

UCLA

UCLA Previously Published Works

Title

Middle East Studies for the New Millennium: Infrastructures of Knowledge

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8jp6f76n>

Journal

Contemporary Sociology A Journal of Reviews, 47(3)

ISSN

0094-3061

Author

Harris, Kevan

Publication Date

2018-05-01

DOI

10.1177/0094306118767651nn

Peer reviewed

need to be undone so that he could love both, openly and honestly? Schippers wants us to appreciate that such questions matter theoretically, sociologically, and politically.

Polyamory subcultures provide Schippers with clues to how multipartnered sex can reconfigure selves and relationships in queer, feminist, and anti-racist ways. As presented in *Beyond Monogamy*, these clues are strongest regarding hegemonic relations between femininities and masculinities, though they extend to race and, to a lesser extent, class as well. Unlike polygyny, polyamory decreases competition for female partners because everyone has access to multiple partners, and polyamory subcultures tend to reject sexual double standards while encouraging open communication and interpersonal responsibility. Schippers argues that these basic feminist and queer-friendly blueprints, combined with a DIY spirit, lead to self-reflective, conscientious decisions about how to do things not just differently, but better—for ourselves, for our lovers, even for our lovers' lovers.

And therein lies a key point: successful multipartnered relationships often necessitate what polyamorists refer to as *compersion*, finding joy in a partner's experience of pleasure with another partner. Moreover, these other partners, or *metamours* in polyamory-speak, should also be afforded respect and consideration. Within these generous bounds of intimacy and interpersonal responsibility lies the potential to build from the ground up—across gender, race, class, and sexuality and with equality, social justice, and an ethic of care built in.

Beyond Monogamy will be of interest to sociologists and scholars of race, gender, and sexuality. The book does not provide the basic tenets of critical discussions of race, gender, or sexuality but assumes them as starting points in a complex theory-building discussion that is alternately dense and heavily worded, personally revealing and accessible, and even pornographic. One of the most captivating aspects of the book is Schipper's use of graphic depictions of sex—both real (auto-ethnographic) and imagined (fictional narratives/vignettes). Using sex in these ways deconstructs the sacred/profane binary

that marginalizes the explicitly erotic in scholarly work. It also bridges the gap between academic theorizing and polyqueer cultural practice.

As Schippers points out, literary feminist theorists have a long history of exploring power and building theory through pornographic fictional narratives. Yet such lurid engagement of the erotic remains rare in sociology and perhaps rare in all of queer and cultural studies. Her focus on fantasy and fictional narratives also reflects the overarching goal of *Beyond Monogamy*—to look forward, expand conversation, and explore the possibilities of polyqueer sexualities for reconfiguring ourselves and building more just relationships and communities. In short, for doing things differently.

Middle East Studies for the New Millennium: Infrastructures of Knowledge, edited by **Seteney Shami** and **Cynthia Miller-Idriss**. New York: New York University Press, 2016. 512 pp. \$55.00 cloth. ISBN: 9781479827787.

KEVAN HARRIS
University of California-Los Angeles
kevanharris@ucla.edu

It has been good times and bad times for Middle East studies in the United States, sociologists included. Since 2001, the relative share of dissertation subjects focusing on Islam or Muslims has increased, as have articles in flagship journals across most U.S. disciplines. Many Islamic studies or Middle East studies centers were founded by U.S. universities after 2001, and older ones were rebranded to take advantage of newfound attention. The American Sociological Association is currently considering a petition, signed by this reviewer among others, to create a new section on the "Global Middle East." The proposed section's title is unwieldy, to be sure, as are most petitions designed by committee, but the growing movement by involved students and scholars is genuine.

As Seteney Shami and Cynthia Miller-Idriss, the editors of *Middle East Studies for the New Millennium: Infrastructures of*

Knowledge, describe, however, the mounting woes of the field signal a “canary in the mine shaft” for U.S. universities (p. 353). After 2001, even with renewed public interest in the region, the long decline in U.S. federal funding for foreign language training and area studies programs continued apace. Budget sequestrations during the Obama administration sent the Department of Education’s support of university-based National Resource Centers to their lowest level, in real terms, in over half a century. Such “Title VI” funding for area studies centers, as it is known under the U.S. Higher Education Act, may be zeroed out in future federal budgets, no matter the regional focus, except under the auspices of producing knowledge specifically for security studies—the restricted charge to “know your enemy.”

As the data gathered for this volume show, U.S. universities are not good at furnishing instrumental inputs for national security anyway. Most undergraduates undertaking foreign language or area studies training do not study abroad, and few go on to work for the U.S. government aside from those in Washington locales such as Georgetown University. Politicians may believe that the United States is embattled in a Cold War with a nebulous Middle Eastern enemy, but these new Cold Warriors prefer to draw knowledge from, and spend their limited funds on, Defense Department-linked war colleges and Dupont Circle think tanks.

Even as the 2011 Arab uprisings partly upended the popular consensus on the Middle East, U.S. institutions with the potential to bolster an interdisciplinary mix of scholars to renew Middle East studies remain in dire shape. This volume, the first of a promised series to emerge from the Social Science Research Council-funded project *Producing Knowledge on World Regions*, aims at such a “field-building” assessment of scholarly disciplines and academic organizations alike (p. 24). As such, it is best suited for center administrators and program directors in search of useful scaffolding from which to solicit resources for their own projects and initiatives.

The volume opens with a set of essays taking aim at social scientific approaches to the

Middle East. Political science, economics, and sociology are jabbed for generalization, quantification, and theoretical hubris. While such concerns are valid, these objections rework the 1890s *methodenstreit* of universal covering laws versus particular historical conjunctures and rehash the 1990s science wars on the power imbalances of knowledge production, rather than examining disciplinary debates about the region. In other words, a novice reader would learn little about theoretical paradigms on the Middle East, right or wrong, but she would read much about the hidden “work” that these paradigms carry out by framing the region one way or another.

The standout chapter in this section, by political scientist Lisa Wedeen, goes further to note how the presence of the United States in the region is largely absent from accounts that purport to explain Middle Eastern exceptionalism. Moreover, the United States is not considered an “area” within comparative social science. Rather, it is the crucial “non-area” that fashions our theoretical yardsticks. The parochialism of American-centered political science is “so central to the discipline that it is able to stand in for and produce knowledge about the general character of political life” (pp. 50–51).

The second section assesses area studies centers and language training across U.S. universities. A case study of Middle East studies at New York University, by Jonathan Friedman and Cynthia Miller-Idriss, illustrates broader challenges to cross-disciplinary knowledge production. Even within Middle East studies, methodological training differs by period. Late antiquity and classical Islamic studies are populated by philologists who rely on textual source criticism; early modern historiography is largely fielded by social historians who utilize archives and material culture; and meanwhile the modern Middle East is examined through anthropological and social scientific lenses of ethnographic and comparative methods. Specialization requires intensive training and produces a handful of experts in each subfield.

In tension with this ethos, New York University has pursued an institution-wide goal of internationalization, whereby

students can learn about a cosmopolitan array of “global” issues through short stays at NYU-administered campuses in Abu Dhabi, Shanghai, Accra, and other locales. English is the spoken language for all students abroad, while the NYU brand remains disconnected from local universities that would have previously sponsored longer stays for students. As the authors note, this cosmopolitan logic of higher education fits neither into the specialization requirements of area studies nor into the Cold War approach of producing experts for the “national interest.” Instead, as Craig Calhoun has described, the economic restructuring of higher education since the 1990s has led to “a collapsing of semi-autonomous social fields into markets” legitimated by students’ supposed needs for workplace skills and intercultural experiences (quoted on p. 365).

A separate chapter by Laura Bier reviews dissertations produced from 2000 to 2010 in Middle East studies across multiple disciplines. The author repeats the previous criticisms of social science and historical methods as evidenced by the topics listed, while uncritically celebrating the increasing “imprint of the theoretical and epistemological concerns of structuralism, postcolonial studies, feminist theory, and cultural studies” (p. 265). While these theoretical approaches are held up to be superior without reflexive scrutiny, the irony is not lost on one of the editors, Seteney Shami, in a subsequent chapter. As Shami notes, the “acrimonious debates between discipline-oriented scholars and their area studies counterparts regarding the merits and shortcomings of their respective scholarly practices” contributed to the crisis of area studies alongside the securitization of U.S. government knowledge needs and the neoliberalization of the university (p. 364). The “terrorism studies” genre of the think tank world or the client-consumer model of higher education cares not a whit for the canon wars or the *methodenstreit*.

One hopes that a forthright assessment of producing knowledge on world regions might generate calls for a temporary truce between the humanities and social sciences. Given the impossibility of shoehorning a field into a desired mold, an ecumenical appraisal

of disciplines that acknowledges the need for diverse methodological approaches would firm up any broader appeal for revitalizing institutions under the rubric of Middle East studies. In a phenomenal conclusion, political scientist Lisa Anderson writes, “it is a mistake to say we study a region. We study things that happen in a region. Most of these are universal—power, states, poetry, families, livelihoods, jokes, corruption . . . —and we merely study particular expressions” (p. 438). Between American parochialism and regional exceptionalism lies the intellectual necessity and defense of area studies, Middle East or otherwise.

The New Americans? Immigration, Protest, and the Politics of Latino Identity, by **Heather Silber Mohamed**. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2017. 242 pp. \$22.95 paper. ISBN: 9780700623860.

JAMIE LONGAZEL

John Jay College of Criminal Justice, CUNY
 jlongazel@jjay.cuny.edu

~~Writing about recent events can feel like a fool's errand. With the social and political landscape forever in flux, the finish line is always elusive. Sometimes you just want everything else to slow down, dreading that moment when the world described in your manuscript no longer resembles the world described in the morning news.~~

~~I suspect Heather Silber Mohamed found herself in a similar spot. Her book, *The New Americans? Immigration, Protest, and the Politics of Latino Identity*, focuses on the congressional debate over immigration reform in 2005 and 2006 and the ensuing protests. Yet its 2017 release coincided with the beginning of Donald Trump's presidency and a shift in American politics that has been nothing short of gargantuan.~~

~~There were occasions in the book where you could sense her feeling uneasy about this. I would imagine there are also potential readers—those who have spent recent months puzzling over Trump's unexpected victory and fuming over his off-color remarks—wondering if such a book is worth their time.~~