

Knowledge at the service of the British Empire

The Gazetteer of the Persian Gulf, Oman and Central Arabia

NELIDA FUCCARO

*Abstract*¹

This article explores different contexts of and implications for the production of colonial knowledge in India at the turn of the twentieth century by concentrating on The Gazetteer of the Persian Gulf, Oman and Central Arabia, a voluminous geographical and historical compilation dealing with one of the peripheries of the British Indian Empire which is still used widely by historians as a source of information on the region. In order to highlight the close relationship between imperial agency, the power of knowledge and the making of different types of boundaries, the Gazetteer is analyzed as a text and as a political and scholarly enterprise which presented the Persian Gulf as a cultural and geopolitical creation of the Indian metropole.

Knowledge at the service of politics is an old story, particularly when considering the history of European colonialism in Asia, Africa and the Middle East in the 19th and 20th centuries. Colonial enterprises were in fact characterized not only by military conquest and imperial subjugation, superior armies and navies, military technology and bureaucratic skills. They were also the result of the ability on the part of the European conquerors to produce and systematize knowledge about the land and peoples they came to rule (Dirks 1996: ix-xvii). By focusing on *The Gazetteer of the Persian Gulf, Oman and Central Arabia* this chapter examines the interplay between the production of knowledge, the infrastructure of empire and the textual representation of the indigenous politics and societies of the Persian Gulf in British India at the turn of the 20th century. While the literature on knowledge and empire focusing on the Indian sub-continent is vast and largely inspired by insights from Foucault and Said (Cohn

¹ I wish to thank James Onley and Peter Sluglett for comments on earlier drafts of this article and bibliographical suggestions. I am also grateful to the participants of the workshop 'Changes in the Boundaries of Knowledge' for their feedback, particularly to Inga Brandell and Johan Schimanski.

1987 and 1996; Dirks 2001; Inden 1990; Metcalf 1994), to date no study has dealt with the Persian Gulf region, an important periphery of the British Indian Empire which connected the sub-continent to the Middle East.

Literary sources such as the *Gazetteer* provide a unique perspective on the intrinsic relationship between the production of colonial knowledge and different processes of boundary making. These texts illustrate how new forms of knowledge on indigenous peoples were instrumental in furthering imperial ideals by offering novel categories of understanding of local cultures and political systems. The *Gazetteer* is an historical and geographical compilation which was issued as a secret document by the Government of India on the eve of the First World War and conceived to assist the consolidation of British informal rule in the Persian Gulf. As an encyclopaedic work which runs to some 5,000 pages, this voluminous publication expanded both quantitatively and qualitatively the body of information on the Gulf region available to British officials in India, in the Persian Gulf and in London. In doing so it undoubtedly engendered an epistemic shift by proposing (and imposing) novel interpretations of Gulf history, politics and societies dictated by the contingencies of imperial power and assisted by imperial scientific knowledge and by European political philosophy on the East. Further, and more concretely, this process of knowledge production resulted in the creation of new geographies of rule which had long-lasting repercussions on the relationship between India and the Gulf. By advocating the fixation of territorial boundaries in the region's turbulent tribal hinterlands, the *Gazetteer* envisaged the consolidation of the region as the western frontier of British India anticipating a new era of state-building under the aegis of the British Empire which was to materialize after the First World War and continued apace after the discovery of oil in the 1930s and 1940s.

This article follows the well-established premise that there is a close relationship between knowledge, power, and text. As Foucault has famously argued, the production of knowledge is intrinsically interwoven with relations of power, a necessary pre-condition for the establishment of different forms of social, political and cultural control (Foucault 1977, 1981; Gordon 1980). Drawing on Foucault, the powerful critique of Orientalist scholarship by Said has been extremely influential in the study of literary texts and colonial literature as cultural forms which were the unique expression of European domination, that is, a reflection of both political practice and a discourse on the "other" (Said 1979). Following both Foucault and Said, and building on the lively debate on colonial knowledge generated by studies of British India and of the colonial world (Cooper and Stoler 1997: 1-18), the *Gazetteer* is here analyzed from two inter-related perspectives. First, it is discussed as a project of imperial expansion which aimed at furthering British influence in the region. Central to this project were the mobilization of intelligence and bureaucratic networks and the deployment of the academic and investigative skills of several members of the Indian Civil Service, based in India and in the Persian Gulf. This approach also builds on literature dealing with information systems, ideology and strategies of rule in different imperial contexts, with a focus on the agency and worldviews of different types of intelligence gatherers and spies (Bayly 1996; Satia 2008; Ágoston 2007). Second, the *Gazetteer* is examined as a text in order to disclose how its narrative style and contents reproduced newly-conceived British designs

on the region, as well as cultural and political representations of the Gulf world which were embedded in the scholarly and imperial traditions of the East promoted by British and European scholars in the 19th century.

Knowledge as text and imperial practice

Before the publication of the *Gazetteer*, the case of the Persian Gulf suggests that the project of knowledge production in the service of the colonial enterprise was limited as the region remained a far-away appendix of the British Raj throughout much of the 19th century. The realities of informal empire limited the extent of political control exercised by the Government of India as well as the ability of its officials to gather local intelligence. It is true, however, that the official reports, surveys, naval charts and maps produced in this period helped to consolidate British economic and strategic interests while forging alliances with local rulers. Of particular relevance were the navigation guides that the Admiralty started publishing in 1864 under the title of *The Persian Gulf Pilot* which was regularly updated and reprinted, going through eight editions up to 1932 (Great Britain Admiralty 1989). There is ample evidence to suggest that this body of literature was an important instrument in guiding policy-making in London and India and the day-to-day administration of British interests in the key ports of the region such as Bushehr, Manamah and Muscat. In this sense surveys, intelligence *précis* and maps were as influential as the British Navy – the main military force in the region since 1820 – in maintaining the *Pax Britannica* along the coast and in minimizing tribal conflict in its immediate hinterlands (Yapp 1980: 72-84 and 1980a: 41-58).

Nevertheless, knowledge of the geography, politics and societies of the Arab coast and tribal areas of the Arabian Peninsula remained generally patchy and unsystematic until the early 20th century. This in spite of the presence of several “native agencies” located in port towns, which in these scarcely populated and often turbulent regions were central to the information networks which sustained British informal rule. Native agents, usually Indian, Arab or Persian merchants or influential members of local communities, were on the payroll of the Government of India and relied on an entourage of informants which included assistants, interpreters and clerks (Onley 2007: 64-103, 108-117). In the 19th century British influence rested almost exclusively on these agencies which were under the authority of a Political Resident based in Bushehr on the Persian side of the Gulf. The Residency became an exclusively political posting after 1822: it had started its activities in 1763 as a commercial establishment under the East India Company’s factory in Basra. In Ottoman Iraq, the Baghdad Residency also functioned as an important intelligence centre, particularly for northern and central Arabia, although after the 1830s it did not depend directly on the Indian government following its incorporation into the consular service (Satia 2008: 24).

The systematization and codification of the scattered information on the Persian Gulf became a crucial component of the ideology and practice of British imperialism with the compilation and publication of the *Gazetteer* as a secret document between 1908 and 1915 following new British trajectories in the

Persian Gulf which reflected both regional and global developments (Lorimer 1986).² On the one hand, the Gulf had risen to strategic prominence in international politics as a result of British relations with Russia in Iran and Afghanistan and of Germany's growing ambitions in the East. On the other, the decades after the 1880s marked a new phase of British expansion overseas which materialized in the Ottoman Middle East with the occupation of Egypt in 1882. In economic terms, the new global era of 'steel and steam' (as Rhoads Murphey has aptly called the new age of British colonialism by land and sea) transformed the Gulf into a station for British shipping to and from India. This followed the introduction of steam navigation along the river valleys of Iraq and its extension to the Gulf waters in the 1860s (Murphey 1989: 241-42; Yapp 1980a: 54). In political terms, the Government of India tightened its control over the principalities of the Arab coast in the 1880s with the negotiation of exclusive agreements with their rulers which placed them under the direct control of the Imperial Crown. Further, at the turn of the 20th century native agents were replaced by British officials working for the Indian service. In 1905 there were only two native agents in the region, who operated from Sharjah in Trucial Oman and from Gwadar, a port on the Makran coast controlled by Oman, while the agencies of Muscat, Manamah in Bahrain and Kuwait were staffed by newly-appointed British political officers (Lorimer 1986: I, vol.5: 2663-99).

In spite of these new developments, British military establishments remained confined to regional ports and did not grow substantially in size and number. By 1904 they included small contingents of the British Indian Army based in Muscat, Bahrain and Bushehr and two Royal Navy ships stationed in Bushehr and Basra with patrolling duties. There were also several coal depots which provisioned the Navy (Lorimer 1986: I, vol.1: 396). In this age of accelerated economic and political penetration, diplomacy and exploration became far more important than military force. It is no coincidence that the history of the *Gazetteer* should begin in November 1903 with a long official tour of the Persian Gulf by Lord Curzon, the Viceroy of India. Before his appointment to this position Curzon was a bold and compulsive traveller fascinated by Asia. Mixing exploration and politics in the 1880s and early 1890s, he wrote extensively in the British press on the political situation in Qajar Iran and published *Persia and the Persian Question*, which is still regarded as a classic of the political/travel genre (Curzon 1892: 1: vii-xv).

The official and public profile of Curzon's visit to the Persian Gulf was unprecedented for the region. Designed as an effective demonstration of British power and influence, it provided the context for the beginning of fresh investigations into the political situation and social geography of the Persian Gulf. It also initiated the revision and collation of existing information. As related in the *Gazetteer*, Curzon made several naval explorations while cruising along the Gulf coast on official duty. He was assisted by John Gordon Lorimer, an official of the Indian Civil Service who had just been assigned the task of

² A copy of the original version of the *Gazetteer* is included in India Office Records (hereafter IOR) L/P&S/20/C91/1-4. It was republished in 1970 by Gregg International and in 1986 by Archives Editions. The 1986 edition which is used in this article subdivides the two large original volumes (Part I: Historical/ Part II: Geographical and Statistical) into 9 volumes.

compiling the *Gazetteer* with a group of assistants (Lorimer 1986: I, vol.5: 2626-62; Sluglett 2004).³ In the words of an anonymous Indian civil servant, the *Gazetteer* was to provide British agents and policy-makers in both India and London with “a convenient and a portable handbook to the places and interests with which they are likely to be concerned”.⁴

What materialized from this effort was by no means a ‘portable handbook’ but the *magnum opus* of Gulf imperial knowledge. In its final form the *Gazetteer* was an encyclopaedic work of 5,000 pages printed in only a few dozen copies and organized into two large volumes: the first historical and the second geographical and statistical with hundreds of entries providing information on the physical and political geography of the region including towns, villages, tribes and districts.⁵ The first volume also includes a chart showing the location of the pearl banks on the Arabian side, a map of the Persian Gulf, Oman and central Arabia, and the genealogical trees of Gulf ruling families (Lorimer 1986: I, vol.6: Pocket ns. 1-17 and 25). The map included in the *Gazetteer* was the first large-scale cartographic representation of the Persian Gulf and Arabian Peninsula. It was revised in the following years and gained popularity as “Hunter’s map of Arabia”, named after its compiler Captain F. Fraser Hunter. Hunter, an Indian Army officer and surveyor, was a member of Lorimer’s team and worked with him on the map before its publication in the *Gazetteer* (Hunter 1919: 355-63; Anon. 1910: 362-63).

Conceived as a historical and geographical companion for British officials and policy-makers, the *Gazetteer* prompts a reflection on the “investigative modalities” used by Lorimer and by his team to collect information and to translate it into usable text. As shown by the historical anthropologist Bernard Cohn, these “modalities” were procedures of gathering and processing information which constituted an integral part of British colonial practice in India. They included personal observation, surveys and the pursuit of knowledge on the history, languages and cultures of the region through travel accounts, historical works and literary texts (Cohn 1996: 3-11). The same procedures were adopted for the compilation of the *Gazetteer* which draws on both literary sources and intelligence, often first recorded in official correspondence and secret reports. Following a consolidated tradition in the Indian Civil Service, Lorimer was not only a compiler but also a skilled researcher and an astute intelligence officer and field investigator. He consulted the archives of Bombay and Calcutta with his team, and interviewed and corresponded with political agents and missionaries throughout the region. He also perused travel literature and carried out field trips after his first visit in November 1903 as a member of Curzon’s official delegation. As in the case of many fellow civil servants, Lorimer’s training as a colonial administrator and his previous post as a revenue collector and settlement officer on the north-western frontier of British India fostered his intellectual

³ IOR R/1/4/1052 ‘Personal file of J.G. Lorimer 1889-1907, 1919’, p. 2.

⁴ IOR R/1/4/1052 ‘Personal file of J.G. Lorimer’, p. 7.

⁵ See IOR L/P&S/20/C91/1-4 for a copy of the original edition of the *Gazetteer*. Other copies are available from the libraries of the British Embassies in Kuwait, Bahrain and Oman. I am indebted to James Onley for this information.

curiosity and academic aspirations. In the pursuit of a deeper understanding of local realities, he acquired proficiency in Persian, Arabic and Pashtu. Moreover, a few years before he started working on the *Gazetteer* he had compiled a code of tribal law of the Peshawar district and a grammar and vocabulary of Waziri-Pashtu.⁶

A few years after the publication of the *Gazetteer*, Hunter defined it as a “literary record” reflecting contemporary perceptions of this genre of colonial writing (Hunter 1919: 356). Yet the *Gazetteer* is neither a personalized account of the region filtered through Lorimer’s eyes nor a work of original scholarship. This becomes apparent from the textual analysis of the historical volume, which reads like a sequence of *précis* drawn from a variety of official, semi-official and literary sources. These sources (which in some cases are reproduced almost verbatim) include correspondence and reports from the Gulf Residency, political agencies and several departments of the Government of India, as well as travel accounts, diaries and local histories written by Europeans. Lorimer made extensive use of the work of travellers such as Burckhardt, Pelly and Palgrave as main references for central Arabia and Kuwait, areas poorly documented in official records but which had become new targets of imperial expansion and exploration alongside other desert lands of the Peninsula and southern Iraq by the early 20th century and particularly during and after the First World War (Satia 2008: 59-135). Central Arabia in particular had been physically inaccessible to British officials in the 19th and early 20th centuries (Lorimer 1986: I, vol. 3: 1000, 1051, 1157). As one of the most recognizable “Arabian blank spots” on Victorian and Edwardian maps, the area was construed by the world of British imperial intelligence as a fictional place, a space often used to project literary fantasies and illicit adventures (Satia 2008: 59). In contrast, the history of Western Christianity in the Gulf which is included in the historical volume is based on semi-official information provided by missionaries stationed in Baghdad and Bahrain, the two main centres of missionary activities and British direct influence in the region (Lorimer 1986: I, vol.5: 2386-99).

Reflecting the narrative style of the official report, the prose of the historical section of the *Gazetteer* is linear and largely matter-of-fact. The only notable exceptions are the brief descriptions of some Arab rulers which partially fulfil the canons of Orientalist writing. By presenting vignettes which evoke the “picturesque”, “romantic”, “sublime” and “realistic”, these descriptions conform to the aesthetic principles which informed 19th century travel accounts of the Middle East. Lorimer rarely adds a personal literary touch to the narrative. He often relates hearsay or makes use of the hyperbolic and somewhat irreverent language of travel accounts and official reports. The ruler of the principality of Sharjah in Trucial Oman is presented to the reader as “little better than a monster in human shape” (Lorimer 1986: I, vol.2: 690). Discussing the retirement years of Sa‘id ibn Ahmad (r. 1783-1786), the last “genuinely elected” Imam of Oman, the *Gazetteer* reports that “[he] appears to have sunk into a

⁶ IOR R/1/4/1052 ‘Personal file of J.G. Lorimer’, pp.1-6; IOR L/P&J/6/307 File 1759 ‘Examination of Mr J.G. Lorimer in Arabic, 21 October 1891’; IOR V 9337 John Gordon Lorimer, Customary Law of the Main Tribes of the Peshawar District, Lahore, 1899 (Series Punjab Customary Law, vol. 17).

lethargic state not far removed from imbecility” (Lorimer 1986: I, vol.2: 418). Some of his successors are characterized in equally strong terms. Sultan ibn Ahmad (r. 1792-1804) is portrayed as “a man of bold and enterprising temper and in freedom of sensuality” (Lorimer 1986: I, vol.2: 420) and his son Sa’id (r. 1807-56) as “peculiar and unstable” (Lorimer 1986: I, vol.2: 441). Religious inclinations are also subject to some scrutiny. In the case of the elder son of the Omani ruler Faysal ibn Turki (r. 1899-1913) they are interpreted as “bigotry” (Lorimer 1986: I, vol.2: 588). In contrast, the *Gazetteer* construes the piety of the early Sa’udi rulers of Najd in central Arabia as a sign of “patriotic” and “national” fervor (Lorimer 1986: I, vol.3: 1053). These tropes and images suggest how travel accounts and official reports served to typecast Gulf rulers. In this respect Lorimer’s work as a compiler followed an established tradition in British India, where travel accounts in particular constituted the key reference texts which served one of the “investigative modalities” pursued by the British administration to control Indian society (Cohn 1996: 6-7).

While the *Gazetteer* displays only occasionally the literary aesthetics of Orientalism, it conforms strictly to the academic canons of 19th century European writing on the East. The first of the last two appendices to the historical section includes a long bibliography which lists published materials, official and confidential reports and *précis*. The second deals with the transliteration system used for both volumes which was specially devised by Lorimer for the *Gazetteer* (Lorimer 1986: I, vol.5: 2700-41). The *Gazetteer*’s bibliographical and linguistic apparatus is testimony to Lorimer and his team’s strict adherence to Orientalist conventions and to their skills in mastering the tools of 19th century scholarship. It is also significant in the wider context of the production of knowledge about the Gulf, particularly when examining debates surrounding the transliteration of Arabic and Persian words into English. By 1906 this issue had become the object of fierce contestation in Simla, the summer capital of the British Raj, where Lorimer was completing the map of the Persian Gulf, Oman and central Arabia. A special government committee ruled to the effect that no Anglicized version of place names should be used in the *Gazetteer* and that particular attention was to be devoted to the rendering of vernacular terms. In the following years this new system of transliteration, which became known as the Lorimer system, was officially adopted by the Government of India (Hunter 1919: 356-57). The de-Anglicization of indigenous names and the attention paid to vernacular terminology suggest that Gulf languages had become an integral part of the project of imperial knowledge. The “correct” rendering of local idioms and of dialects in particular had in fact become an instrument to penetrate indigenous customs and societies, a means of making local realities intelligible.⁷

In contrast to the historical section, the geographical and statistical part of the *Gazetteer* belongs to the colonial genre of the geographical narrative, which, in British India, usually took the form of descriptions and surveys of regions for administrative purposes (Edney 1990: 77). In the *Gazetteer*, observations of Gulf

⁷ For a discussion of the appropriation of indigenous languages in the Indian context see Cohn 1996: 16-56.

landscapes, politics and societies are neatly ordered as entries in a geographical dictionary to be consulted in conjunction with the map of the Persian Gulf, Oman and central Arabia. The presentation of information in this dictionary is very systematic and user-friendly, as in the manuals and codes of practice used by colonial administrators elsewhere in the Empire. Details on tribes, tribal divisions and topography are often presented in tabular form. Further, the main entries dealing with political divisions are organized following a regular system of topics with standard sub-entries such as “Inhabitants”, “Agriculture and Crops”, “Communications by Land and Water” and “Administration and Government” (Lorimer 1986: II, vol.7, ii).

Central to the *Gazetteer's* geographical narrative was direct observation and human intelligence, not books. Much of the information was collected from surveys carried out between 1903 and 1907 by Lorimer himself, the British agents at Bahrain, Sharjah, Muscat and Kuwait and Percy Cox, the British Resident at Bushehr (Lorimer 1986: II, vol.1: 233, vol.8: 1058, vol. 9: 1313, 1382-3, 1425). Some intelligence was also gathered by Arab and Persian *munshis*, subordinate native political officers who often worked as administrative assistants and translators (Onley 2007: xvii). The text of the *Gazetteer* and the map of the Persian Gulf, Oman and central Arabia indicate that these special investigations were a preliminary exploration of the region's natural, social and political world informed by empirical methods of research. The treatment of land, peoples and resources reflected a 19th century understanding of geography in India and Britain as a science of measurement and description. As recollected by Hunter who helped Lorimer to draw the large-scale map of the region, the *Gazetteer* questioned the geographical knowledge popularized by travellers such as Niebuhr, Palgrave and Burton (Hunter 1919: 357). Yet it did not entirely conform to scientific criteria. For instance, in the absence of census figures, population numbers are approximate and based on estimates of houses and tribal fighters. Much of the topography and social geography of areas far from the coast are also “conjectural”, as Lorimer candidly admits in the Introduction. Further, distances are calculated on the basis of hours, camel and caravan days and miles, depending on the availability of information (Lorimer 1986: II, vol.7: iii-iv).

In some respects British observers continued to investigate the region from a distance as they had done in the 19th century. However, the relative speed with which intelligence was collected and exchanged is indicative of broader changes in the information order championed by the British Indian government in the Gulf and of the increasing cooperation in intelligence matters between India and the Foreign Office. Since the 1830s the latter took charge of the consular agents posted in southern Iraq who provided vital assistance to Lorimer and his team by collecting information and historical works on Basra, Baghdad and Najd (Bayly 1996; Satia 2008: 24). Lorimer could easily organize fact-finding missions from India and was able to tour the Gulf several times with the logistical and political support of British officials. Last but not least, he benefitted from recent improvements in communications, as the establishment of weekly steamship services between the Gulf coast and India in 1874 allowed the relatively quick despatch of *précis* and reports (Lorimer 1986: I, vol.5, 2441). Lines of communication are also discussed in the *Gazetteer* and not only in relation to strategic and military matters. The history of telegraphic and postal services, for

instance, features prominently in the historical section (Lorimer 1986: I, vol.5, 2400-74). By the early 20th century, Gulf agencies had also become a key institution in this chain of knowledge exchange. Agents not only acted as gatherers and procurers of intelligence but also provided help in translating information into text by revising and updating intelligence *précis* and drafts of the *Gazetteer*. For instance, the entry “Bahrain Principality” was revised by the British agent at Bahrain in 1906 after Lorimer had produced a draft article based on his own investigations conducted in the islands in the previous two years (Lorimer 1986: II, vol.7: 233). The significance of the *Gazetteer* for the development of what Satia has recently defined as “the world of British intelligence” in (and *on*) Arabia and the Middle East during and after the First World War is beyond the scope of this study (Satia 2008: 4, 16). Suffice to say that the *Gazetteer* gave new impetus to the exploration of both Arabia and Ottoman Iraq, areas which unlike the majority of the Gulf coast were not under the British Indian government but under the consular jurisdiction of the Foreign Office.

While the pages of the *Gazetteer* disclose the role played by imperial agents as intelligence gatherers and compilers, they offer little or no insight into indigenous actors as active participants in the production of knowledge.⁸ In British India the translation of intelligence and observation into text, maps and naval charts was as much the work of indigenous assistants as of the metropolitan administrators of the Indian Civil Service. For instance, as noted by Matthew Edney, local guides and informants were as influential as metropolitan surveyors and draftsmen in the production of maps of far-away regions not under direct British control (Edney 1990: 25, 79-85). In a study on censuses Peabody has also demonstrated that reliance on native informants was a major determinant in the adoption of caste-based forms of classification which were previously considered as an innovation of the colonial state (Peabody 2001: 841). In the Gulf, as elsewhere on the periphery of British India, local “collaborators” participated in the production of imperial knowledge as intelligence gatherers, spies, local intermediaries and bureaucrats, most notably in the case of native agents.

These individuals assumed a prominent role in the chain of intelligence whenever the observational powers of British officials failed. This was often the result of their inability to access places, particularly tribal hinterlands, or exclusive social milieus. Hence all the intelligence on Oman which appears in the *Gazetteer* was collected in Muscat. It seems that neither Lorimer nor any other British official was able to visit central Arabia as a result of the hostilities between Ibn Sa‘ud and Ibn Rashid (Lorimer 1986: II, vol.9: 1313, 1383). Most of the detailed information on local customs, industries and trade was gathered by occasional informers or by spies working for the agencies. Their mention is often omitted from the pages of the *Gazetteer* in order to add credibility to the text. Discussing distances, Lorimer warns the reader that “estimates ... where they depend on native information only are not very reliable” (Lorimer 1986: II,

⁸ Questioning the assumption that natives were simply passive recipients in the process has been the hallmark of a strand of revisionist literature pioneered among others by Bayly 1996. See Wagoner 2003: 784-786.

vol.7: iii). The presence of local informants can often be inferred from circumstantial evidence provided in the text. For instance, the agents at Kuwait and Bahrain are credited with having gathered crucial intelligence on Najdi tribes, but it is clear that they never visited central Arabia (Lorimer 1986: II, vol.9: 1313). Only a handful of individuals holding official positions in the agencies feature in the text: the native agent at Sharjah, ‘Abd al-Latif ibn ‘Abd al-Rahman, who assisted Lorimer during his investigations in early 1905, and Im‘am al-Haqq, the Indian interpreter of the Bahrain agency and a graduate of Aligarh University, who helped the British agent revise Lorimer’s text (Lorimer 1986: II, vol.7, 233, vol.9: 1425).

New Geographies of Rule

In the text of the *Gazetteer*, British imperial expansion and the information networks which supported it intersected with the technical skills and rational spirit which animated the bureaucrats and administrators on the payroll of the Government of India. A single dominant concern guided the production of the *Gazetteer* in the shadow of informal rule: the idea that in order to control the political destiny of the Gulf polities one must know them. From this perspective the *Gazetteer*’s historical narrative, geographical dictionary, maps and genealogical trees were the “artefacts” defining the new frontier of British imperial knowledge. In depicting territory, societies and indigenous elites, they created new geographies of rule which legitimized and furthered the role of the British Raj as regional protector. To illustrate this point this section focuses on how the *Gazetteer* conceptualizes Gulf history, political systems, elites and borders, drawing on the seminal work of Bernard Cohn. Since the 1950s, more than two decades before Edward Said published *Orientalism*, Cohn’s critique of colonial discourses has focused on the history of key terms such as “tribe”, “caste” and “village” as an integral part of the “technologies” of rule deployed by the British Empire in India, an approach developed more recently by Dirks in his analysis of the construction of caste as a product of the colonial encounter (Cohn 1987; Dirks 2001).

As in the case of India, history was central to bestowing legitimacy upon the British imperial enterprise in the Gulf. Hence the prominent role accorded to it in the *Gazetteer*, which promotes the knowledge of Gulf history as an instrument for understanding indigenous practices of government and for integrating them into a new political project. This is clearly evident in the binary structure of Part I of the historical volume, where the imperial and local histories of the Arab coast are discussed separately. Chapters 2 to 9 concentrate on the history of ruling dynasties of imams, emirs and shaykhs, while Chapter 1 deals with regional history through the lens of European domination (Lorimer 1986: I, vols 1-3). Since 1872, when the Government of India took over political arrangements in the Gulf from the Bombay Presidency, the region is presented as an appendix of the British Indian Empire. The narrative is organized chronologically following the tenure of office of the Viceroys of India. More recent events covering the period 1900 to 1905 are often reported in annalistic form, conveying the sense of urgency and immediacy which originally prompted the compilation of the

Gazetteer (Lorimer 1986: I, vol.1: 265-394). In contrast with this neatly arranged chronological order, Lorimer points to some arbitrary periodization used in the *Gazetteer*, particularly in the sections dealing with the history of local dynasties and principalities. He clearly views this often troubled history as chaotic and messy, in accordance with contemporary conceptions of historical change as linear and evolutionary. Lorimer felt a compelling drive to impose some “rational” organization on the materials. To this effect a detailed table of contents is included in the historical volume which, as explained in the Introduction, partly compensates for this inadequacy (Lorimer 1986: I, vol.1: i-ii).

The *Gazetteer* does not make use of history to present a vision of Gulf civilization. This was partly the result of the limited information available to Lorimer on ancient Gulf cultures and history, but was also a symptom of the general disregard for the cultural achievements of tribal societies in imperial India. As evidence of this disregard, Gulf dynasties and rulers, rather than tribes, constitute the building blocks of the *Gazetteer*’s historical and geographical analysis. That tribal leaders were not central to the representation of Gulf polities also reflected consideration of *realpolitik*. In the Persian Gulf, British policies effectively sought to undermine the military power of leading tribes, favouring, at least along the coast, processes of sedentarization. In this respect, the workings of British power in the Gulf region did not conform to the general patterns found elsewhere in highly tribalized areas under imperial control. In the north-western frontier of India and in rural Iraq during the period of the British Mandate, for instance, tribes constituted the kernel of colonial policies, as well as the focus of colonial representations of indigenous societies (Dodge 2003; Bruce 1932). In the *Gazetteer* tribal solidarities are presented as a corollary of government. The geographical dictionary in particular includes a wealth of information on tribes in connection with ruling elites which were all of tribal descent: the Al Saud and Al Rashid of central Arabia, the Al Khalifah of Bahrain, the Al Sabah of Kuwait and the Al Bu Said of Oman. The genealogical trees of Gulf ruling families included in the historical volume are a visual reminder of how kinship moulded dynastic rule and of the politics of intrigue, murder and warfare which antagonized the various tribal aristocracies (Lorimer 1986: I, vol. 6: Pocket ns 1-17).

In representing Gulf political systems through its rulers, the *Gazetteer* construes them as anarchic, despotic or instruments of good government. The political conduct of those in power was generally measured against the immediate objectives of the *Pax Britannica*. Of particular importance in this respect was their ability to maintain law and order under close British protection. With regard to their ancestors, a key consideration in the portrayal of the *Gazetteer* was the extent to which their style of government fitted in with the imperial ideal of civilizing mission. A case in point is the Sa’udi dynasty of central Arabia which had become a major political force in the Arabian Peninsula and a precious ally of the Government of India against Ottoman expansionism by the time the *Gazetteer* was being compiled. Contrary to one of the classical interpretations of the pre-colonial state in British India (Cohn 1996: 65-72), the Sa’udi government is not presented as a theocracy. It is considered as the “secular” and “political” manifestation of Wahhabism, which is described in very positive terms as a strictly “orthodox” religious movement, contrary to the received wisdom of

the age which viewed it as a manifestation of fundamentalist inclinations. The Sa‘udi emirs of Najd are thus endowed with “patriotic” and “national” qualities, particularly Sa‘ud ibn ‘Abd al-‘Aziz (r. 1803-14) whose rule is presented in the *Gazetteer* as the golden age of the Sa‘udi state. Mirroring the British civilizing mission, he is also praised as the saviour of the corrupt, bloody and lawless world of Najd. His portrayal as a champion of free trade in Arabia also evokes the image of the gentlemanly capitalist of the Victorian age (Lorimer 1986: I, vol. 3: 1052-53, 1063-67).

In the representation of the Sa‘udi dynasty we can also detect clear hints of the romantic conception of the tribal world which dominated much of the 19th century travel literature on Arabia and which during and after the First World War permeated the geographical and cultural imaginary of British agents such as T.E Lawrence and Gertrude Bell (Geniesse 1999; Ure 2003; Satia 2008: 60-70). The notion that tribal Arabia was an unadulterated locus of loyalty, freedom and even democratic values is echoed in many of Lorimer’s literary sources. The *Gazetteer* further characterizes the political profile of Sa‘ud ibn al-‘Aziz Al Sa‘ud as “never that of an absolute or arbitrary monarch; it was rather that of a great Arab Shaykh ruling by influence, whose subordinate allies and subjects possessed a large degree of local freedom and even rights” (Lorimer 1986: I, vol.3: 1063). Discussing the amirs of ‘Unayzah, the capital of the Qasim region of Najd, the *Gazetteer* explains that they “wielded them [their powers] in a constitutional manner deferring to some extent to their *majlis* or their council” (Lorimer 1986: II, vol.7: 76). The egalitarian disposition of the tribesmen of central Arabia also becomes apparent in the distinction made between bigoted and “good” Wahhabis, the latter tempered by the “more generous” disposition of Bedouin blood (Lorimer 1986: I, vol. 3: 1109).

The solid foundations of the Sa‘udi state and its alleged secular and national character and fair administration conformed to British ideals of indigenous good governance at a time when the Government of India needed strong and loyal allies in the region. In a similar vein the Omani ruler Ahmad ibn Sa‘id (r. 1754-83) wins praise in the *Gazetteer* for his role as a state builder. He is briefly but splendidly characterized as a true father of his people and a patron of the arts, a mixture of Renaissance prince and Mogul emperor (Lorimer 1986: I, vol.2: 416). This is in stark contrast to the political and moral decadence attributed to his successors who are generally regarded as having lost influence and legitimacy. The disappearance of “vigorous government” in Oman was a major drawback in British eyes as it encouraged foreign penetration. In 1899 the Government of India forced the ruler Faysal ibn Turki to cancel a concession he had given to the French government for the establishment of a coal depot (Lorimer 1986: I, vol.2: 555-60).

The issue of law as linked to political order was also central in the definition of the ideological infrastructure which dominated the British conception of Gulf politics. It is perhaps in this respect that the *Gazetteer* is most explicit in voicing the historical inevitability of the civilizing mission of empire. The absence of institutionalized legal systems and of a “regular” system of succession was a key element in the construction of this ideological infrastructure. As a counterpoint to the favourable assessment of domestic politics in Sa‘udi Najd, the *Gazetteer* raises the question of “civil rights” in Oman and Bahrain, criticizing the legal

powers of the rulers, the justice dispensed by Muslim courts and the application of tribal customary law. In the first instance, the arbitrary nature of local government was measured by the ill-treatment on the part of indigenous rulers of British-protected subjects. These were mostly Indian and Persian merchants who, by the late 19th century, enjoyed rights of extra-territorial jurisdiction and thus were under the protection of the British Crown. Often, the jurisdictional authority of rulers, tribes and religious courts intersected with that of the Government of India, particularly in cases of commercial disputes involving locals and British-protected merchants (Lorimer 1986: II, vol.7: 249-251, vol. 9: 1420). The “imperfect” nature of heredity across the region was also considered a further indication of lawlessness. According to local customs, succession was not established by primogeniture but extended to all members of ruling families. The issue of hereditary sovereignty is explicitly discussed in the case of 19th century Oman and informs much of the understanding of the history of domestic politics in the smaller tribal principalities of the region, from Trucial Oman to Bahrain (Lorimer 1986: I, vol.1: 419).

By the turn of the 20th century the securing of rights of succession by primogeniture and the consolidation of extra-territorial jurisdiction had become the centrepiece of British imperial policies in the Gulf. This is epitomized by developments in Bahrain, the linchpin of British power in the region. When Lorimer visited the islands in 1904, the Government of India had already recognized the son of the ruler ‘Isa ibn ‘Ali Al Khalifah as his heir apparent. Earlier in the year, after clashes between Persians and Najdi tribesmen in Manamah, the protections afforded by the laws of British India were extended to all the foreign population of the islands (Fuccaro 2009: 78, 153-56). In the light of these developments it is no coincidence that the *Gazetteer* devotes much attention to Bahrain, stressing the arbitrary character of the local government, which was clearly uncongenial to British interests and ideals (Lorimer 1986: I, vol.2: 926-33, 938-42; II, vol.7: 248-53). Discussing the situation in the period 1904-7, the *Gazetteer* notes:

It was felt also that some of the features of the internal administration of Bahrain were not altogether creditable to the protecting British power. The slave trade still flourishes... oppression of subjects too was rife carried on not only by the Shaikh [‘Isa ibn ‘Ali Al Khalifah] and by members of the Al Khalifa family, but also by petty magisterial and revenue authorities... the chief sufferers from the arbitrariness of the administration were the aboriginal cultivating population. (Lorimer 1986: I, vol. 2: 943).

Uniquely among Gulf ruling families, the depiction of the Al Khalifah resembles that of “Oriental despots”, a trope which dominated much of the literature on Mogul emperors and Hindu states in India, and on the Qajar dynasty of Iran (Cohn 1987: 209-12; Cohn 1996: 62-65; Inden 1990: 162-212; Abrahamian 1979). The Al Khalifah regime suffered from loose and ill-organized government, but in the eyes of British observers displayed two salient characteristics of despotism: the arbitrary nature of justice and the insecurity of property rights. Thus the *Gazetteer* places emphasis on the position of the ruler as the supreme landowner of the islands and on the deplorable condition of the Shi‘i agricultural population. In order to provide a well-rounded picture of the Al Khalifah as

feudal “despots”, Bahrain’s legal and political system is described in detail, and an entire section is devoted to “Class Disabilities and Privileges” (Lorimer 1986: II, vol. 7: 248-49). Bahrain thus becomes the archetype of tyrannical, yet chaotic, government, almost as a counterpoint to the idyllic and somewhat idealized portrayal of Sa’udi Najd. The ideological construction of local government in Bahrain is far more comprehensive than that of any other region along the Arab coast, supported by a dearth of detail and first-hand information on different aspects of the politics, economics and demography of the region. The political importance assumed by the islands at the turn of the 20th century clearly played a role, prompting the close scrutiny of the *Gazetteer*. Bahrain’s society and its rulers had received constant British attention since the early 19th century, given the strategic and commercial importance of the islands as the world centre of pearling and as the largest commercial entrepôt of the region, a fact which can readily explain the *Gazetteer*’s more elaborate portrayal and interpretation of local realities.

Imperial concerns with imparting order to the Arab coast are also evident from the *Gazetteer*’s underlying preoccupation with political and territorial boundaries. From this perspective, both the geographical dictionary and the map of the Persian Gulf, Oman and central Arabia can be read as textual and visual commentaries on the contemporary landscape and government. In fact, as stated in the Introduction to the dictionary, they were primarily conceived as an account of “physical and political conditions” (Lorimer 1986: II, vol.7: i). Besides offering a vision of imperial order which centres on political units (parallel to the historical section), they are testimony to British endeavours to fix the sphere of influence of local rulers by drawing clear boundary lines across the region. As the Persian Gulf marked the imaginary western frontier of British India, the need to fix territorial borders was compelling in the tense political climate of the early 20th century characterised by increasing European rivalry over Asia and the Middle East.

Although the publication of the *Gazetteer* was preceded by extensive discussions between Lorimer and the political agents on where boundary lines should be drawn,⁹ the identification of borders proved to be an arduous task, given that the Arabian Peninsula had notoriously fluid land frontiers. In spite of these limitations, the theme of boundary features prominently as a discourse of state-building, that is, as a line defining administrative rather than tribal influence. In the geographical dictionary consistent attention is devoted to each of the entries dealing with local political units recognized by the British Government: the Sultanate of Oman, Sa’udi Najd and the various principalities of the Arab coast. Depending on the perceived nature and knowledge of local government, these frontiers are described in the text either as “boundaries” or “limits” of state authority. Only on a few occasions, and particularly when discussing remote areas of central Arabia, does the *Gazetteer* use geographical features such as hills as an indication of borders (Lorimer 1986: II, vol. 8: 1059-61, vol. 9: 1351-52, 1385, 1428, 1485-86, 1733).

⁹ See for instance IOR R/15/5/67 ‘Relations with Qatif and boundaries of Kuwait, 1905-14’ Correspondence Political Agent Bahrain to Political Agent Kuwait, 25 March 1905.

The map of the Persian Gulf, Oman and central Arabia highlights the additional limitations posed by cartography in fixing both imperial projections on borders and political realities on the ground. Lorimer never intended to produce a tribal map of the Arabian Peninsula. His main concern was to include key topographical elements (towns, villages, wells and mountain ranges) and to visualize the political geography of the region following the rationale of the geographical dictionary. A further aim was also to produce a map which could take its place alongside existing maps of British India in order to have “a map of that portion of the world between Burma and Egypt” (Hunter 1919: 357-63; Anon. 1910: 362). The final version of the map included in the *Gazetteer* orders the territory, following an administrative/political taxonomy which reflects a mixture of topographical conventions and imperial aspirations rather than realities on the ground. Only some of the possessions of the Ottoman Empire and Qajar Iran are marked by provincial or state boundary lines. These two imperial systems were established political realities in the mind of the Government of India as the large territorial empires which controlled southern Iraq and Iran. The classification of political and administrative units in the rest of the region, including the coastal areas and their desert hinterlands which were the object of British designs, is misleading at best. With no boundary lines, it can only be inferred from the size and typeface of the letters used for the names of its main geographical/political units. While Oman and Trucial Oman are designated as “countries”, Bahrain is marked as a “district” and Qatar as a “division” or “province”, suggesting that size was used as the principal criterion for classification (Lorimer 1986: I, vol.6).

By presenting the theme of border as an instrument of state-making, the *Gazetteer* provides a striking narrative and cartographic representation of British imperial projections on the region at the turn of the 20th century. These were projections of order and imperial discipline which in many important respects anticipated political developments after the First World War. In fact, in this period the fixation of boundary lines became an integral part of processes of institution-building which underscored the emergence of modern states under the aegis of the British Empire and oil. With the notable exception of Saudi Arabia, which in the inter-war period emerged as a regional power, the drawing of political borders which the *Gazetteer* had publicized so fervently a few decades earlier continued to be largely an imperialist enterprise dictated by the strategic concerns of the British Government and by the economic interests of British and American oil companies. Since the 1970s when countries such as Kuwait, Bahrain and the United Arab Emirates were released from British control, borders have increasingly functioned as powerful catalysts of local identity and symbols of national cohesion. Arguably, this is an important legacy of the imperial order first championed by the *Gazetteer*.

Conclusion

The *Gazetteer* was conceived of as an important instrument for furthering the influence of the Government of India in the Persian Gulf and for incorporating this peripheral region more securely into the sphere of empire. Its publication

between 1908 and 1915 reflected a new vision of imperial order, which was sustained by the investigative and academic skills of members of the Indian Civil Service. In British India the compilation of handbooks and guides for the use of colonial officials was considered as a mark of distinction in the service and received official encouragement. Building on earlier images and representations of the Gulf and Arabian Peninsula by travellers, Orientalists and Indian civil servants, the *Gazetteer* defined the new frontier of British imperial knowledge, while securing the reputation of Lorimer for posterity. As recently suggested by Satia, the *Gazetteer* also gave impetus to the exploration of Arabia spearheading the vast intelligence effort undertaken by the British Government in the Middle East during and after the First World War, which led to the establishment of mandates in Iraq, Palestine and Transjordan (Satia, 2008: 16, 27-28).

As an exercise in the systematization of knowledge, the *Gazetteer* discloses a great deal about the political aspirations which were guiding the British enterprise along the Arab coast and in the Arabian Peninsula at the turn of the 20th century. It is also fairly explicit about the imperial ideals which underscored this enterprise. The ways in which Gulf history and geography are presented reveal that such knowledge underpinned, and to a certain extent sought to justify, what had become key imperial undertakings in the region: the maintenance of peace and political order under the aegis of the *Pax Britannica*, the transformation of indigenous rulers into trusted British vassals and, last but not least, the fixing of the territorial boundaries of their domains as a way of protecting the western frontier of the British Indian Empire. It can be argued that in focusing on political geographies of rule and boundary lines the *Gazetteer* started the discursive process of modern state-building along the Arab coast, that is, the gradual constitution of territorial states. This has been normally understood as a development associated with the changing nature of the British presence in the Gulf and Middle East after the First World War, with the discovery of oil in the 1930s and 1940s and with the granting of oil concessions to European and American companies (Zahlan 1989: 23-26). What is argued here is that political frontiers and reformed governments were already being conceptualized in the *Gazetteer* as an exercise in imperial knowledge, in anticipation of their implementation on the ground.

References and sources

India Office Records (London)

R/1/4/1052 'Personal file of J.G. Lorimer 1889-1907, 1919'

R/15/1 (Political Residency Bushehr, 1763-1947)

722-726 Persian Gulf Gazetteer Part I Historical and Political Materials

727-728 Persian Gulf Gazetteer Part II Geographical and Descriptive

R/15/5/67 'Relations with Qatif and boundaries of Kuwait, 1905-14'

L/P&S/20 (Political and Secret Department Library Collections, 1800-1947)

C 91/1 The Gazetteer of the Persian Gulf, Arabia and Oman. Vol. I Historical, Part I Calcutta: Government of India, 1915, 1624 pp.

C 91/2 Vol. I Historical, Part II Calcutta: Government of India, 1915, 1625-2741 pp.

- C 91/3 Vol. I Historical, Part III Calcutta: Government of India, 1915, 17 Genealogical Tables and Maps.
- C 91/4 Vol. II Geographical and Statistical Calcutta: Government of India, 1908, 1, 952 pp.
- L/P&J/6/307 File 1759 'Examination of Mr J.G. Lorimer in Arabic, 21 October 1891'
- V 9337 John Gordon Lorimer, Customary Law of the Main Tribes of the Peshawar District, Lahore, 1899 (Series Punjab Customary Law, vol. 17)

Books and articles

- Abrahamian, Ervand (1974). 'Oriental Despotism: the case of Qajar Iran' *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 5: pp. 3-31.
- Ágoston, Gábor (2007). 'Information, Ideology and Limits of Imperial Policy: Ottoman Grand Strategy in the Context of Ottoman-Hapsburg Rivalry' in Virginia H. Aksan and Daniel Goffman eds. *The Early Modern Ottomans: Remapping the Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 75-103.
- Anon. (1910). 'A New Map of Arabia' *Bulletin of the American Geographical Society* 42/5: pp. 362-63.
- Bayly, Christopher A. (1996). *Empire and Information: Intelligence Gathering and Social Communication in India 1780-1870*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bruce, Colonel C.E. (1932). 'The Sandeman Policy as Applied to Tribal Problems of Today' *The Journal of Royal Central Asian Society* 19: pp. 45-67.
- Cohn, Bernard S. (1987). *An Anthropologist among the Historians and Other Essays*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Cohn, Bernard S. (1996). *Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Cooper, Frederick and Stoler, Ann L., eds (1997). *Tensions of Empire. Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Curzon, George N. (1892). *Persia and the Persian Question*. London: Longmans, 2 vols.
- Dewey, Clive (1993). *Anglo-Indian Attitudes: The Mind of the Indian Civil Service*, London: Hambledon Press.
- Dirks, Nicholas B. (2001). *Castes of Mind: Colonialism and the Making of Modern India*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Dirks, Nicholas B. (1996). Foreword to Bernard S. Cohn, *Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, ix-xvii.
- Dodge, Toby (2003). *Inventing Iraq: The Failure of Nation Building and a History Denied*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Edney, Matthew H. (1990). *Mapping an Empire: The Geographical Construction of British India, 1765-1843*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, Michel (1981). *The History of Sexuality*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Foucault, Michel (1977). *Discipline and Punishment*. London: Tavistock.
- Fuccaro, Nelida (2009). *Histories of City and State in the Persian Gulf: Manama since 1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Geniesse, Jane F. (1999). *Freya Stark Passionate Nomad*. London: Random House.
- Gordon, Colin ed. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Michel Foucault. Brighton: Harvester Press.
- Great Britain Admiralty (1989). *The Persian Gulf Pilot, 1864-1932*. Farnham Common: Archive Editions, 8 vols.
- Hunter, Fraser F. (1919). 'Reminiscences of the Map of Arabia and Persian Gulf' *The Geographical Journal* 54/6: pp. 355-63.
- Inden, Ronald B. (1990). *Imagining India*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lorimer, John Gordon (1986). *The Gazetteer of the Persian Gulf, Oman and Central Arabia*. (Part I: Historical/ Part II: Geographical and Statistical, 9 vols) Gerrards Cross, Archive Editions (first republication by Gregg International, Farnborough, 1970).
- Metcalf, Thomas R. (1994). *Ideologies of the Raj*. The New Cambridge History of India, II.4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Murphey, Rhoads (1989). 'On the Evolution of the Port City' in Frank Broeze ed. *Brides of the Sea: Port Cities of Asia from the 16th-20th Centuries*. Kensington: New South Wales University Press, pp. 223-46.

- Onley, James (2007). *The Arabian Frontier of the British Raj: Merchants, Rulers and the British in the Nineteenth-Century Gulf*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Peabody, Norbert (2001). 'Cents, Sense, Census: Human Inventories in Late Precolonial and Early Colonial India' *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 43/4: pp. 819-850.
- Said, Edward (1979). *Orientalism*. New York : Vintage Books.
- Satia, Priya (2008). *Spies in Arabia. The Great War and the Cultural Foundations of Britain's Covert Empire in the Middle East*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sluglett, Peter (2004). 'Lorimer, John Gordon (1870–1914)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press.
(<http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/view/article/38933>).
- Ure, John (2003). *In Search of Nomads: An English Obsession from Hester Stanhope to Bruce Chatwin*. London: Constable.
- Wagoner, Phillip B. (2003). 'Precolonial Intellectuals and the Production of Colonial Knowledge' *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 45/4: pp. 783-814.
- Yapp, Malcolm (1980). 'British Policy in the Persian Gulf' in Alvin J. Cottrell et al. eds. *The Persian Gulf States: A General Survey*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, pp. 70–100.
- Yapp, Malcolm (1980 a). 'The Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries' in Alvin J. Cottrell et al. eds. *The Persian Gulf States: A General Survey*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, pp. 41–69.
- Zahlan, Rosemarie S. (1989). *The Making of the Modern Gulf States: Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar the United Arab Emirates and Oman*. Reading: Ithaca Press