

5-5-2017

The Impact of Colonial Rule on Women's Rights: A Case Study Specific to Egypt under the Rule of British Consul-General Lord Evelyn Cromer

Haneen Rasool

University of Puget Sound, hrasool@pugetsound.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://soundideas.pugetsound.edu/relics>

Recommended Citation

Rasool, Haneen (2017) "The Impact of Colonial Rule on Women's Rights: A Case Study Specific to Egypt under the Rule of British Consul-General Lord Evelyn Cromer," *Relics, Remnants, and Religion: An Undergraduate Journal in Religious Studies*: Vol. 2 : Iss. 2 , Article 1.

Available at: <http://soundideas.pugetsound.edu/relics/vol2/iss2/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Publications at Sound Ideas. It has been accepted for inclusion in Relics, Remnants, and Religion: An Undergraduate Journal in Religious Studies by an authorized editor of Sound Ideas. For more information, please contact soundideas@pugetsound.edu.

ABSTRACT

This paper seeks to explore the impact of colonial rule on women's rights using a case study specific to Egypt under the rule of British Consul-General Lord Evelyn Cromer. Cromer's policies and actions demonstrate the othering of the Egyptian people but it also highlights, in particular, the double-othering of Egyptian women due to their race and religious beliefs as well as their gender. In order to address these issues, analysis of primary source texts written by Cromer provide insight into his beliefs about the Egyptian people as well as his views about women's rights. These primary source texts are supplemented by multiple secondary sources from other scholars who have provided evidence demonstrating Cromer's misogyny and hypocrisy in claiming to fight for the rights of women in Egypt. Through in-depth analysis, it is my hope to demonstrate the impact of colonialism on women's rights as well as how a similar ideology stemmed from British cultural and societal expectations, specifically the absence of women's rights in Britain during the colonial era.

INTRODUCTION

Colonialism has long been a part of Western society and their actions have always been driven by expansion, oppression, or wealth. There have been many attempts to justify colonialism by 'othering' or dehumanizing people and their religious beliefs. Moreover, differences in interpretation have often resulted in violence and attempts to validate unjust actions. Conflicts in religion have, in many cases, occurred for two overarching reasons: first, differences in interpretation resulted in religious intolerance or violence among sects; second, with interpretation came the belief, for some, that one group of people could be superior to another. Groups were considered inferior either because they practiced different religious beliefs or because they expressed different physical traits with regard to gender or skin color. In this

paper, I will explore these causes of conflict with a focus on the use of religion and the attempt to justify discriminating actions committed against women. More specifically, I will investigate the Western tendency to paint Middle Eastern women as oppressed in an effort to rationalize colonialism. Building off of the arguments of previous scholars, the purpose of this paper is to investigate how through the portrayal of British culture and Christianity as superior, Cromer effectively ‘double-othered’ and dehumanized Egyptian women. He essentially placed them in an inferior position based on the fact that they were Egyptian Muslims and because they were women. In addition, I will explore how the practice of ‘othering’ effected women in England and how the fundamentals of colonialism denying basic human rights were established in England itself.

HISTORIOGRAPHY

Jane Card’s article “The Power of Context: The Portrait of Dido Elizabeth Belle Lindsay and Lady Elizabeth Murray” is about a woman named Dido Belle Lindsay who was of both of African and British descent whilst living in England. Card discusses the struggles she faced because of her ethnicity and her gender at a time when women in England were denied rights and slavery was still practiced. Dido’s life story is a critical example of ‘double-othering’ in colonial England. Moreover, her story relates to the experiences of women in Egypt who were also ‘double-othered’ because of their race and their gender. In this sense, its use in this paper as evidence of ‘double-othering’ adds significantly to the issues addressed in the essay.

The article “At Once Human and Not Human: Law, Gender and Historical Becoming in Colonial Egypt,” Samera Esmeir explores laws regarding women in both England and Egypt during colonialism. She explains how British colonialism impacted women’s rights in Egypt and how the law was used to determine who could be considered human under British rule. This is

useful in this paper because it explains British law in Egypt and why it caused so many problems. It also provides insight into how women in England and Egypt were treated under the law.

In Mary Ann Fay's *Unveiling the Harem: Elite Women and the Paradox of Seclusion in Eighteenth-Century Cairo*, Fay looks into the way harems were portrayed by men in the west. She states that, "for Westerners, the harem was a trope that permitted unfavorable comparisons between the Orient and the West and validated their belief in the superiority of Western civilization."¹ She goes on to point out examples from British novels that demonstrate this mindset. Fay also explores the way gender plays a role in the East and how the views of the West affected this. She provides an insightful idea of what the Middle East was like for women prior to colonialism and how stereotypes in the West changed this. Her exploration of women in the Middle East offers insight into the effect of colonialism on Egyptian women and the 'double-othering' they experienced under British rule.

Richard King's essay *The Association of 'Religion' with Violence* explores many of the issues regarding colonialism. More specifically, he explores how many countries in the past, and today, express fears about religious violence as a way of propagating their own ideologies and politics. He often points out the hypocrisy of many countries because of their actions against other groups of people. He emphasizes that they can use religious violence as a way to establish and promote their interests. His essay is a good source in this paper when analyzing Cromer's actions against the Egyptians. Specifically his claims that women in the Middle East were denied freedom because of religious and political beliefs in the East. King essentially outlines the common beliefs and ideas that people like Cromer used to establish colonial rule.

¹ Mary Fay, *Unveiling the Harem: Elite Women and the Paradox of Seclusion in Eighteenth-Century Cairo* (Syracuse, N.Y: Syracuse University Press, 2012), 24.

Leila Ahmed's *Women and Gender in Islam* provides solid accounts and analysis of the impact of colonialism on Egyptian women, specifically the effect it had in their everyday lives and on their freedoms as Muslim women. Ahmed explores the colonial era and provides examples of people like Lord Cromer who "was...[a] founding member and sometime president of the Men's League for Opposing Women's Suffrage."² She explains many of the hypocrisies concerning his treatment of women in England whilst claiming to provide women in Egypt with freedom and equality. She also looks at how British politics changed Egyptian society and culture so as to make the Egyptian people take part in what the English considered a superior culture. Her work is useful in this paper because she provides insight into how colonialism and British ideologies affected women in the Middle East. In doing so Ahmed provides evidence that 'double-othering' and dehumanization took place with regard to the treatment of Egyptian Muslims as well as the treatment of Egyptian women.

A Companion to Gender History contains essays about topics associated with gender. One essay by Guity Nashat titled *Women in the Middle East 8000 BCE to 1700 CE*, explores how Islam changed the way women were treated. She details many of the laws and social changes that gave women more freedom in Islam. Her descriptions show what life for women in the Middle East was like prior to colonialism.

Sarah Graham-Brown's book *Images of Women: The Portrayal of Women in Photography of the Middle East, 1860-1950* provides primary sources, specifically photographs of families and women from the Middle East. In many of the photos there is a significant difference between the initial cultural dress of women before colonialism and the cultural changes that took place after colonialism. In addition to this, Brown uses some of Cromer's

² Leila Ahmed, *Women and Gender in Islam*, 153.

statements about women in Egypt and the differences between British women and Egyptian women. This is useful in this paper because she clearly explores the ‘double-othering’ of Egyptian women not only in the images portrayed but also in many of Cromer’s statements.

In “Lord Cromer: Practitioner and Philosopher of Imperialism Robert” Tignor provides an in depth understanding of Lord Cromer and his policies concerning the treatment of the Egyptian people. Tignor mentions many of Cromer’s failures in Egypt such as ignoring the fact that education should have been given to the Egyptian people. Tignor’s essay is useful for this paper because he explains the issues the Egyptian people faced because of Cromer’s leadership. His essay demonstrates how Cromer’s actions forced many Egyptians to live without rights that were granted to the British. Thus, there was an ‘othering’ of the Egyptian people that was present in his policies and his beliefs.

METHODOLOGY

In order to explore this topic, it is necessary to investigate a case study and apply how the reasons previously stated were implemented in the study. The case study I will be using is the effect of colonialism in Egypt under the rule of the British colonizer, Lord Cromer, British Consul-General of Egypt. He wrote two volumes entitled *Modern Egypt*, which will be the focus of this paper. I will reference other scholarly sources depicting and analyzing Lord Cromer’s attempt to undermine the authority of the Egyptian people. In brief, Lord Cromer promoted the idea that women in Egypt under Islamic law required freedom. Moreover, he depicted Christianity and British culture as superior and therefore more capable of providing said freedom.

In his book *Modern Egypt*, Lord Cromer attempted to justify his actions in Egypt through providing detailed accounts of his view of Egyptian culture and politics. In one part of the book

he describes Islam and the Egyptian people in negative racist ways. Moreover, he portrays the English as superior due to race and Christianity. The book also offers first-hand accounts of the treatment of women in Egypt and England from a man who implemented political policies denying women basic rights. Furthermore, his descriptions also provide examples of the ‘double-othering’ and dehumanization of Egyptian women that took place under colonial rule.

In addition to Lord Cromer’s book I will also be exploring the story of Dido Belle Lindsay. The reason for discussing this case is because Dido’s story offers insight into the roles and expectations of women in England during the 18th and 19th centuries. Moreover, her story provides a detailed account of a woman who was ‘double-othered’ in British society.

BACKGROUND TO THE ENGLISH DOUBLE-OTHERING OF EGYPTIAN WOMEN: ENGLISH DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN

Lord Cromer had very specific views about women’s rights and their roles in society. He sought to destroy or distort any attempt women made to establish their rights as human beings. Gender stereotypes already existed in England with the major difference being that English women were white and therefore considered superior to Egyptian women. Thus dehumanization was present in both instances. The dehumanization of women in Egypt is explored in an essay titled “At Once Human and Not Human: Law, Gender, and Historical Becoming in Colonial Egypt” by Samera Esmeir. Esmeir writes,

The law did not subordinate, but inscribed, created, animated, and gave qualified life to forms that seemed to lack it. The law, in short, through the category of the person, determined who was human, the boundaries of the human and its others. The law, then, could decide whether women were human. In this sense, law’s modern power was colonial: it delineated a boundary between the human and the subhuman.³

³ Esmeir, “At Once Human and Not Human.”, 239.

Through the British legal system men determined women's positions in society and denied women power to alter their status as equals in the system. Moreover, women in England endured legal restrictions that resulted in 'othering' through an inability to explore education and politics other than what men deemed appropriate. In this sense, colonial denigration of women began in England with women being denied rights. Evidence of this appears in the laws that were established by the British in order to maintain a certain hierarchy in society. This is observed in Mary Ann Fay's *Unveiling the Haram*. Fay states that,

Eighteenth century common law, which prevailed in England and in the colonies of North America, did not conflate the personhood of wife into that of her husband, thereby making it impossible for a married women of any class including the elite to own property or make a contract. Under common law...a married women was under the perpetual guardianship of her husband and could not legally marry in her own right. In other words, the law kept her in a childlike state and she could never, as long as she was married, achieve her legal majority.⁴

Fay's statement relates back to Esmeir's quote about the effect British colonial law had in Egypt and who was considered human and received human rights. Similarly, women in England did not retain any sort of identity under British law. Instead they were treated as second-class citizens and expected to submit to the demands of men.

Women in England were subject to the colonialist beliefs of superiority used to establish a society with the proper gender-based order according to men. However, despite the laws and expectations in British culture, there were women who spoke up against their treatment. In one instance Fay expresses the view of an Englishwoman by the name of Lady Mary:

⁴ Mary Fay, *Unveiling the Harem: Elite Women and the Paradox of Seclusion in Eighteenth-Century Cairo* (Syracuse, N.Y: Syracuse University Press, 2012), 123-124.

Lady Mary was a perceptive and empathetic observer, particularly of women's lives, and her letters from Istanbul stand in startling contrast to the writings of her male compatriots, for whom she had a great deal of contempt... The difference between Lady Mary's views of Ottoman women and those of male travelers to the empire can be seen in the use of enslavement to describe the condition of women... Lady Mary before her marriage to Montagu described herself and the other women of her class as virtual slaves who were sold into marriage by their families, but she described Ottoman women... as 'the only free people in the empire.'⁵

Lady Mary's description is a sharp contrast to the way men such as Lord Cromer described women in both England and Egypt. According to Cromer, women in the Middle East needed freedom from the British, however, from an Englishwoman's perspective, women in the Middle East were "the only free people."⁶ This speaks immeasurably to the position of women in England and how sexist beliefs spread by men impacted their ability to live without even the most basic rights. Feminists like Lady Mary attempted to disrupt what had become the social norm. These women recognized it as an unjust system that denied them the right to take part in politics and education. This suggests that the attitudes of 'othering' and dehumanization that occurred within colonialism, were present in British society prior to colonial expansion. With regard to England and Egypt, what differed between the two cultures and their treatment of women was that the British men viewed themselves superior based on ethnicity as well as gender. Therefore the British established laws that emphasized these differences and dehumanized the 'other' to justify colonialism.

Despite his claims about the wellbeing of women in Egypt, Cromer maintained extremely bigoted views about women. He worked to undermine the rights of women in England and Egypt. An example of where this is present is in Sarah Graham-Brown's book, *Images of*

⁵ Ibid, 125.

⁶ Ibid, 125.

Women: The Portrayal of Women in Photography of the Middle East 1860-1950. Brown

references a statement made by Cromer in one of his letters in which he explains,

I have no doubt that the real reason [for the increase in infant death] is that Egyptian mothers do not in the least understand how to look after their children. You are probably aware that infant mortality in England and Wales is about 132 per thousand births, but that the rate is much higher, going up as much as 208 per thousand, in manufacturing towns where women are largely employed in the factories. Moreover, it is a rather remarkable fact, which is not generally known, that when a strike takes place, and the women are therefore obliged to stay in their homes, the infant mortality at once decreases.⁷

The difference that Cromer immediately identifies is the association of “Egyptian mothers” with poor parenting. In contrast, the reason he gives for infant death in England is because women must work in some places and remain home in others. Therefore, according to Cromer, it is not the fault of the English mother but an issue regarding her inability to remain at home. But despite this assumption, women in England had no say in changing the law much like the colonized Egyptians. Moreover, the Egyptian women and English women were both dehumanized. This is indicative of a sexist mindset existing in England prior to the colonization of Egypt as well as the fact that the laws established in England were carried over to the Middle East in an effort to ‘double-other’ women in the East. Cromer confirms this statement when he writes,

When an Egyptian woman interferes in politics, her interference is almost always mischievous. The information she obtains is necessarily communicated to her through a variety of distorted media...Ignorance of any world beyond that of the harem renders it impossible for her to discriminate between truth and falsehood...Amongst other social difficulties it has, therefore, to be noted that Moslem women in Egypt are secluded, and that their influence...is, in all political and administrative matters, generally bad.⁸

⁷ Sarah Graham-Brown, *Images of Women: The Portrayal of Women in Photography of the Middle East, 1860-1950* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 108.

⁸ Evelyn Baring Cromer, *Modern Egypt*, 156-157.

Cromer's statement assumes that women had no place in public affairs similar to the way women in England were expected to avoid politics and other male-dominated fields. Thus, the treatment of women in both societies was based on the belief that women in general were incompetent and therefore unable to participate in politics or education.

While 'double-othering' was common in Egypt, there was one famous instance in which 'double-othering' occurred in England--the case of Dido Belle Lindsay. According to Jane Card,

Dido Belle was the illegitimate daughter of the aristocrat Captain Sir John Lindsay by a black slave, Maria Belle...Dido was brought up in Kenwood House, the home of Lord and Lady Mansfield, Lindsay's uncle and aunt. William Murray, first Earl of Mansfield...was Lord Chief justice of the King's Bench.⁹

Dido's experience as a woman of African descent living in England when slavery was still a legal practice illustrates her experience with 'double-othering' and dehumanization. She was denied the right to be considered the equal of a white Englishwoman due to the color of her skin. Moreover, she was denied equality as a woman because she was expected to live her life in subordination to men. Thus, Dido's experiences in England resembled the experiences of women in Egypt. Women in Egypt were denied the right to be considered equal to white women due to their Egyptian ethnicity, as well as being forced to live without rights as women.

COLONIAL JUSTIFICATION

In order to justify colonialism, European men often stated that they were freeing women in the Middle East who they claimed were being oppressed. However, before colonialism,

⁹ Jane Card, "The Power of Context: The Portrait of Dido Elizabeth Belle Lindsay and Lady Elizabeth Murray," *Teaching History*, no. 160 (September 2015): 8-14, 8.

women in the Middle East had more rights than women in Europe. According to Guity Nashat in her essay *Women in the Middle East, 8000 BCE to 1700 CE*, she states that,

“The Qur’anic law of inheritance provides women with a share of their parents’, husband’s, siblings’, and children’s estates. It stipulates that, ‘a male child shall have the equivalent of two female children’... The same proportion applies to a widow’s share of her husband’s estate”¹⁰

Nashat’s statement about Qur’anic law indicates that the oppression of women was not a pre-existing condition in the Middle East as Lord Cromer suggests, but that its foundation must have begun elsewhere. Moreover, in England, usually when a man died and left any wealth it passed only to his first-born son or another man in the family. Thus, women were in many cases unable to inherit anything. Fay explores this topic further stating,

Although common law granted women some protection for their real property, their personal property became the husband’s absolutely upon their marriage...Sir William Blackstone...said, ‘By marriage the very being or legal existence of a woman is suspended, or at least it is incorporated or consolidated into that of the husband, under whose wing, protection and cover she performs everything and she is therefore called in our law a *feme covert*.’¹¹

The idea that a woman was not legally allowed to maintain her own identity was very similar to the way that women in the Middle East were portrayed by societies in the West. Furthermore, Cromer severely oversimplifies the treatment of women in England and Egypt. In doing so he falsely portrays the effects of ‘othering’ and dehumanizing women in both societies. In his book *Modern Egypt* Cromer states,

Look now to the consequences which result from the degradation of women in Mohammedan countries...there is a radical difference between the position of Moslem women and that of their European

¹⁰ Teresa A. Meade and Merry E. Wiesner-Hanks, *A Companion to Gender History*, 1 edition (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2004), 234.

¹¹ Fay, *Unveiling the Harem*, 129.

sisters. In the first place, the face of the Moslem woman is veiled when she appears in public. The face of the European woman is exposed to view in public. The only restraints placed on her movements are those dictated by her own sense of propriety.¹²

This example of the oversimplification of women's oppression in Europe indicates the way British men attempted to justify sexism in England. In this instance, it becomes clear that 'othering' was the result of prejudices that existed against women regardless of where they were from.

The laws against women had existed long before the colonization of Egypt and were passed directly from England to the colonies. Leila Ahmed addresses colonial justification stating that,

Broadly speaking, the thesis of the discourse on Islam blending a colonialism committed to male dominance with feminism...was that Islam was innately and immutably oppressive to women, that the veil and segregation epitomized that oppression, and that these customs were the fundamental reasons for the general and comprehensive backwardness of Islamic societies.¹³

Through criticizing the culture that existed in Egypt it was possible for British policies regarding women to be carried over from England. By blaming Islam and Egyptian culture, inferiority in the colonies was established first based on a person's ethnicity. Second, but just as importantly, gender differences established a secondary level of inferiority within the social structure of the colonized people.

¹² Evelyn Baring Cromer, *Modern Egypt*, 155.

¹³ Leila Ahmed, *Women and Gender in Islam: Historical Roots of a Modern Debate* (New Haven [Conn.]: Yale University Press, 1992), 151-152.

In addition to legal justifications of colonialism, Cromer used the belief that Christianity was superior in order to propagate the actions of the British. Cromer emphasizes this idea when he states,

Islam keeps women in a position of marked inferiority...Islam has the reputation of being an intolerant religion...Islamism...unlike Christianity, tends to engender the idea that revenge and hatred, rather than love and charity, should form the basis of the relations between man and man[.]¹⁴

Richard King discussed the use of Christianity to justify colonialism in his essay *The Association of 'Religion' with Violence*. King expresses the belief that religion has only been used in an effort to justify controversial or illegal actions that are implemented by governments. He states,

The Enlightenment secularist model...has...led to a prevailing belief in Northern Europe and its former colonies...that religion and politics represent two separate realms of human life...A...consequence...has been to perform a...separation of acts of violence...by nation-states from acts of violence...in the name of 'religion'...The modern secular nation-state was formed in a Euro-American context...its very legitimacy was bound up with a denial of the violence associated with its own birth.¹⁵

King's analysis of the hypocrisy regarding the beliefs of the West in order to justify their actions relates to Cromer's depiction of Islam as violent or unjust towards women. Moreover, Cromer's view of Christianity relates to King's main point. This point is that by propagating their own superiority based on the acts of religious violence committed by another group, the country launching colonialism is ignoring the history of religious intolerance and hatred that was present in its own nation. Similarly, in neglecting to acknowledge the actions of Christianity in denying freedoms, he also ignores the fact that women in England were 'othered' in a prominently Christian society.

¹⁴ Evelyn Baring Cromer, *Modern Egypt*, 134, 137, 139.

¹⁵ John Hinnells and Richard King, eds., *Religion and Violence in South Asia: Theory and Practice* (London ; New York: Routledge, 2006), 235.

CROMER AND THE ‘DOUBLE-OTHERING’ OF WOMEN IN EGYPT

The final argument in this essay and the culminating statement refers to the ‘double-othering’ and dehumanization of Egyptian women. This ‘double-othering’ and dehumanization was established during colonialism based on the belief held by Cromer that all Egyptians were inferior to the English. Moreover, Egyptian women, in addition to being Egyptian Muslims, were also stereotyped based on gender. Cromer’s actions against women in England while discussing freedom for women in Egypt can be observed in Leila Ahmed statement that,

Cromer’s paternalistic convictions and his belief in the proper subordination of women most clearly declared themselves. This champion of the unveiling of Egyptian women was, in England, founding member and sometime president of the Men’s League for Opposing Women’s Suffrage.¹⁶

Egyptian women fell into a category of inferiority within a dehumanized and colonized group of people, the Egyptian Muslims. Therefore, the actions of the British against women in Egypt, were influenced first by the fact that they were Egyptian Muslims and second because they were women. Thus, we see the ‘double-othering’ and dehumanization of women in order to establish the dominance of the British both as white Europeans and as men.

Cromer continuously returned to the ingrained belief: because the people of Egypt were of a different race and religion, they were inferior to the British. Moreover, Cromer’s treatment of women in Egypt was expressed through the belief that not only women but all Egyptians were inferior. As a result, the Egyptian people were stereotyped and denied rights that would have been provided to the English. In Rober Tignor’s essay “Lord Cromer: Practitioner and Philosopher of Imperialism” Tignor states that,

¹⁶ Leila Ahmed, *Women and Gender in Islam*, 153.

[Cromer's] failures in the later years of his administration arose because he felt little sympathy for the people and the society he governed...He did not believe that the East was really capable of reform, and he was therefore unreceptive to the demands for more education and for the creation of representative institutions.¹⁷

Thus, in this statement, we observe that Cromer's views of the Egyptians were built on stereotypes established by the West. Moreover, he countered his views of Egyptians with the belief that the British were superior due to their race and ethnicity. He explained this concept of superiority in detail in his book *Modern Egypt*. Cromer states that,

On the one hand, besides being one of the European family in respect to general civilization, the Englishman, amidst many deviations from the path, will strive, perhaps to a greater extent than any other member of that family, to attain to a high degree of eminently Christian civilization...He 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.¹⁸

His use of the term "Puritan blood" indicates his belief that not only were all non-Europeans separate and 'other' because of their religion but because they were of different origins. This belief is evident in the way he describes Egyptians as, "[holding] fast to the faith of Islam... Islam as a social system has been a complete failure."¹⁹ Indicating issues with the "social system" speaks to the way in which Cromer views Egyptian society and culture as inferior. Moreover, to establish British rule in Egypt, the English sought to undermine the laws that were already present in Islam and institute their own legal system. Thus, they gave themselves the power to determine who was superior and who was inferior. With this idea in place, the Egyptian

¹⁷ Robert L. Tignor, "Lord Cromer: Practitioner and Philosopher of Imperialism," *Journal of British Studies* 2, no. 2 (1963): 142–59.

¹⁸ Earl of Evelyn Baring Cromer, *Modern Egypt* (New York: Macmillan Co, 1908), 132.

¹⁹ *Ibid*, 132, 134.

people were automatically reduced to “subhuman”²⁰ because they were not English, white, or Christian. Furthermore, many Egyptians were denied the right to an education based on their ethnicity.²¹ Cromer extended this inferiority on a general level to all Egyptian people with women becoming second-class citizens within the order of the dehumanized Egyptian society.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this paper was to delve further into understanding how the superiority complex surrounding British culture combined with Cromer’s view of Christian and Islamic beliefs effectively ‘othered’ the Egyptian people. Moreover, Cromer ‘double-others’ women in Egypt by establishing systems and laws that discriminated against them because they were Egyptian Muslims and because they were women. Furthermore, the ‘double-othering’ that impacted women in Egypt began with the ‘othering’ of women in England. This ‘othering’ was evident based on the laws that Britain established regarding the rights of women in the England prior to the colonization of Egypt. Discrimination first established itself based on ethnicity. Second, the oppression of women became a way in which Britain could justify its actions. Egyptian women were never held as equals or protected under the law just as British women were not. The only difference that would have been acknowledged was that women in England were white Englishwomen and therefore considered superior.

The issues concerning unjust actions against women, with regard to a lack of freedom and identity, continue to be an obstacle in many societies today. These issues have become even more apparent with the recent election of Donald Trump, a racist and misogynistic man, as

²⁰ Samera Esmeir, “At Once Human and Not Human: Law, Gender and Historical Becoming in Colonial Egypt,” *Gender & History* 23, no. 2 (August 1, 2011): 235–49, doi:10.1111/j.1468-0424.2011.01636.x, 239.

²¹ Tignor, “Lord Cromer.”, 148.

President-Elect of the United States. As a result the ‘othering’ and ‘double-othering’ of minorities and women is of great concern to many people around the world. Trump and Cromer share many aspects in terms of their negative views of women and their white supremacist mindsets. These views enabled both men to take control through the use of inequality and hate speech.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Card, Jane. “The Power of Context: The Portrait of Dido Elizabeth Belle Lindsay and Lady Elizabeth Murray.” *Teaching History*, no. 160 (September 2015): 8–14.
- Esmeir, Samera. “At Once Human and Not Human: Law, Gender and Historical Becoming in Colonial Egypt.” *Gender & History* 23, no. 2 (August 1, 2011): 235–49.
doi:10.1111/j.1468-0424.2011.01636.x.
- Evelyn Baring Cromer, Earl of. *Modern Egypt*. New York: Macmillan Co, 1908.
- Fay, Mary. *Unveiling the Harem: Elite Women and the Paradox of Seclusion in Eighteenth-Century Cairo*. Syracuse, N.Y: Syracuse University Press, 2012.
- Hinnells, John, and Richard King, eds. *Religion and Violence in South Asia: Theory and Practice*. London ; New York: Routledge, 2006.

Leila Ahmed, author. *Women and Gender in Islam: Historical Roots of a Modern Debate*. New Haven [Conn.]: Yale University Press, 1992.

Meade, Teresa A., and Merry E. Wiesner-Hanks. *A Companion to Gender History*. 1 edition. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2004.

Sarah Graham-Brown, author. *Images of Women: The Portrayal of Women in Photography of the Middle East, 1860-1950*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.

Tignor, Robert L. "Lord Cromer: Practitioner and Philosopher of Imperialism." *Journal of British Studies* 2, no. 2 (1963): 142–59.