four social corruptions that Lane-Poole identifies are part of an unwritten ‘Oriental moral code’. They involve what Cromer and Lane-Poole perceive as the abuse of three human groups: women, slaves, and religious minorities. In the case of legal-religious omnipotence, the entire Egyptian population is affected. Cromer finds the four Islamic tenets identified by Lane-Poole to be morally repugnant and in need of reform. Cromer’s concerns with slavery, antiquated laws and intolerance as mentioned above
will now be discussed. The analysis of the plight of Egyptian women that was introduced in Chapter Two will be resumed at the end of this chapter.

The institution of slavery in the Islamic social system is considered to be a "fatal blot". Interestingly, Cromer fails to elaborate on this condemnation in his usual fashion, perhaps because the difference between 'Eastern' and 'Western' appears to be quite narrow. He admits that Christians have hunted and owned slaves in the past, but to maintain a semblance of difference to the 'barbarous' Muslims, he stipulates that Christianity has never "sanctioned" slavery. Cromer concedes that "as a general rule, slaves are well treated" and compares them to 'Western servants', who were actually less well off because they could be fired without compensation, while an 'Oriental' slave owner was supposed to support dismissed slaves. This reversal of the differences between East and West (ie. that East is now better than West) is short lived because 'Orientals' still indulged in the Slave Trade, which Cromer hopes would eventually be crushed. His successful program was to cut off the slave supply from other countries, and to discourage slave-owning in Egypt. Two conditions blocked Cromer's efforts: most of the slaves in Egypt were women in harems, and also the potential for Moslem leaders' disapproval. Women leaving the harem, Cromer explains, were penniless and often "starved or fell into a life of vice", which meant that emancipation was not necessarily good. A Home for Freed Female Slaves was provided in Cairo to curb this hopeless situation. Secondly, slavery was protected under the Sacred Law of Islam (Sheriat), which made its abolition no simple process of Christian, or even Khedival Decree. This would be considered by religious leaders as meddling with the Sheriat which, Cromer argues, 'the Englishman' will "scrupulously" avoid, no matter how immoral, or inhumane he finds the sanctified abuses.
The Sheriat had strict jurisdiction over issues "relating to personal status" such as wills, successions or divorce among Muslims. Cromer includes many examples of what his 'Western mind' considers to be 'injustice'.

'Civilized Englishmen' were particularly offended by Moslem punishments, such as crucifixion and other forms of mutilation that Cromer claims must be allowed to continue. The problems of different perspectives here are very complicated: opposing conceptions of justice could never be reconciled because Moslem values were entrenched in their social system, their laws, and their sense of ultimate truth (religion). Such a combination of divergent institutions, Cromer concludes, has produced an 'inelastic' society. The inherent contradiction of Cromer's purpose is in his determination to tolerate Islamic injustices while establishing a Christian code of morality; to stay out of the Kadi's courts but reform the secular; to reform Egyptian society when the social system is based on Islam! Reform was impossible without infiltrating Islam. The contradictions are less glaring with his conviction that the system is crumbling:

let no practical politician think that they have a plan capable of resuscitating a body, which is not, indeed, dead, and which may yet linger on for centuries, but which is nevertheless politically and socially moribund, and whose gradual decay cannot be arrested by any modern palliatives however skilfully they may be applied.

Cromer appears to identify 'the Englishman' as a participant in the historical process of sweeping away corruption. His own part within this larger scheme was as the 'man on the spot' who had skillfully to control the battle between modernity and antiquity in Egypt so that it appeared as progress.

Cromer also includes personal and public examples of Moslem intolerance in Modern Egypt. The 'European family of Christians' is generally portrayed as tolerant and progressive, and ultimately as peaceful. Cromer is no exception, relating Ramazan visits to the 'Alim' (notable) Sheikh el-Bekri even under strained conditions:
I always felt that, when I left his house, he cursed me, my race, and my
religion, and I never entertained the least ill-will against him for doing
so.\footnote{42}

Without explaining the reason for his tolerance of the Alim's behavior, Cromer's reaction is certainly Christian: turn the other cheek when someone strikes you so that they can strike the other side. Cromer returns to the old sheikh's house even though he is secretly 'struck' every time he leaves, presumably because he understands that the old sheikh did not know any better. To recall Said's terminology, tolerance was another virtue within the imperial 'knowledge' that excluded Moslems. Cromer identifies the Moslems as negatives for responding to adverse situations within the Old Testament tradition of an 'eye for an eye', which was the precursor to 'turn the other cheek'. A typical example of 'native intolerance' is shown in Cromer's comparison of Christians and Moslems:

Islam, therefore, unlike Christianity, tends to engender the idea that revenge and hatred, rather than love and charity should form the basis of relations between man and man; and it inculcates a special degree of hatred against those who do not accept the Moslem faith.\footnote{43}

Cromer lists various situations where intolerance is reinforced in the 'system': at the mosque religious leaders (Mollahs) recite verse to "invoke divine wrath on the heads of unbelievers", who could legally be enslaved if captured in war, or killed and sent to their rightful place in hell.\footnote{44} Cromer cites reports during the Arabi revolt of increasing tensions between Christians and Moslems. He concludes that Moslems were inspired by "race hatred and fanaticism":

A Sheikh had been crying aloud in the public thoroughfares, 'O Moslems, come and help me to kill the Christians!' On June 9, a Greek was warned by an Egyptian to 'take care, as the Arabs were going to kill the Christians either that day or the following day.' On the 10th, some low-class Moslems went about the streets calling out that 'the last day for the Christians was drawing nigh'.\footnote{45}

Even if these reports were exaggerated, their importance is in the fact that Cromer believes them. The differences are again redrawn as superior Christians had to try and understand 'inferior Moslem fanatics'.
Islam presents a considerable obstacle to Cromer's prescriptions for moral progress, acting as a fortress around 'Oriental society' to exclude Western influence. The 'Egyptian mind' is enveloped in Islamic ideals from childhood. Hence "the slow-thinking Moslem, weighted by his leaden creed" is basically isolated from other alternatives for moral inspiration.\(^{46}\) Cromer is well aware of the difficulty and even danger of penetrating the Islamic shield. He is admittedly confused over how to reform the Egyptian while respecting the authority and position of Islam. Reaching the Egyptian is difficult enough without having to deal with the protective mechanisms of religion. Officially, Cromer scrupulously discourages proselytism. Government Officials, Missionaries and philanthropists are cautioned against interfering with the Islamic system.\(^{47}\) Excessive prodding could cause great problems for the imperial administration because of Islam’s pervasive influence. Anti-British passions could be inflamed among Egyptians quite easily, especially with the Islamic history of alleged intolerance. Although the moral development appears to be unattainable, Cromer speculates that Islam may change over time, and with it a "higher moral and intellectual ideal" may evolve.\(^{48}\) The first hint of such change is identified in the ‘Europeanized Egyptian’, who has dropped much of his Moslem heritage.\(^{49}\) In the meantime, however, Cromer warns against disrupting the Islamic ‘pillars of society’.

Cromer is unable to achieve immediate reforms over those aspects of the system that are directed by Islam. This troublesome area is not his only target for social reform. In *Modern Egypt* Cromer devotes three chapters to his attack on the worst ‘long-standing abuses’ under secular jurisdiction. He identifies them as the "three C’s": courbash, corvee, and corruption. The first is an hippopotamus whip, the second is forced labour and the third is bribery. Ruling groups used these tortuous methods for discipline, tax recovery, intimidation, and also forcing confessions from both witnesses
and accused in court cases. Cromer discusses the positive and negative aspects of abolishing the "three C's" on intellectual and moral regeneration.

The courbush was an integral part of Egyptian life. Its "universal" application in various situations pre-empted more sophisticated means for punishment and coercion. At the urging of Lord Dufferin, a Circular was issued in Cairo on January 16, 1883, forbidding use of the courbush. It was signed by the Minister of Interior, Ismail Pasha Eyoub. Cromer notes that the Circular recognized that past restrictions of the courbush had been regrettably violated, but ensured that this one would be enforced. Dufferin "had initiated a social and administrative revolution." ‘Average Egyptians’ recognized the English as instigators of this new law, and were newly confident in resisting their oppressors. The negative side of courbush abolition was that it left a legal and judicial vacuum. There was nothing to replace the courbush for gaining evidence against people accused of crimes. Cromer argues that witnesses would never think to volunteer their information. Throughout Egyptian history, evidence had been forcibly extracted via the courbush. Since Egyptians were not used to this new freedom, disorder was possible. Potential criminals knew that traditional ‘habits of thought’ regarding the judicial process prevented witnesses and accusers from coming forward. Cromer notes that crime did increase in the beginning of the Occupation. Nubar Pasha instituted the Commissions of Brigandage in response; these employed torture, and the Circular was widely ignored. The Commissions remained until Sir John Scott assumed the Judicial Advisership in February 1891, when Dufferin’s vision of lifting the burden of torture from the Egyptian was finally achieved.

The second of the ‘three C’s’, the corvee, had also been an Egyptian tradition since Pharonic times. The courbush and corvee worked in tandem, as the former enforced the latter when necessary. Forced labour was used mainly for clearing mud.
from the canal beds during the low Nile, which was required for free-flowing irrigation. If the mud was not cleared, the Nile canals would clog and the fields would dehydrate. The corvee also supplied manpower for watching the high Nile against flooding. On April 2 1888 a Decree partially abolished the corvee, and from January 1892 the corvee was restricted to canal digging during the low Nile. Cromer notes that corvee manpower is still necessary for watching the high Nile, and although not totally abolished, it has been greatly diminished and is steadily decreasing.\textsuperscript{58} It was difficult to abolish the corvee because of international restraints, French objections, and also insufficient funds to support the free labour.\textsuperscript{59} Another problem was Egyptian refusal to dig the canals voluntarily.\textsuperscript{60} Cromer argues that Egyptians were unwittingly causing their own starvation. This dilemma lasted through 1883 and 1884. By January 1885, scientific advancements replaced the corvee: mud deposits were naturally transferred from the canal bed to the fields through flotation.\textsuperscript{61}

Abolishing the corvee and courbhash caused Egyptian habits of thought to change, as Cromer had expected. ‘Natives’ were forced to view ‘authority’ from a different perspective, other than fear. The police and judicature had to be perceived as fair to both accusers and accused. The old system of torture was supposed to be forgotten. In the case of forced labour, Egyptians had to view labour organizers not as oppressors, but as liberators from starvation and poverty. They had to learn that clearing the Nile bed was to their advantage instead of only for the benefit of their taskmasters. A formidable obstacle to courbhash and corvee abolition was the enduring habits of thought that instinctively rejected the supposedly positive benefits of reform.

Corruption was considered to be the final threat to social, and therefore intellectual and moral progress. Cromer defines corruption as ‘bribery’, or ‘backshish’ in various situations, but mainly in government circles. Most Egyptians allegedly traded in
backshish, from the Khedives down through the rungs of authority to the fellaheen. Power relationships depended on the weak paying the strong for favours, protection, privilege, etc. Cromer argues that when he arrived in Egypt bribery was so common that nothing could be accomplished without it. Since ‘Oriental society’ accepted corruption, it would take time to remedy this ‘habit of thought’. No matter what Decrees were passed at British instigation, it was again difficult to change public opinion. Cromer lists seven social-structural reforms that were expected to curtail backshish. Firstly, government expenses were to be recorded through a system of organized accounting and audit. The proclivity to extort would hopefully diminish with salary increases for government agents and also the lowest classes. Government stores and public works were to be supplied through tenders at fixed prices. The standards required of prospective court Judges would be raised. Corvee reforms meant that village sheikhs could no longer demand military exemption bribes from their fellaheen. Recruiting was systematized. And finally, British officials allegedly deterred corruption by their vigilance and also by their presence as examples of upright behavior. Cromer is uncertain about the success of these seven assaults on corruption, and blames the corrupt Egyptian nature for his inability to measure the results. He argues that since Egyptians do not like to complain, there is no way of finding out if they are still being forced to pay backshish. As for the officials, Cromer alleges that they are experts of deception and hence are difficult to trace. He concludes that bribery has been greatly reduced, but remains in various pockets of society and government.

What is the relationship between formal education and reforming the ‘Egyptian mind’? Cromer clearly sees a role for education by asking the following question at the beginning of Chapter LIX of Modern Egypt, entitled "Education": "What, however, has been done in the direction of moral and intellectual progress?" This is the first time he treats the topic of ‘moral and intellectual progress’ as distinct from ‘material,
structural, social or administrative progress'. Cromer regards 'the school' to be a natural center for moral and intellectual development. According to a fellow Anglo-Egyptian, J.E. Marshall:

'It was hoped that by education the people would acquire British minds and a British outlook, and that a race comparable to Victorian Liberals would be produced.'

Marshall does not identify who was 'hoping' for this transference of British 'minds and outlook' through education, but since Cromer was the Consul-General, it may be assumed that he is at least included, if not the instigator of this view. This hypothesis is confirmed in Cromer's writings where he suggests that by stretching the definition of 'education', formal schooling can contribute to 'character' reform:

if we speak of education in the broadest sense of the term - that is to say, if we include the formation not only of the intellect, but also of the character.

By specifying the formation of 'character', Cromer argues that not only intellect but also morality may be developed in the schools. However, formal education alone cannot reform the 'Egyptian national character'. Instead of explaining how 'character' can be reformed outside of the educational system, Cromer restates the need for its development:

National character is a plant of slow growth. Such instruction as can be afforded in schools and colleges only constitutes one of the elements which contribute to its modification and development. All that can be said is that no effort should be spared to foster the growth of all those moral and intellectual qualities which, collectively, tend to the formation of character.

Responding to suggestions in England that increased education should prepare Egyptians for independence, Cromer repeats his point in Abbas II:

Personally, I do not believe that such education as can be imparted in the schools and colleges will ever render the Egyptians capable of complete self-government without some transformation of the national character, which must necessarily be a slow process.

The extra-educational influences on 'character reform' are unidentified. Of course these have been discussed above in the context of other structural reforms. Their
mysterious quality within the discussion of educational reform unfortunately gives the impression that Cromer does not know how 'the Egyptian character' will be reformed outside of the schools. Cromer does note that schools have had some success in effecting 'Egyptian character development' and speculates "with a fair amount of confidence that something has been done towards forming and elevating the 'characters' of Egyptians." He concludes that 'character reform' in the schools is still in its earliest stages with intangible results:

> Whilst, however, it may reasonably be held that something has been done in the direction of imparting rectitude, virility, and moral equipoise to the Egyptian character, it must be admitted that there is still abundant room for improvement in all these directions. If the moral influences to which the Egyptians are now exposed were withdrawn, or even weakened, a relapse would inevitably ensue.

British forces should not be withdrawn before the 'Egyptian character' has been reformed, in this context through the minimal influence of the school system. The 'Egyptian mind' is again portrayed as an impediment to English evacuation because the process of intellectual and moral regeneration is incomplete.

Cromer did not see significant evidence of moral and intellectual development within the schools mainly because educational reform was a low priority. Also, education was more technical, than 'character' oriented. Cromer believed that the government was not responsible for financing educational development. In this case he was a typical 'Victorian liberal' with a laissez-faire ideology: Egyptians should finance and develop their own system of 'knowledge'. However, that system should conform to British standards, which were practical, as opposed to literary. Cromer supported primary and technical education because of their immediate benefits to Egypt. The system endeavored to produce farmers and government workers. Those suited for manual labour had to acquire skills in agriculture and irrigation because these areas held the most potential for employment and long term economic growth for Egypt.
Primary and secondary education were also geared to producing competent civil servants. To avoid the potential unemployment of these 'educated' Egyptians, Cromer increased tuition fees when necessary and also instituted entrance and graduation exams in the schools. This would curtail over-enrollment, and hopefully educate only the number of Egyptians necessary for government work. By concentrating on primary, secondary and technical instruction, Cromer has also been criticized for not encouraging 'higher education'. In his farewell speech, Cromer refutes the allegation that he neglected moral and intellectual development in Egypt by listing the many structural reforms that have also been discussed above; his argument supports the claim for moral development, but none of the reforms mentioned directly inspired intellectual regeneration as would be afforded in universities. Educational policy was therefore closely linked to politics and finance. 'Knowledge' was to be communicated if it would contribute to future economic growth, or political stability.

Civil Service education was the most popular discipline among Egyptians. Those who responded to education for government work allegedly saw Western 'knowledge' as important for their own personal advancement. In this discussion, Cromer specifies the Muslim Egyptian, as opposed to Copts, Jews and other 'dwellers' who may be considered 'Egyptian' but due to their ethnicity have been exposed to better educational opportunities. In class terms, Cromer refers to "the upper and middle classes of society" who are employed within the government. Cromer 'knows' that they are serious about wanting education because they are willing to pay for it after the initial period of free instruction. He argues that Egyptian realization of the need for improved education was part of their emergence out of 'backwardness'. Admitting that they were inferior to 'the Western' was the first step toward civilization:

The Egyptians have, in fact, made one great step forward in the race for a national existence. They have learnt that they are ignorant. They wish to be taught.
By ‘admitting’ that they needed help through Western instruction, they now wanted to become like ‘Westerns’. Cromer argues that since the reign of Muhammad Ali Egyptians devalued education, but with the Occupation an "intellectual awakening" occurred in Egypt.\(^8\) ‘Natives’ knew that they would have to educate their children so that they would qualify for jobs within the new society. Egyptians allegedly learned this by watching the steady advancement of educated Syrians, Europeans and Levantines. Concurrently, Egyptians were by-passed, and threatened with stagnation because of their inability to compete with educated ‘foreigners’. To advance, achieve parity and even intellectual superiority, Egyptians would have to educate themselves. Copts also felt that they had to improve themselves both to retain their clerical positions and also to advance like everyone else.\(^8\) Cromer notes that Copts were traditionally in a better position for employment because they were Christian and often educated in American missionary schools, as opposed to the Muslim directed Kuttabs. They also showed good potential for improvement as

> Many of the younger generation speak English, and show a tendency to develop moral and intellectual qualities generally superior to those or their fathers.\(^8\)

Their main rival was not the newly educated Egyptians, but Christian Syrian immigrants who were allegedly smarter and gaining many government positions at Coptic expense.

Cromer admits that educational reform has been slow and identifies two structural reasons: poor financing and obstructive ‘native administrators’.\(^8\) Available funds simply could not be stretched to cover education requirements. Tax reform and solvency were ranked more urgent. As for the Ministers of Education, Cromer argues that they appreciated the power of European ‘knowledge’, and the necessity for its dissemination. Acquiring such ‘knowledge’, and hence the secrets of ‘self-government’ were soon realized to be a sure way to oust the British ‘advisers’. Despite their
enlightenment, Cromer argues that poor administration of the Department of Public Instruction undermined their attempts at reform. Bureaucratic inertia threatened progress in the Department. Inconsistent policies and annual changes in leadership disrupted the previous year's innovations and also set in motion new policies that would only be retracted the following year. Cromer notes that many new schools deceptively appeared to enjoy 'progress'. This was strictly superficial because the quality of the facilities and also the qualifications of the instructors were inadequate. According to Cromer, opening new schools that were sub-standard not only stunted educational growth, but the system actually regressed.

Tampering with the education system also proposed many problems for the imperial administration. Besides his laissez-faire attitude and the desire to avoid unemployment, Cromer had other reasons that he felt legitimated a hold on educational development. Firstly, higher education was considered a threat because it creates a gulf between the upper and lower classes. Primary education was increased so that the fellah intellect would be sharpened enough to detect emerging nationalists and other apparent opportunists, whom Cromer calls the "'wily politician'." Nationalist ideas were considered threatening to the regime and the fellah, because they abused Western 'knowledge'. Egyptians were supposed to learn basic, technical skills and also the finer points of 'good character', not absorb Western concepts such as 'liberty', 'equality' or 'self-government' before they were ready. Hence developing 'the Egyptian' was potentially destructive. Welch points out that a sound Egyptian understanding of their masters could destabilise the imperial relationship.

Anglo-Egyptians never believed that Western education could significantly alter the Egyptian character. If anything, it might cause harm. Marshall supports this conclusion by observing that through education, the Egyptians have become "defiant". For Cromer, another obvious reason for limiting enrollment
through exams and fees was to curtail the development of an 'over-educated', unemployed elite. Unemployment was a financial and social drain on the administration and unemployed 'intellectuals' were also an outright threat. Idle time was an opportunity for contemplating their situation, the country's plight, and finally its causes, which would lead to criticism of the occupation. According to Mansfield, nationalist sentiments took root most easily in the Law School, where Anglo-Egyptians suspected that French teachers were inspiring anti-English thought. With Egyptian Law based on the Napoleonic Code, instructors were predominantly French. In 1899, an English department was introduced after much French objection. Despite increasing anglicization, the Law School was marred by Anglo-French tensions until 1907 when the French director was replaced by a Canadian. Amid the European dispute over control, an Egyptian 'nationalist' movement continued to grow within the Law School.

Another impediment to educational reform was Islam. 'Native' schools were traditionally based on Islamic 'knowledge'. 'Character reform' was hardly possible in the village Kuttabs or, as Cromer calls them, "Mosque Schools", because of their strict religious instruction. The only government interference in these village schools was in the form of supervision and reorganizing the curricula; by 1897 the '3 R's' were incorporated into the official curriculum and henceforth an increasing number of Kuttabs came under government direction each year. 'Supervision' was to be limited, as spreading Western 'knowledge' was dangerously close to proselytism. For this reason, Cromer avoided the El-Azhar University as a vehicle for educational improvement. As mentioned above, it was important not to upset Islam, even for the improvement of 'character'. The safest recourse was to identify the problems of Islamic centered education and discuss the need for change, as Cromer has done in his writings. Cromer criticizes the Kuttabs and Al-Azhar for their teaching by forced memorization as indoctrinating 'the mind' instead of stimulating the thought processes. This criticism,
although valid, is wholly theoretical when considering the instructional methods in state supervised schools. English teachers were not required to learn Arabic and simply dictated their lessons, which meant that students also had to learn through memorization because there were no translations. In unsupervised Kuttabs, students memorized the Koran, in Cromerian schools, they memorized blocs of dictated information. The only difference in the two systems is the type of 'knowledge' that was being communicated; and of course the state school pupils had the extra burden of assimilating 'knowledge' through a different language. In both situations, 'understanding' is less important than regurgitation of information.

The key to successful educational reform in Cromerian Egypt is not in its content or structure, but in its pupils. Cromer argues that women and girls have to be educated. Failure adequately to reform the 'national character' through schools is due to the fact that they are mainly attended by Egyptian males. Improving an educational system that only caters to males is useless.

If it be once admitted that no good moral results will accrue from female education in Egypt, then, indeed, the reformer may well despair of the cause of Egyptian education generally in the highest sense of the word. Cromer's argument is based on the debilitating effect that female ignorance has over the Egyptian men, who rule the country.

The position of women in Egypt, and in Mohammedan countries generally, is, therefore, a fatal obstacle to the attainment of that elevation of thought and character which should accompany the introduction of European civilization, if that civilization is to produce its full measure of beneficial effect. The "obvious remedy" is female education. No matter what the European does to elevate the Egyptian, he will not be successful unless he 'educates and elevates' 'native' women. The educated Egyptian man will never be complete without his educated female counterpart, who is responsible for his early development. Furthermore, the entire society will continue to suffer under the burden of female ignorance:
I wish to state my strong conviction, based on some thirty years of sympathetic intercourse with Orientals, that the East can never really advance unless some thorough - but, of course, gradual - change be made in the position of women. Education is, I need hardly say, only a part - albeit an important part - of the general question.

Cromer writes this in his Annual Report for 1901. The cause of female education was identified as crucial to mental and moral regeneration in his Annual Reports one decade earlier. The sincerity of his concern over the position of women in Egypt appears to be genuine.

Cromer denounces the Islamic restrictions on female education. He argues that Moslem law suppresses women’s intellectual and moral freedom and ultimately "cramps the intellect and withers the mental development of one-half of the population in Moslem countries." Women are denied access to formal education and kept ignorant within the confines of Islamic customs. For Cromer, the worst consequence of female oppression is not suffering, but the indirectly negative effect upon Egyptian men. Ignorant mothers are considered to be unproductive influences on their male children. Cromer cites seclusion as particularly damaging to male development via female stagnation. He stresses the destructive effect of female stagnation on the relationships between mothers and sons, and also husbands and wives:

Moreover, inasmuch as women, in their capacities as wives and mothers, exercise a great influence over the characters of their husbands and sons, it is obvious that the seclusion of women must produce a deteriorating effect on the male population, in whose presumed interests the custom was originally established, and is still maintained.

Women should improve their ‘mind’ in order to be a positive influence over the men in their homes. Matriarchs must be examples of fine morality and ‘knowledge’ to all male members of the household. Cromer concludes that Moslem women should also be educated to promote a better understanding between East and West by inculcating European values on men in the home. At present women have very little access to European ‘knowledge’ due to their seclusion. They are informed only by what reaches
the harem, which is often distorted rumors and "trumpery gossip" that inflames passions. Seclusion prevents daughters, mothers, aunts, grandmothers, from making balanced judgements on the truthfulness of their information and hence their actions and words are irresponsible.\textsuperscript{103} The Egyptian home is portrayed as a den of confusion perpetuated by ignorant women.

The status of female education in Cromerian Egypt has been criticized by historians. Negative results usually refer to the numbers of girls attending schools nationwide, as opposed to those directly supervised by the state. In 1895 six percent of students in state sponsored Kuttabs were female, which had risen to twenty-four percent by 1903 and thirty-seven percent by 1913.\textsuperscript{104} Female enrollment increased as the state absorbed more Kuttabs. By comparison, Kuttabs that were only helped by 'grants in aid' had seven percent female students in 1903 and ten percent in 1913.\textsuperscript{105} In the higher primary schools there were less opportunities for girls, but enrollment did increase slowly. Secondary and technical education was basically prohibited until long past Cromer's departure from Egypt.\textsuperscript{106} These restrictions reflect the fact that the goal of female education was not to produce professionals, but to create good wives and mothers, which was "their natural avocation"\textsuperscript{107} Women were to learn reading, writing and 'housewife' skills. As the first teacher of her children and the keeper of the household, the Egyptian woman deserved the chance to improve her domestic condition. This was her traditional role and there was nothing shameful in being a wife or a mother. The only profession that needed women was teaching, in the Kuttabs and higher primary schools. In 1900 the Saniyyah School began the first term of female teacher training with four students; at this point, and for some time, Europeans still held the best teaching jobs.\textsuperscript{108} According to Cromer, female teachers were required so that female education in general could be increased. Although 'professionals', female teachers contributed to Cromer's system of female education for creating good wives
and mothers; this is a noble objective, considering the degenerate homelife that Cromer describes.

According to Cromer, there were many initial objections to educating Egyptian women. Although these were likely based on religious reasons, Cromer does not describe them in Islamic terms. He simply notes that the general population was unenthusiastic, while the 'upper classes' were staunchly opposed. In order to encourage attendance, many received free education until 1905 when sufficient numbers warranted the collection of tuition fees. By the time Cromer published *Modern Egypt*, parental reluctance to send young girls to school had dissipated. Female attendance had increased, terms were extended, and standards were improving. Cromer notes that as more men are educated, they prefer better educated wives; also, as men pursue education, marriages occur later in life which allows women to remain in school longer than heretofore. With this progress, Cromer is hopeful of its future positive effects on Egyptian society. However, as most educated women are still secluded, Cromer is unsure of how successfully men have been improved through female education. He does expect that female education will conquer the Moslem impediment because women are allegedly less devoted to the patriarchal system of Islam, which Cromer notes was designed by and for men. He concludes that Moslem men have generally become agnostic with European education and influence and the effect should be the same on Moslem women, who are assumed to be less religious. Cromer qualifies himself by noting that these are only suggestions, and refuses to make any definite conclusions on the limited available evidence. However, he is determined that female education is crucial for 'civilizing' Egypt. Cromer advises to pursue female education, despite the fact that success can be neither predicted, nor guaranteed.
The resistance to female education was part of a general reluctance to accept the legitimacy of most British-inspired reforms in Egypt. 'Native' mis-understanding of their intended 'positive' effects is Cromer's most enduring obstacle to complete domination and effective rule. The 'administrative mind' is entrenched in the idea that the corvee, courbash and corruption are correct methods for administration. The fellah is too 'ignorant' and apathetic to resist oppression. The 'Egyptian mind' resists reforms because of its alleged deficiencies. It is duped by exploitative Europeans (ie. Greeks) and easily corrupted into criminal behavior. Using Cromer's logic, the Egyptian does not realize what is good for him; he must be enlightened by the benevolent 'Englishman'.

CROMER'S EVALUATION OF MORAL AND INTELLECTUAL REFORM

Contemporary critics of Cromer's administration have accused him of neglecting the 'Oriental mind'. These include Egyptians, Englishmen and Anglo-Egyptian subordinates. They base their arguments on the alleged higher priority given to structural reforms. One Egyptian Agent states that the neglect of moral reform was due to Cromer's natural inclination to ignore such a personal issue:

'But it is the exclusively material character of our achievement throughout, to the exclusion of moral development, which might offer ground for criticism. Cromer's positive mind, through it had a humanistic side, was disposed to pass by the things of the soul.'

Considering Cromer's insistence on the importance of structural reforms for reforming the 'native mind', this observation is inaccurate. Cromer's opponents also argue that the educational system did little to effect moral and intellectual development. He is accused of deliberately suppressing the 'native mind' for more effective colonial control. One outspoken opponent was Duse Mohamed, a 'Europeanized Egyptian' whose father supported Arabi Pasha and died in the rebellion. Among many complaints against England, Mohamed exclaims:
We censure her for having kept the natives in ignorance for twenty-eight years, spending only about 1 per cent on education of the EL258,000,000, revenue obtained during the first twenty-five years of the Occupation....

Mohamed's criticism is emotionally charged and appears unobjective. Cromer retorts to all of his critics that the English Administration should not be blamed for enduring 'native ignorance', which will take many more years to overcome.

Cromer 'confidently' argues that there has been some progress toward 'character reform' in Egypt. In his last speech before leaving Egypt he "hotly repudiated" charges that moral reform was "neglected". His argument is based on the supposed domino effect of structural reforms encouraging moral progress, and includes many examples. Equal distribution of water for all Egyptians is supposed to encourage general cooperation. Thrift is encouraged so that the profits of labour could be enjoyed. 'Honest administration' and responsible spending of tax-payer funds should inspire Egyptians with trust. Free speech and equality before the law should encourage politicization and standing up for one's rights. Medical and prison improvements should effect a better attitude. Cromer concludes

'If all these, and many other points to which I could allude, do not constitute some moral advancement, then, of a truth, I do not know what the word morality implies.'

In *Modern Egypt* Cromer lists eight major improvements to Egyptian society that have contributed to 'character reform'. Firstly, learning European languages, literature and sciences has likely corrected certain inaccuracies of Egyptian 'habits of thought'. Egyptians have also surely improved their own behavior by observing their upright European 'advisers'. The near abolition of oppressive institutions such as torture, slavery and inequality is thought to have softened the rough edges of the 'native character'. In addition, property rights were established, 'nepotism' was curtailed, and other entrenched 'vices' were criticized. Finally, Cromer argues that European political and social ideologies "should act as antidotes against moral degradation". Despite
these 'progressive' measures, Cromer argues that the 'Egyptian mind' requires far more
positive stimulants in society for its renewal. British forces must remain, because the
improvements are not yet secure as 'the Egyptian mind' is only just emerging from an
'intellectual vacuum'. A premature evacuation would undoubtedly cause the Egyptian
to regress back into his degenerate state.

Evacuation was considered impossible until a stable, competent group of
administrators is created, which will take 'some time'. In Abbas II Cromer does note
that since 1882 the "governing capacity" of Egyptian Ministers and other government
employees has steadily improved. This progress should continue, but there is still a
long way to go before Cromer will be satisfied. Throughout his term in Egypt, Cromer
felt that the governing classes were incapable of 'self-government'. On April 25 1890,
he wrote to Salisbury with the following evaluation of the Occupation:

"Until a race of Egyptians has arisen far more competent than any which
now exist'...the evacuation of the country by the British Army would be
attended with very grave risks."

Writing to Salisbury on 29 February, 1896, Cromer was still wont to find adequate
'natives' in Government: "'Egypt hasn't produced a man yet' who was truly a capable
administrator." The 'character' and intellect of even a few Egyptians would not be
adequately "trained" until long after the publication of Modern Egypt. By 1907 he
was still convinced that a "race of Egyptians capable of governing the country without
foreign aid has not as yet been formed...." Cromer argues that this is understandable
because it takes more than twenty years to change a nation that is thousands of years
old. He also notes that structural reforms are achieved faster, and with more visible
results:

Moral and intellectual progress must of necessity always be a plant of
slow growth. It takes more time to form the mind of a statesman, or even
to train a competent administrator, than it does to dig a canal or to
construct a railway."
He then lists the main reasons why it should take time. Firstly, Egyptians had always lived under "a system eminently calculated to paralyze their intellectual and warp their moral faculties..." As mentioned above, their historically oppressed ‘mind’ would not be easily changed. Also, English officials work under "difficult" and "complicated" circumstances with international, English, Ottoman and other ‘Oriental’ interferences. In an article written after his departure from Egypt, Cromer is still pessimistic:

> Before Orientals can attain anything approaching to the British ideal of self-government they will have to undergo very numerous transmigrations of political thought.

In particular, Egyptians will have to realize that slavery is wrong. Cromer notes that from Muhammad’s days in the seventh century, slavery has been tolerated. If Islam does not proscribe slavery, how could British-inspired ‘thought’ do otherwise? This was one of many persistent attitudes that Anglo-Egyptians still had to deal with after Cromer’s departure in 1907.

Cromer is reluctant to speculate on the future of moral and intellectual regeneration in Egypt. He notes that under the Ministry of Fehmi, "Egypt has made greater progress, both moral and material, than at any previous period." Fehmi’s stable Ministry is conducive to moral improvement because Western influence is relatively unobstructed. Cromer is sure that changes in Egyptian morality are effected in some way by structural improvements. Hopefully these changes would be positive:

> The material benefits derived from Europeanisation are unquestionably great, but as regards the ultimate effect on public and private morality the future is altogether uncertain.

Egyptian morality is too intangible accurately to measure even in its present state; by contrast, material improvements are obvious. Cromer suggests that intellectual and moral reform will be more noticeable now that financial stability and relative prosperity
from the most fundamental material improvements have been achieved. Secure material gains, such as solvency and bureaucratic organization ensure that intellectual, and perhaps moral progress will proceed more rapidly during the next quarter of a century than during that which has now terminated.  

More manpower and resources can be allocated to moral and intellectual reform now that the structural urgencies have been resolved. Progress will be faster because the old generation of ignorant and corrupt officials has been largely removed. Also, traditional 'habits of thought' have been shaken and new ideas have had a chance to take root to some extent. However, Cromer concludes that progress depends mainly on the Egyptian:

We cannot as yet predict with any degree of assurance the moral, intellectual, and political results likely to be obtained by the transformation which is at present taking place in the Egyptian national character.

There is no doubt that Cromer thinks that the 'national character' is changing, but the composition of its new morality and intellect are difficult for him to determine.

---
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Cromer is unclear on who was being recruited for what. Since it follows the point on
corvee regulation, it could relate to labour for digging the canals. However, it may
refer to military recruiting.


There is little disagreement among historians and his contemporaries on this point.

University Press, 1985), p. 124. Universities were reserved for rich males.

Mansfield, *The British in Egypt*, p. 139.


Restrictions remained until 1914 on Secondary schools, while in 1909 the technical school opened its doors with a "school of practical housewifery", p. 128.

However, Cromer does 'pass by the soul' of the Egyptian in seeking to create automatons.

Duse Mohamed, p. 226. This figure is cited in other secondary sources, ie. Mansfield, *The British in Egypt*, p. 96.


CONCLUSION: THE CONTRADICTIONS OF ORIENTALIST EPISTEMOLOGY

Cromer was unable to reform ‘the Egyptian’ before he left Egypt because he never truly understood the ‘native mind’. Moreover, he never understood that the ‘native mind’ is a social-imperial construction. This paper has revealed that Cromer’s Orientalist methods of understanding his subjects through isolation, dehumanization, description and comparison were ultimately flawed because they created a distorted image of ‘the Oriental’ which Cromer himself believed. ‘The Oriental’ is portrayed as deficient, which justifies the Occupation, but that very deficiency is not taken seriously enough to convince Cromer that reforming ‘the native mind’ is impossible. Cromer does not see his own methodology for understanding as self-defeating. Instead, he predictably blames ‘the Oriental’ for being so difficult to understand. Cromer admits that Anglo-Egyptians found the Egyptian to be "wellnigh incomprehensible":

They were brought face to face with a population which, in the eyes of the European, was, morally and politically speaking, walking on its head. However, the European was in Egypt because the Egyptian was ‘walking on his head’. Cromer created a fundamental contradiction within his mission: the very ‘differences’ that the paternalist stressed for legitimacy, actually stood in the way of reform and progress. Between his divided society of ‘Orientals’ and ‘Englishmen’ stood a "thick mist" of mis-understanding that inevitably perpetuated division. Among the many negative influences that could be caused by this strict division was the inability of Englishmen to truly understand Egyptians because they never integrated with the natives enough to learn about their ‘collective psyche’.

The main problem with Cromer’s epistemology is in his racial categorization, or stereotyping, of the dwellers as ‘Orientals’. Stereotyping is perpetuated by ignorance of ‘other’ peoples, and the fact that an entire group can not truthfully be described in terms
of a collective ‘mind’. The Consul was intentionally ignorant by clinging to a narrow perspective: he views the dwellers from a detached, "educated European", biased, "oblivion" that creates a false "reality" of ‘Oriental society’. Edward Said terms this type of classification the ‘Orientalization of the Oriental’. It is more accurate in Cromer’s case to identify this process as the ‘Orientalization of the dwellers’, because the dwellers exist, while the ‘Oriental’ does not. By Orientalising the dwellers, Cromer defines them by what he perceives them to be, not by what they actually are. This is the problem with Cromer’s ‘reality’: it is not real. Understanding is inevitably compromised by completely disregarding racial or ethnic differences in the indiscriminate designation of all Eastern peoples as ‘Orientals’. Cromer’s logic is supposed to preclude ‘inter-Oriental’ differences because all ‘Orientals’ were supposed to have the same ‘mind’. Cromer could not have fully understood each group in Egyptian society on its own terms, because he does not always recognize their existence; this is evident in his oscillation between Orientalist generalizations and the painful reality of his subject mosaic.

In order for ‘the Oriental’ to be real, he would have to ‘occur in fact, or in truth’. Cromer’s descriptions of ‘the Oriental’ are opinions, but not facts. It may be a fact that the British fleet bombarded the forts at Alexandria on July 11, 1882, bit it is not a fact that all fellaheen are ignorant, nor that all Easterners have the same general traits that can be summed up under the heading of ‘Oriental’. Cromer sought to change the ‘national character and habits of thought’ in Egypt. What ‘nation’ was he referring to? The ‘Oriental nation’? Certainly not, because there was no such thing as an ‘Oriental nation’. The ‘Oriental’ is an artificial construction within Cromer’s imperial ‘reality’. If he did mean the ‘Oriental nation’, then his confusion on this matter would explain his failure because Cromer would be trying to reform something that does not really exist. If Cromer meant the ‘Egyptian nation’ then why was he so interested in changing the
were the traditional ruling class and thus had to be modernized. The poor Egyptians could never be ‘molded into something really useful’ fast enough to allow Britain to ignore the elites. The common denominator between the Pashas and ‘Egyptians’ is that they are ‘Orientals’. By classifying all of the dwellers as ‘Orientals’, Cromer carelessly confuses stereotyping with ‘understanding’: he adds to the existing information about the ‘Oriental’ stereotype, but not about the real inhabitants of Egypt. Cromer’s most realistic description of his subjects is as ‘the dwellers in Egypt’. This term is hardly used, because it obviously was not accurate enough for his purposes: it included many groups that did not directly affect British policy and were therefore ineligible for reform. The mythical ‘Oriental’ is the real object of understanding and reform, not ‘the dwellers.’ Cromer analyzed and tried to reform something that was not real. Perhaps this mistake in the basic premises of what he was studying is why he could never fully ‘understand’ his subjects.

What about the ‘Oriental’ capabilities of ‘understanding’? Were they willing ‘automatons’? Could they really understand anything about the benefits of technical application of European-style reform? Would not the "thick mist" between the Eastern and Western ‘minds’ render the English instruction inherently deficient? Considering Cromer’s conclusion that the ‘Oriental’ and European are opposites, even if the ‘Oriental’ is told how to think, would there not always be the possibility of that ‘natural’ tendency to think the ‘other’ way? Apparently not, because as ‘automatons’ they were only supposed to assimilate information, not think about it or understand it in any real depth. The contradiction still remains in the fact that the ‘Oriental flaws’ consistently pointed out by Cromer would still have logically impeded the construction even of ‘automatons’. The ultimate contradiction of his plans is the impossibility of creating an entire country full of ‘automatons’, because surely there will be some whose ‘habits of thought’ will resist annihilation and want a ‘national character’ with substance.
Through description and comparison, Cromer confirms two prerequisite conditions for his ‘mission’: ‘the Oriental’ as a problem, and the legitimacy of the Occupation. ‘The Oriental’ is also revealed to be the antithesis of the European. It appears to have been beyond Cromer’s comprehension that ‘the dwellers’ were not necessarily the negatives of Englishmen, but simply different. To a ‘superior Englishman’, difference and oppositeness are presumably varying stages of the inherent deficiency of all ‘others’. These conditions of ‘otherness’ are considered to be self-destructive and also potentially threatening to the mission. Cromer acknowledges the seriousness of this situation:

Indeed, this difference of mental attributes constitutes perhaps the greatest of all barriers. It prevents the Englishman and the Egyptian from understanding each other.

Since ‘the Oriental’ is so problematic, the inevitable question emerges: how could Cromer have thought it possible to work successfully with a population that he was convinced at the time were so ‘unworkable’, so ‘alien’? Especially when he repeatedly refers to their ‘want of accuracy’, and ‘love of intrigue’? When Cromer describes and compares the ‘deficiencies of Orientals’, he does not acknowledge their inhibiting effect on reform in Egypt. Instead, these are implied as mere obstacles to be beaten.

Religious differences are especially troublesome for Cromer, and he even acknowledges that Egyptian Moslems would always hold up the barriers to Englishmen, and therefore to reform. Instituting the Christian Code contradicts the official ban on proselytism and threatens the predominance of Islam. Cromer is well aware of this potential problem. He asks if it is possible to teach a Christian code of morality without teaching Christianity? Cromer does not know the answer and suggests that future ‘Egyptians’ will attest to its success or failure. He is confused over how to teach Christian values without disturbing Islam, and acknowledges that this would be a
difficult, but necessary task. Egyptians must learn the Christian code, in order to reform themselves.

Cromer displays his characteristic *mis-understanding* of 'the native' in his descriptions of Egyptian women. The intolerable oppression of Moslem women makes their 'European sisters' appear to be almost equal to European men. This is a false conclusion because the situations of the two different groups of women were relative, based on each society's levels of 'advancement'. Understanding the Moslem woman would be impossible for Cromer, because she is voiceless. Cromer admits his inaccess to female opinion by criticizing their ignorance due to seclusion. Women with political grievances are considered 'mischievous' because they are invariably motivated by 'superstition' and 'mis-information' both of which are allegedly cultivated in the harem. Since women can not be heard, much less understood, they are negatively portrayed despite their wretched condition.

The differences in "mental attributes" between Cromer and his 'subjects', no matter what their position in society, made complete 'understanding' impossible. In his Introductory chapter of *Modern Egypt*, Cromer concedes, "I have lived too long in the East not to be aware that it is difficult for any European to arrive at a true estimate of 'Oriental' wishes, aspirations and opinions." Despite his admonitions for prospective imperial agents to *know* 'the East', Cromer admits that complete knowledge is impossible. This was a lifelong dilemma for the Consul-General. He continued to study, and always encountered the differences between the 'Eastern and Western minds and methods'. Cromer repeatedly shows frustration over the elusive 'native mind'. In his introduction to *Modern Egypt* he frankly admits that there are inherent problems in working with the 'Eastern mind'. Specific concern is expressed at the difficulty of
estimating 'native' opinion and also of determining 'Oriental' needs and desires.\textsuperscript{7}

Cromer quotes Professor Sayce to enforce his point:

> Those who have been in the East and have tried to mingle with the native population know well how utterly impossible it is for the European to look at the world with the same eyes as the Oriental. For a while, indeed, the European may fancy that he and the Oriental understand one another, but sooner or later a time comes when he is suddenly awakened from his dream, and finds himself in the presence of a mind which is as strange to him as would be the mind of an inhabitant of Saturn.\textsuperscript{8}

The point is well made when considering the absurdity of understanding anything from Saturn in 1907, when \textit{Modern Egypt} was first published. The descriptions of 'Oriental deficiency' and comparisons with 'British superiority' in Cromer's writings attest to the difficulties of apprehending the 'native mind'. It took "some while" before Cromer recognized that 'the Egyptian' was so difficult to comprehend.\textsuperscript{9} He admits that until his final days as Consul General, he was still "learning".

\textsuperscript{1} ME, p. 587. Italics are mine.
\textsuperscript{2} ME, p. 579.
\textsuperscript{3} ME, p. 571.
\textsuperscript{4} ME, p. 639.
\textsuperscript{5} ME, p. 571.
\textsuperscript{6} ME, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{7} ME, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{8} ME, p. 5. Cromer quotes Professor Sayce, \textit{The Higher Criticism and the Monuments}, p. 58.
\textsuperscript{9} ME, p. 5-6.
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