

**How to cite this article:**

Yari, M., Bakhshayeshiardestani, A., & Tohidfam, M. (2027). The West's Self-Perceived Mission: Bernard Lewis's Views on Western Saviorism. *Journal of Historical Research, Law and Policy*, 5(5), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.61838/jhrp.382>



Article history:
Original Research

Dates:

Submission Date: 08 April 2026

Revision Date: 02 July 2026

Acceptance Date: 09 July 2026

First Publication Date: 21 July 2026

Final Publication Date: 01 September 2027

The West's Self-Perceived Mission: Bernard Lewis's Views on Western Saviorism

1. Milad. Yari¹: PhD Student, Department of Political Science, CT.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
2. Ahmad. Bakhshayeshiardestani²: Department of Political Thought, CT.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
3. Mohammad. Tohidfam³: Department of Political Science, CT.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

*corresponding author's email: ahm.bakhshayeshiardestani@iauctb.ac.ir

ABSTRACT

The confrontation and rivalry between the Western world and the Islamic world is not a new phenomenon; these two civilizations have each, at different points in history, sought to demonstrate their superiority over the other. Following the beginning of the Renaissance movement in the West, the balance gradually shifted in favor of the West. Through fundamental transformations at various levels, Western societies entered the path of development and progress. Since the West's advancement over the East, various Orientalists have attempted to explain the reasons for this development and to offer prescriptions regarding how to manage the new conditions and how to deal with a world perceived as more backward. One of these thinkers is Bernard Lewis. He attributes the responsibility for Muslims' backwardness to Muslims themselves and, in doing so, attempts to assign a mission to the West for reforming the Islamic world. The main objective of this article is to determine, first, the nature of the mission that Lewis assigns to the West; and second, the theoretical and epistemological foundations on which Lewis's view is based, as well as whether these foundations are firmly established. According to the findings of this article, numerous epistemological objections can be raised against Bernard Lewis's view of the "mission of the West." Drawing on Feyerabend's theories, Lewis's views are understood not as knowledge about Islam and Islamic societies, but rather as a form of ideology placed in the service of power.

Keywords: Bernard Lewis, Feyerabend, Orientalism, Islam, West, mission of the West

Introduction

Since the West entered the path of progress and development, various Western countries have repeatedly sought to turn their superior position in wealth and technology into an instrument for domination and influence over other nations. From the first Western colonial powers, namely Spain and Portugal, to Britain and, today, the United States, all have pursued their interests and ambitions in weaker countries under the guise of claiming a mission—colonialism, or so-called "civilizing development." In fact, these ambitions and interests could not be pursued unless the internal structures of colonized countries were adapted and made compatible with the desires and objectives of the colonial powers.



Although the stronger side has always sought to consolidate, stabilize, and expand its power, the method and practice of Western countries in this pursuit of influence have had their own specific and shared foundations. The Western Renaissance, which occurred across various epistemic, cultural, religious, political, and, of course, economic domains, led to the West's leap forward and the emergence of sustainable development among Western societies. This leap and development provided them with tools through which they could see themselves as superior to others and, consequently, entertain the idea of conquering and dominating the world.

This condition and, behind it, such a mode of thought, sent Western ships, armies, and delegations toward non-Western worlds. The new conquerors embarked on this journey with cannons, machines, new commodities, and the Bible. The first colonial powers of the modern era were the Spanish and the Portuguese. Later, this banner passed to the Netherlands and Britain, and today it is the United States that, with its star-spangled flag, intends to illuminate the dark, non-modern world.

Naturally, behind the beautiful and benevolent slogans of the West lie numerous material interests. It is clear to any researcher that the main objective of a colonial power's presence beyond its borders is nothing other than benefiting from the markets of target countries, cheap labor, keeping the wheels of its own economy in motion, gaining access to greater resources and wealth, and, of course, displaying its authority. However, every power, in order to exercise its power—or, more precisely, to facilitate the exercise of power—needs a justification, pretext, and popular, legitimizing rationale. In fact, although plunder and pillage may be carried out merely by relying on the force of the sword, it is better and more effective to justify domination and influence in such a way that they appear pleasant and legitimate even to the country under domination. This is precisely the effort that colonial powers have always undertaken in order to legitimize their actions and commands.

Today, an entity called the West, led and represented by the United States, occupies such a position. The logic of American behavior is the same logic of the past. A country, because of its considerable military and economic capabilities, considers itself entitled to move toward other nations and demand from them the reward for this superiority. This is the role that the United States assigned to itself after the end of World War II. With the decline, or in Churchill's words, the sunset of the British Empire, it was now the turn of an emerging power called the United States. This position, which the United States assumed from the mid-twentieth century onward, entered a new phase with the occurrence of two events. One of these events was the collapse of the Soviet Union as the most important rival to America's global unilateralism, and the other was the attack on the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center, namely the well-known event of September 11.

After these two events, a rigid and sharply delineated bipolarity emerged between Islam and the West, and the Islamic world was represented as the destroyer of the new civilized world. In this context, a self-perceived and self-constructed mission was defined for the West in general and for the United States in particular. The danger of Islam was exaggerated, and the whole of Western civilization was imagined as a precious pearl that might at any moment be trampled underfoot by Muslim demons. Therefore, it became necessary to contain, reform, and, in a word, civilize the Islamic world as soon as possible.

This mission of the West was formulated and explained by Western thinkers and research institutions and implemented by Western foreign-policy apparatuses, armies, and financial-economic institutions. One of the important thinkers who reflected and wrote on this matter is Bernard Lewis, the Anglo-American thinker who had close relations with the American foreign-policy apparatus, particularly during the administration of George W. Bush.

The main objective of this article is to become familiar with the nature of the mission that Bernard Lewis attributes to the West, especially the United States, in order to understand what the West's principal plan for Islamic countries is and what theory underpins Western ideas regarding the Islamic world. Second, the article seeks to determine on which theoretical and historical foundations Bernard Lewis assigns such a mission to the West. In fact, what is his principal pretext for the West's reformist mission toward Islamic countries?

Research Background

Numerous studies have been conducted and many articles and books have been published on the relationship between the West and Islam, as well as on Orientalist studies of the Islamic world. Here, we refer to some of them. Isazadeh and Sharaf al-Din, in a study entitled "The Clash of Civilizations Theory: A Conceptual Framework for Understanding Islamophobia," attempt to examine and analyze one of the most important theoretical foundations of Islamophobia, namely the theory or paradigm of the "clash of civilizations," especially its famous and common readings, including the views of Samuel Huntington and Bernard Lewis, together with the explanations of some commentators and the critiques of its critics (1). This study concludes that, in the past two decades, the clash of civilizations theory has shaped and theorized Western public opinion, mass-media policies, state policies, and the positions of officials in Western countries with respect to Islam and Muslims.

Entekhabi, in a study entitled "Bernard Lewis and the Confrontation of Civilizations," critiques this fundamental view of Bernard Lewis: that the declining condition of the Islamic world, from the perspective of Islamic fundamentalists, provided an arena in which they could desperately attempt, through terror, destruction, exclusivism, and violence, to reconstruct the lost glory of the Islamic world and thereby win the hearts of Muslim masses (2). Entekhabi concludes that it is not difficult to infer the practical prescription that emerged from Lewis's explanation of the relationship between the Islamic world and the West: America must plant respect—or at least fear—of the West in the heart of the Islamic world, even if this requires war.

As'ad AbuKhalil, in a study entitled "The Legacy and Fallacies of Bernard Lewis," regards Bernard Lewis's greatest mistake as his connection and association with American neoconservatives (3). In this study, AbuKhalil concludes that a significant alignment emerged between Bernard Lewis's views and those of George Bush. According to AbuKhalil, Bernard Lewis's works served as George Bush's roadmap: "The Bush administration valued Mr. Lewis's views on Middle Eastern affairs more than those of any other scholar. A marked-up copy of one of his articles could be seen among George Bush's briefing reports, and before and after the invasion of Iraq in March 2003, he met with the President. Mr. Lewis held briefings at the White House, at the residence of Vice President Dick Cheney, and at the Pentagon during Donald Rumsfeld's tenure as Secretary of Defense."

Ahmad Muhammad, in a study entitled "A Path to Iraq: Constructing a Neoconservative War," raises the fundamental question of what caused Lewis to have such a lasting impact on American neoconservative policymakers (3). In Muhammad's view, the answer must be sought in Lewis's views on Islam and the Middle East, as well as in the prescription he formulated on their basis and, of course, in his extensive personal connections. Regarding Lewis's view of Islam, he concludes: "In a word, from Lewis's perspective, the Islamic world is ill and even moribund, and America must, even by force, pull the Islamic world, especially the Middle East, toward democracy."

In the present study, while taking into account the studies and research conducted in this field, we seek, through an epistemological critique of Bernard Lewis's thought, to foreground the unintended or deliberate contradictory

contents of Lewis's thought, thereby showing that the intellectual edifice of this Orientalist has been built upon erroneous and invalid foundations. In fact, by relying on mistaken assumptions, he prescribes duties for Islamic societies. He asks the West to be a nursemaid more solicitous than the mother for Muslims and to guide them onto a path of righteousness, while serious and numerous epistemological doubts exist regarding the truth and correctness of that path.

Theoretical Framework

The new age, or the modern period, possesses meanings and characteristics that profoundly affect and transform the system of individual and social human life. One of the most important and fundamental changes was the revolution that occurred in the domain of approaches to truth, knowledge, and the ways of attaining it. Within this framework, the human being reaches a degree of self-sufficiency in acquiring truth and attaining knowledge. In fact, this self-sufficiency was a claim advanced by modern epistemology under the title of humanism: "The modern age began with the proposition that the human being is the measure and criterion of existence, namely the very doctrine of the primacy of the human being, or humanism, of the Renaissance, which in the modern period reached its ultimate growth and perfection in the form of subjectivism. Human self-foundation, which is the most prominent feature of modernity and the basis and principle of Descartes's philosophy, became the starting point of thought in the philosophies after him and, in this respect, made them all in some way subordinate to itself" (4).

On this basis, the human being, by relying on reason and the faculty of understanding and by passing through a process of trial and error, can attain certain and indubitable knowledge. In fact, a centrality was granted to the human being and human reason according to which attaining absolute truth was no longer an impossible fantasy. "The principle justifying the codification of earthly laws is the belief in the function and ultimately the correctness of human reason. This principle does not deny the possibility of error in human social activity. However, it is founded on the belief that individuals will ultimately be able, by relying on the power of their reason, to discover the correct path. This acceptance of the centrality of human reason is highly important for modernity. Indeed, it can be said that the radical manner of accepting or rejecting its claims leads to accepting or rejecting this claim: that the basis and foundation of human happiness is obedience to the commands of reason" (5).

In our view, all approaches founded on this epistemological basis are nothing but masked dogmatism, because human science, knowledge, and cognition are exposed to numerous defects, risks, and obstacles, and no researcher's findings can be considered final findings or absolute truth. For this reason, and in order to critique and examine the ideas of Bernard Lewis—who falls among certainty-oriented thinkers—we have turned to Feyerabend's thought and adopted his views on knowledge, science, and ideology as the theoretical framework.

For Feyerabend, science is not absolute truth; rather, it is an institution constructed amid various moral, economic, political, and other components. In fact, science is not an object that can be approached by a knowing subject and possessed exactly as it is, because science—particularly in the field of the humanities—has a fluid nature that interacts with other institutions, and part of truth takes shape in the process of these very interactions. For this reason, science should not be turned into an idol, because science is not superior knowledge. Feyerabend expresses dissatisfaction that supporters of science typically elevate it above other forms of knowledge without properly investigating those other forms (6).

Feyerabend's arguments for demonstrating that science cannot be superior and final knowledge are numerous. We refer to some of them below:

1. Science is strongly influenced by prejudice, emotions, and individual desires, and it takes shape under their influence. This is what is referred to as subjective prejudgments. For example, if a researcher likes a phenomenon, person, or procedure, their scientific effort will be directed toward supporting and proving it; conversely, if those phenomena, persons, or procedures are not pleasing to them, they make considerable effort to foreground their flaws and defects, and so forth.

In this regard, Feyerabend argues: “Many contemporary scientific ideas that are widely accepted have continued to exist only because of factors such as prejudice, pride, and intense emotions” (7).

2. Indoctrinated cognition through repetition: In this regard, Feyerabend enters the discussion through a psychological foundation and emphasizes that frequent repetition—even if incorrect and erroneous—may become conditioned in the audience and cause the repeated proposition to be transformed into a scientific truth: “Theories, when they are born and formed, are vague and unsupported. Theories become clear and reasonable only after their confused parts have been used for a long period” (7).
3. The influence of history and prejudgments on cognition: Another factor affecting the formation of cognition is the background and history of knowledge. This factor may be called the unconscious of knowledge, meaning that the history of studies conducted in a field plays an important role in the process of acquiring knowledge, and any researcher who wishes to enter that field is, willingly or unwillingly, influenced by the research background. Feyerabend reminds us of this reality and states: “Science has been separated from daily life, human conditions, and historical processes that affect science, and what remains is only a myth of abstract and barren concepts and superficial approaches to science” (8).

From Feyerabend’s perspective, the aforementioned factors and several other factors mean that no researcher can claim certain knowledge, because their science is caught among, and influenced by, numerous non-scientific and non-epistemic components. But why, despite these issues, do some researchers stamp certainty on what they have attained? This is a question to which Feyerabend finds the answer in the linkage and, in fact, the merging of science and ideology. For him, what is often called science is nothing but ideology. The work of such researchers is “a tradition called science that has turned into ideology” (9).

Taking this principle into account, one must not be deceived by passing off ideology as science, because “science is merely one of the many ideologies that moves society forward, and it must be treated in the same way as other ideologies” (10).

This event is more common among Western scholars: those who, in their close relations with power—the heads of their countries who claim mastery over the world—formulate an ideology intended to help legitimize the policies of those in power and sell this ideology in the marketplace of ideas as science. It is for this reason that Feyerabend regards the main work of Western scientists as the selling of ideas: “Scientists are not judges of truth and error; they are only sellers of ideas and instruments” (11).

For this reason, their findings are not science but ideology; an ideology based on falsehood: “All ideologies must be viewed within a historical perspective. They should not be taken too seriously. They should either be read like fairy tales, tales that contain many interesting things but at the same time include shameful falsehoods” (10).

We have used Feyerabend’s theory to examine and analyze Bernard Lewis’s ideas about Islam, and specifically the mission that he attributes to the West vis-à-vis the Islamic world, in order to show that Bernard Lewis’s understanding of Islam is not the truth of Islam, but rather an ideology serving the interests of Western states.

Because of this understanding, the mission that Bernard Lewis assigns to the West in order to reform and civilize the Islamic world is also invalid.

Methodology

The present article was developed with the aim of examining the nature of the “self-perceived mission of the West” in Bernard Lewis’s thought and assessing the stability of its theoretical and epistemological foundations. This study seeks to determine whether Lewis’s propositions concerning the backwardness of the Islamic world and the necessity of its reform by the West rest on firm epistemic foundations or whether they possess an ideological and power-oriented identity. Achieving this objective requires the adoption of a method capable of challenging the epistemological foundations of the text beyond its descriptive layers. In this section, the research paradigm, the methodological framework based on Feyerabend’s philosophy of science, the textual corpus, the data-collection method, and the process of critical data analysis are explained.

Research Design and Approach

This article is a qualitative study with a “critical-epistemological analysis” nature, situated within the paradigm of poststructuralism and critical metatheories of science. Instead of using quantitative variables, this article employs “textual analysis with an ideology-critique approach.”

The methodological foundation of this article is grounded in Paul Feyerabend’s theory of science and epistemology. Feyerabend, by proposing the principles of “epistemological anarchism” and offering a serious critique of scientific dogmatism, argues that there is no single, superior, and absolute scientific method for discovering truth and that the superiority of one view over other views often results not from epistemic superiority but from relations of power and hegemonic institutions (12).

In this article, this Feyerabendian perspective is used as a methodological tool of deconstruction in order to show how Lewis’s narrative of Islam and the West possesses a dogmatic structure. Through this approach, Lewis’s view is analyzed and examined not as objective and neutral “knowledge” about Islamic societies but as an “ideology” serving the reproduction of Western power and the justification of its interventionism, namely the mission of reforming the Islamic world.

Textual Corpus and Sampling Method

There is no statistical population in the conventional sense, and the data consist of written texts. The textual corpus of this study includes two categories of sources:

1. Core sources, or primary sources: central texts, books, and articles by Bernard Lewis in which the thesis of “Muslim backwardness,” the internal causes of this backwardness, and the reformist mission of the West are theorized, especially works such as *What Went Wrong?* (13) and *The Crisis of Islam* (14).
2. Supporting, theoretical sources: written works by Paul Feyerabend on the critique of scientific methodology and the transformation of knowledge into ideology, especially *Against Method* (12) and *Science in a Free Society* (15).

The texts were selected through purposive sampling (16). The criterion for including Lewis’s texts in the analytical process was the presence of propositions that directly indicated the localization of responsibility for backwardness within the Islamic world and the epistemic/moral justification of the West’s saviorist mission.

Instrument and Data-Collection Process

The data-collection instrument in this interpretive-philosophical article is “qualitative structured note-taking” through the critical study of texts. In this process, the researcher acts as the instrument of analysis and extracts data by relying on the “theoretical sensitivity” derived from mastery of Feyerabend’s philosophy (16).

The stages of data collection proceeded step by step as follows:

1. Extracting Bernard Lewis’s claims concerning the blaming of the Islamic world and the genealogy of the concept of the “mission of the West”;
2. Separating the epistemological foundations and theoretical presuppositions on which Lewis grounds his view;
3. Taking notes on Feyerabend’s epistemological codes concerning the transformation of scientific claims into instruments of power and hegemony.

Data-Analysis Method

The data-analysis method in this article is “critical thematic analysis with a deductive approach.” The analysis goes beyond the surface structure of the texts and targets their ideological deep structure. The analytical steps of this article were based on aligning Lewis’s texts with Feyerabend’s epistemological indicators:

1. Initial coding: identifying propositions in which Lewis positions the West as a rational/reformist observer and the East as a passive subject in need of reform;
2. Assessing the strength of foundations: examining Lewis’s historical and methodological claims and evaluating their scientific caliber on the basis of criteria of epistemic stability;
3. Ideology assessment based on Feyerabend: aligning the structure of Lewis’s arguments with Feyerabend’s model in order to reveal how this view negates cultural and epistemic plurality and reproduces itself as the only “legitimate knowledge,” ultimately serving the institution of power, namely the political-civilizational saviorism of the West.

Validation and Scientific Value of the Study

To ensure the quality, accuracy, and scientific value of this qualitative article, Guba and Lincoln’s four criteria of “trustworthiness” were used (17).

1. Credibility: This was achieved through prolonged engagement with Bernard Lewis’s original texts, repeated rereading of critiques, and the application of peer supervision through consultation with professors in the fields of political philosophy and methodology.
2. Transferability: By providing a “thick and contextualized description” of the intellectual structures of Feyerabend and Lewis, and by precisely documenting direct quotations, the researcher has made it possible to evaluate and apply this analytical model to other Orientalist texts.
3. Dependability: The step-by-step process of engaging with the texts and the manner of aligning the thesis of the “mission of the West” with concepts in the philosophy of science have been recorded with full transparency so that the process of judgment and the tracing of arguments can be easily carried out.

Confirmability: Through commitment to self-reflexivity and precise documentation of textual references, the researcher has attempted to prevent the imposition of personal presuppositions and to ground the final inference, namely the ideological nature of Lewis's view, entirely in textual evidence.

Results and Findings

The Bipolarity of the West and the Anti-West

For any entry into Bernard Lewis's political thought, the most important point at the first step is attention to the existence of a bipolarity at the heart of his thought: a kind of dualism between us, the West, and our opponents, the opponents of the West. In Lewis's thought, there is a bold and identifiable line between the West and the West's other, one that completely separates the two from each other. One side stands at the utmost degree of progress, civilization, and light, while the other side stands at the utmost degree of backwardness, savagery, and darkness. The first side is the West, namely civilization itself, which Lewis defines as follows: "Today it has become customary to call this vast sphere of civilization, originally European but led by America, 'the West'" (2).

As is clear from this definition, Bernard Lewis, by ignoring all other ancient civilizations that have existed or still exist, regards the principal sphere of civilization as the West and assigns the leadership of the civilized world to the United States. In fact, in Lewis's view, the Western world is a world that, by relying on its intrinsic qualities and long struggles, has reached such a degree of development and civilization that it can now claim mastery and superiority over the world. The process of Western superiority over other civilizations began in the fifteenth century and ultimately led, on the one hand, to the progress of the West and, on the other, to the backwardness of the Islamic world: "The modern age represents a period that began in the late fifteenth century, when a revived and developing Europe initiated a new age and a new civilization that eventually encompassed the entire world" (2).

The head and master of this West is the United States. In other words, the management of this civilization in terms of continuing the path of progress and confronting the afflictions and dangers of this path falls to the United States. In this approach, world history is the arena of a great rivalry between Western civilization and Islamic civilization. This rivalry has a very long history and is so important that many global developments after the emergence of Islam can be attributed to the confrontations and conflicts between these two civilizations.

This rivalry was once favorable to Muslims, and they were the ones who, beyond Westerners, were the masters of the world. This superiority is something Bernard Lewis himself acknowledges. In analyzing and comparing these two poles during the Middle Ages, he argues: "If we wish to compare Christianity and Islam in the Middle Ages, we shall certainly see that the Islamic world offered a better path toward the civilization of the modern age. The Islamic world was a vast and rich world, encompassing a broad sphere, diverse peoples, and valuable resources. Islam, because of its proximity to various civilizations and the creativity it produced, was able to play an extraordinary role in enriching this cultural heritage. Here, it is enough to mention two cases: one, bringing paper and the paper-making industry from China; and the other, accepting geographical calculation and the zero from India, which opened the way for the renaissance of the sciences and literature. This story belongs to centuries before the movement that later emerged in Europe and took the name Renaissance. By comparison, Christian Europe was poorer in resources, its vision was limited and local, and in most cases its level was far below Islam and its achievements" (2).

But at a certain point in history, this balance changed in favor of the West. Centuries after this shift in balance, thinkers such as Bernard Lewis now not only remind us of this superiority but, following this reminder, attribute a kind of mission and responsibility to the Western world in relation to the Islamic world. In fact, they attempt to connect the protection of the superiority of Western civilization to the supervision, control, and guidance of the Islamic world.

The West as Savior: The Mission of the West in Civilizing the Uncivilized World

But what does the West possess that Orientalists such as Bernard Lewis insistently seek to preserve, protect, and expand? In other words, what achievement has Western civilization left behind that has caused Westerners to assign themselves the role of police and judge in the world? In Bernard Lewis's thought, Western civilization has brought important achievements not merely for itself but for all humanity, the most important of which can be summarized in one word: pluralism.

For Bernard Lewis, apart from all the material and cultural benefits that have been the product and achievement of Western civilization, pluralism is the most important legacy left by the West, and preserving and promoting this legacy is the West's mission. From this perspective, Western civilization has created a context in which all cultures, ideas, rituals, and beliefs have equal opportunities for manifestation and expression.

Lewis believes that in order to reach a desirable level of pluralism, the West began with itself, that is, by striving to know other cultures, which means respect for the other: "It was the West that first, and for a very long time, undertook the scientific study of foreign cultures and, through curiosity, interest, and respect—even the exhumation of buried cultures and the deciphering of forgotten texts—played a fundamental role in helping these cultures recognize and understand their own identity" (2).

After this first step, the West tried to adopt respect for other cultures as an ideal and to struggle for it: "The tragic record of our Western wars and persecutions testifies that we have often failed, catastrophically, to respect those who differed from us. But this is something we have struggled to achieve as an ideal, and we have not been entirely unsuccessful" (2).

Although this struggle has not led to ideal and final results, it has had significant and hopeful achievements: "Imperialism, sexism, and racism are Western words, not in the sense that the West invented these evils, which are unfortunately universal, but in the sense that the West recognized their demonic identity, condemned them by naming them as sins, and made every effort to reduce their intensity and help their victims; and its efforts have not been entirely fruitless" (2).

All Western interventions and influences in other non-Western lands are justified by the pretext of protecting this important achievement. From this perspective, the world has entered an irreversible path of modernity and modernization, and along this global path, dangers from the anti-West threaten this process. The most important of these threats comes from the Islamic world, and for this reason, abandoning the world before Islam is portrayed as dangerous.

As noted, the event of September 11 was regarded, in a significant way, as a serious warning of this danger. Regardless of who caused this event, the attack on the Twin Towers poured water into the mill of theories advanced by writers such as Bernard Lewis. A glance at the headlines of major American newspapers after September 11 testifies to this claim. Some headlines in The New York Times after this event were as follows: "Yes, it is about Islam"; "This is a religious war"; "The barbarians at the gate"; "The dream of holy war"; "Dictating faith"; "The deep

intellectual roots of Islamic rage”; “The intermingling of Islam and politics”; “Faith and secular government”; and “How Islam attained, and then lost, leadership of the world of knowledge” (3). The Wall Street Journal likewise ran a headline stating: “A culture of barbarism and savagery has declared war; not because of our policies, but because of the values for which we stand: democracy and freedom” (3).

Orientalists such as Bernard Lewis, before and after this event, attempted to suggest a kind of danger from Islam for Western civilization. For a long time, this has been a common practice in the Western epistemic apparatus. In Edward Said’s words: “The news media, the government, geopolitical strategists, and academic experts on Islamic topics all possess agreement and coordination: a consensus that Islam is a threat to the West” (1).

From their perspective, the matter does not end with a few bombings, attacks, or suicide operations; the main issue is the struggle, or jihad, of the Islamic world against the totality of the West. In this condition, if the West abandons the arena and allows Muslims to roam and assert themselves, not only the West but the entire world will be exposed to damage and collapse: “Western civilization may truly abandon the stage: the distrust of many of those who should logically be among its supporters may combine with the fervent passions of its claimants and cause its destruction. But if this happens, all men and women on all continents will be impoverished, miserable, and endangered” (2).

The most important outcome—and, in fact, loss—that the whole world would suffer because of this negligence by the West is the disappearance of that very pluralism and acceptance of the other: “If Western culture truly abandons the arena, imperialism, sexism, and racism will not disappear with it. In that case, the freedom to condemn them and to strive to end them will be damaged” (2).

The space that Bernard Lewis depicts for the relationship between the Western world and the Islamic world is based on a serious and full-scale war: a war between the forces of good and the forces of evil, a war between light and darkness. Lewis was among the first people in the twentieth century to explicitly speak of a war of civilizations. Some, in fact, believe that the main idea of the clash of civilizations theory, known by the name of Samuel Huntington, belongs to Bernard Lewis.

Edward Said is among these people. He claims that the clash of civilizations theory originates from a famous article in *The Atlantic* in 1990 entitled “The Roots of Muslim Rage,” written by Bernard Lewis, the well-known Orientalist and professor at Princeton University. Interestingly, the cover image of the issue of *The Atlantic* that contained Lewis’s article was, fully in line with the content of the article, highly provocative and biased: “a sinister bearded man with a white turban staring at the American flag” (18).

In order to sound the alarm more forcefully, Lewis refers to the roots and reasons for this Muslim hostility toward the West and argues that two factors have caused Muslims to possess firm faith in jihad for the purpose of destroying the West. One factor is that they have fallen behind the West in a historical battle. In fact, Muslims have always been serious rivals of the West from the past to the present, but now, for several centuries, they have disastrously lost the contest to the West: “For Muslims, accepting and adapting to the new situation was slow and painful, for the course of affairs no longer seemed to follow the will of the Islamic state but rather the desire of the Christian enemy, and there were times when the life and death of the abode of Islam depended on the assistance or even the goodwill of this or that Christian state” (13).

Second, Islam is intrinsically a monolithic and rigid religion, and Muslims are a narcissistic and self-centered group who do not grant non-Muslims the slightest right to express an opinion or assert their existence, because in their view there is only one superior religion, namely Islam, while all others are unbelievers and deserving of

punishment. In fact, from the Muslim perspective, the world is divided into the abode of Islam and the abode of unbelief, and one must always strive to attach, annex, and subject the world of unbelief to the world of Islam: “From the viewpoint of a Muslim, the world was divided into two parts: one, the rule of the abode of Islam, in which Islamic laws ruled legally and juridically; and the other, the abode of war, which was devoid of Islamic laws. Between these two there was a permanent state of war. This struggle continued until the word of God reached the ears of all creatures” (13).

To prove his claim, Bernard Lewis, apart from the text of the Qur'an and the conduct of Islamic great figures, presents examples of the behavior of various Islamic groups as evidence in order to remind his audience that Muslims have long been a “self-righteous” people. For example, at one point he refers to the behavior of the Ismaili group, or the Assassins, and says that from their point of view: “God appoints the Imam, and the Imam is the source and repository of truth. Only the Imam can, through revelation, inspiration, insight, and logic, confirm what is true, and only the Ismaili Imam, because of the nature and quality of his authority, can fulfill such a role; indeed, he alone is the true Imam. Consequently, all the Imam’s rivals are usurpers, his followers are sinners, and their teachings are figurative and false” (19).

But the main point is that Bernard Lewis does not present these warnings merely to announce danger; rather, the continuation of this warning is the mission he wants to place on the shoulders of the West and the standard-bearer of Western civilization, namely the United States. In fact, this danger is like a problem posed in order to be solved. From Lewis’s perspective, the solution to removing this danger is to protect the achievements of Western civilization by attacking and eliminating the source of danger. According to Bernard Lewis, the philosophy and history of Islam and the conduct of contemporary Muslims show that they are in conflict with the culture of modern Western democracy, and this problem will not be solved unless Islamic countries are penetrated and entered either peacefully or even by force, and unless the structures of Muslim states and the structures of Muslim public culture are adapted to Western democracy. According to this view, one must enter the body of the Islamic world and change the policies of Islamic countries there.

With this thesis, Lewis grants permission for every kind of Western presence in the Islamic world—whether invasion and attack or consensual influence—and insistently asks the West not to be embarrassed by this presence and interference, because it is engaged in carrying out an important mission: “We Westerners have indeed been guilty of selfishness and domination, aggression and plunder, subjugation and enslavement, killing and looting. Nevertheless, in order to lessen the burden of our sins, we can argue that a long time has passed since we regarded these actions as permissible, and it was even long before that when we did them for the satisfaction of God and saw divine providence in them” (2).

What is interesting is that despite Lewis’s boundless praise of the West—to the extent that beyond the concrete instances of Western civilizational progress, he relates this progress to intrinsic and racial matters—he recognizes only one major weakness for this civilization: the possibility of Western negligence and tolerance toward the danger of Islam. He sees the West as a human being who has achieved great success and obtained immense wealth but may, through negligence, expose it to theft by tricksters. Lewis’s theory, however, is that not only must this wealth be protected with tooth and nail, but in order to ensure its protection, effort must be devoted to disciplining and civilizing Muslim savages. If civilizing is not possible, only one path remains: civilizing through force. “Sin in its modern sense is corrosive and destructive; at the same time, it may be said that this concept is a clear example of arrogant self-regard, which constitutes the deepest and most distinctive weakness of Western civilization. Assuming

responsibility for all the evils of the world may be interpreted as a new version of the phrase ‘the white man’s burden.’ Such an interpretation is as deceptive for us and as boastful toward others as our glorious predecessors, with the same arrogance and vanity, claimed that they were the source of all good things” (2).

In order to persuade both his Western and non-Western audiences, and also to stimulate and encourage Western, especially American, policymakers to carry out this mission, Lewis turns to history and says that carrying out this mission is not only the desire of Western society but also the wish of Muslims themselves. In his view, a significant part of the Islamic world also wishes the West to come and reform their structures so that they too can reach the position the West has reached. Bernard Lewis’s historical example is the right of capitulation that Muslim states granted to Western states as a license for Western activity inside Islamic countries. In Lewis’s view, the privileges that Muslims granted to the West under the guise of the “right of capitulation” or the “most-favored-nation principle” constituted a kind of plea and request: “Western trade in the Middle East was secure under the capitulation system and had the right of free and unconditional entry into these countries. The term ‘capitulation’ in Ottoman times referred to privileges that Ottoman rulers and other Islamic countries granted to Christian states, allowing the subjects of these countries to reside in Islamic lands and engage in business without being subject to the fiscal disabilities and other disabilities imposed by Muslim rulers on non-Muslim subjects” (13).

He cites the text of the Ottoman capitulation agreement with England, in which the supplicatory tone of the Ottoman caliph addressing the British monarch is evident. The agreement resembles an invitation more than a contract; an invitation from the Ottoman Caliphate to Great Britain: “We, the most sacred emperor and guardian of Muslims . . . the powerful sovereign Murad Khan, as a sign of imperial friendship, express and declare that the people and subjects of Queen Elizabeth of England may come safely and confidently to our emirates, with goods and commodities, baggage and other items, by sea in small and large ships, by land with carriages and livestock, and no one has the right to harm them; and they may buy and sell without hindrance and be subject to the customs and regulations of their own country” (13).

The presence of the West within Islamic societies is so important for Muslims themselves that they are willing to grant any privilege or tribute to Westerners, so long as they come for the purpose of reform. In such a situation, from Lewis’s perspective, it would be the height of negligence for Western states to leave the Islamic world to itself. The mission of the West must not be forgotten, and there is no doubt that the most important party and government that supported and implemented Lewis’s theories was the neoconservatives in the United States.

At the end of this section, it is not irrelevant to take a look at the national anthem of the United States. The lyrics of this anthem refer to this illuminating and reformist mission of the West against barbarians and savages. This anthem shows that the mission that Westerners have defined for themselves, both on their own behalf and on behalf of Muslims, is a relatively general belief and desire among Americans; figures such as Bernard Lewis provide coherence and theoretical grounding for such a belief. The text of the anthem is as follows:

“In this first light of dawn, say, can you see what we proudly hailed in the twilight’s last gleaming yesterday? The flag whose broad stripes and bright stars, through this perilous fight, over the ramparts we were always watching, was it still gallantly streaming? And the rockets’ red glare and the bombs of the enemy bursting in air gave proof through the night that our flag was still there. Say, does that star-spangled banner still wave over the land of the free and the home of the brave?”

Discussion and Interpretation of Findings: Epistemological Problems in Bernard Lewis's Theory

Analyzing and examining the view of a political thinker requires, above all, determining the relationship between thought and the structure of power. What was once called the linkage between pen and sword, and is today referred to as power and knowledge, has a significant effect on the formation and formulation of a political theory. The complementary relationship between these two elements has led to considerable overlaps between them.

What the structure of power expects from a thought-producing thinker is that words and expressions be arranged in such a way that a legitimizing idea emerges from them; an idea, or ideas, that give meaning to certain actions that have already been determined and designed. Of course, this does not mean that, in this relationship, the thinker is a passive and will-less subject. No. Rather, the thinker is either fully aligned with the ruling opinion or, with slight changes in their views, provides services to the government while also pursuing personal, intellectual, or even aspirational interests and ambitions. In this article, we seek to determine whether Bernard Lewis's thought on the mission of the West possesses internal coherence. Is what he has attained regarding the understanding of Islam the truth of Islam, or is it a fallacy whose source lies in material interests, intellectual prejudices, and historical perceptions of Islam? In fact, it is important for us to know whether, if Bernard Lewis's theories did not have the supportive backing of American neoconservatives, they would still be logically and epistemologically defensible.

In our view, Bernard Lewis's theories contain fundamental and foundational defects, and because their bases, assumptions, and foundations have been built crookedly, one naturally cannot stamp approval on the edifice built upon these incorrect foundations. Here, we refer to some of these defects:

Selective and self-interested selection from the history of Islam:

Martyr Motahhari, regarding the foundations of historical critique in the book *Imamate and Leadership*, writes: "Every nation always tries to extract and present the beauties of its own history and, as far as possible, to cover over the ugliness of its history" (20). This means that some researchers, if they like a period or personality in history, deliberately extract its outstanding and pride-inspiring points and deliberately ignore the dark points; conversely, if they dislike a part of history, they deliberately emphasize its dark and ugly points in order, in some way, to attribute those dark points to the entirety of that history.

This is precisely what Feyerabend refers to as the role of the human factor in shaping truth. No matter how much a researcher emphasizes their neutrality, the role of human desires and personal, ethnic, partisan, racial, and similar interests in directing research results cannot be denied. Science does not take shape beyond human interests; rather, it comes into being under them. Thus, the human factor is never eliminated. It is either manifest and visible, or hidden from sight; but in either case, it exists: "What we have been told is that science is established and beyond the human context, and that scientists act neutrally and objectively, and that their prejudices and individual desires have no effect on science. But such an understanding of science is not truly correct; the human factor has not been eliminated, but only hidden" (8).

What Bernard Lewis and most Orientalists have understood and extracted from the history of Islam and the personality of Muslims consists mainly of the dark and decadent parts of this history. Wherever a Muslim or an Islamic state has made the slightest mistake or error, Bernard Lewis's attention has been drawn to it, and he has narrated it with full intensity. This can be seen in his selection of the Ismaili sect and the writing of an independent book about them. Among all the semi-independent states that the history of Islam has witnessed, the selection of

the Ismailis raises many questions. Yet when we know that, in terms of their mode of action against enemies, the behavior of the Ismailis bears the greatest resemblance to radical Muslim groups such as al-Qaeda and ISIS, the answer to the question becomes somewhat easier.

It is not important that, fundamentally, the group known as the Ismailis is a Shiite group; that it took shape in a specific historical period and according to the specific requirements of that time; that it established rule over a limited part of the Islamic realm; that in terms of its objectives and programs it differs essentially from terrorist groups; and that, in fact, it emerged and cohered against the authority of the Abbasid Caliphate. Rather, what matters is that there is a particular similarity in the manner of eliminating enemies among these groups.

Thus, among this great number of small and large Islamic states over approximately fourteen centuries, the Ismailis are selected. When we observe the following passage about the Ismailis, it is unconsciously suggested to any audience that there is an interesting similarity between the Ismailis and terrorist groups. Does this similarity not lead us to the proposition that assassination is an old tradition among Muslims? In describing the assassination process among the Ismailis, Bernard Lewis writes, in the words of the ambassador sent by Emperor Frederick Barbarossa to Egypt: "In these castles, many sons of subjects are trained from adolescence; they learn numerous and various languages, such as Latin, Greek, Roman, the languages of Muslims in near and distant regions, and other languages, and they speak them fluently. Absolute obedience to the chief of the people is taught to them. They learn to obey their leader and elder and to carry out all his orders without question. In return, the chief, who has complete authority over all living and existing gods, grants them the pleasure of life in paradise. They firmly believe that the slightest resistance or questioning of the chief's commands will deprive them of paradise and salvation. It should be noted that from the time these children are brought into the fortress, they see no one except their teachers and trainers until the time they are summoned before the leader and receive the order to kill someone. When they appear before the leader, he asks them whether they are prepared to obey his commands in order to attain the promised paradise. At this time, according to instructions these young men had previously received, they throw themselves at his feet without any hesitation and, with one voice and with eagerness, declare that they accept the leader's call and command to carry out any mission. At this moment, the emir gives each one a golden dagger and sends them to kill and execute any commander he has in mind" (19).

Improper generalizations; false analogies:

The complementary aspect of selective choice is the process of generalization. In this process, after selecting a limited number of Islamic thoughts, groups, and personalities—those that are suitable for strengthening the main idea—they are generalized to the whole history of Islam. In this process, examples are passed off as the whole and the principle, and the task is simplified for the general audience. Under these conditions, there is no longer any need to examine the entire history of Islam in order to understand whether Islam in its entirety is such a thing or not. Rather, through oversimplification, that one example, or those few examples, must be taken as indicating the whole truth of Islam. This method is not the narration of truth but merely a representation: "In this type of representation, the Muslim community is portrayed as a homogeneous and unified group" (21).

The result of this type of representation in the form of generalization is that Islam is intrinsically a violent religion and Muslims are all extremist radicals who want to destroy all Western achievements at once. In Bernard Lewis's view, "Islam was from the beginning a warlike religion and, indeed, a military religion, and its followers are fanatical warriors who seek to promote their sharia by relying on military force" (22).

This is a reverse process in the field of cognition, meaning that Bernard Lewis believes that Islam is an intrinsically violent religion and that Muslims are intrinsically violence-seeking. After this, he looks for observations that prove his theory. In fact, he does not arrive at theory through observation; rather, he has a theory and seeks evidence to prove it. Bernard Lewis is not a scholar beyond horizons who, through observations and the collection of details, reaches a general inference. Rather, he initially has a theory aligned with hegemony; in the next step, he presents evidence appropriate to and supportive of that theory in order to strengthen and prove it.

This is the same method used by all positivists. While they claim to collect evidence in order to prove a hypothesis, their main work is in fact to seek documents and evidence in order to prove their theory. In Feyerabend's words: "The traditional argument of positivists is that the scientific method requires the collection of evidence and the inference of theory from it. This view is based on the erroneous idea that observation and theory can be separated. It is theories that shape and order observations, and this means that theories cannot be justified through observation" (9).

A civilized frame for racism:

As noted, Bernard Lewis speaks of a kind of mission for the West in relation to the Islamic world. In his view, now that the West has reached this level of light, progress, and happiness, it is obliged to attack the backward dark world and gift these blessings and benefits to the East. But the ambiguous point here is that one of the fundamental foundations of Lewis's thought is that the West has progressed because its people are intrinsically development-oriented, while the others of the West, especially Muslims, are backward because, conversely, they are intrinsically lazy and blame-shifting: "Their success is certainly due to qualities and characteristics that exist intrinsically and potentially in European civilization and in its people, qualities that others lacked or were deficient in" (2).

The mode of operation of such thinkers is that they present an ideal of the desirable human being and society and regard whatever conforms to it as civilized and all else as savage: "A society organized according to well-defined and restrictive rules, in such a way that human beings are homogenized within it by following these rules, forcibly pushes the human being who opposes these rules into the non-human territory of irregularity and plunders both their reasoning and their humanity" (7).

Even if we accept Bernard Lewis's claim, is such a transfer truly possible while Muslims are intrinsically lazy and opposed to development? And what a futile effort it would be to plant seeds in rocky ground. It is obvious that the transfer of an intrinsic matter is impossible and unachievable. With this description, the Western commodity has no buyers in the Islamic world, and it would be better for the West to remove this duty and mission from itself.

Self-contradiction; pluralism turns into its opposite:

Two components of Bernard Lewis's thought are in serious conflict with each other. He refers to pluralism and its requirements, such as tolerance and acceptance of the other, as the greatest achievement of Western civilization and considers the most important mission of the West to be the export of this great achievement. But this issue has two fundamental problems.

First, the West defends pluralism and multiculturalism while it has no tolerance for cultures critical of the West. In fact, pluralism is respected only as long as we do not witness the emergence of a culture positioned against, or even critical of, Western culture. Within this framework, multiculturalism never has the potential to accommodate

an anti-Western culture within itself. Only approving cultures can fit into this assemblage. Therefore, it seems that what Bernard Lewis defends is less pluralism than a kind of effort toward homogenization and sameness.

Second, the West wants to export this same incomplete and defective pluralism through imposition, force, and war. Bernard Lewis not only grants permission for war against the Islamic world but also asks the American foreign-policy apparatus never to feel embarrassed by this military aggression, because it is for a sacred ideal: "We Westerners have indeed been guilty of selfishness and domination, aggression and plunder, subjugation and enslavement, killing and looting. Nevertheless, in order to lessen the burden of our sins, we can argue that a long time has passed since we regarded these actions as permissible, and it was even long before that when we did them for the satisfaction of God and saw divine providence in them" (2).

Although this is the same Machiavellian logic of justifying the means by the end, it goes even beyond that. Transferring a culture of tolerance and forbearance through war is the conjunction of contradictories. To be able to drop shells and bombs on people's heads and, if they ask why, to say that we want to bring them democracy and freedom, is a contradiction that only those who have posed it can solve.

Conclusion

There is no doubt that there has always been a tangible rivalry between the Islamic world and the West. Apart from the numerous historical wars and rivalries between these two civilizations, it is sufficient for us to look at them in order to know that this rivalry is both deeply rooted and likely without end. There is also no doubt that after the Renaissance, the Western world, through scientific and technological transformations—which themselves were rooted in fundamental political, intellectual, economic, and other reforms—advanced significantly beyond the Islamic world. All these intellectual efforts and the great number of Islamic movements in the contemporary period testify to the Islamic world's awareness of having fallen behind the caravan of progress. But whether these matters should become a license for the West to place the Islamic world under its domination and influence is highly doubtful and ambiguous. Thinkers such as Bernard Lewis infer from the above premises that there is now a mission for the West to reform and, more precisely, civilize the Islamic world.

This mission, which is self-perceived and self-designed, contains fundamental epistemic problems. Bernard Lewis's premises lead to the principle of the "mission of the West." Bernard Lewis's biased thought, serving power, has presented an incorrect and false image of the Islamic world and its relations with the West. In this depiction, the Islamic world is considered a savage world that poses a threat to Western civilization. This very proposition has functioned as a license for the West and Western states to discipline, contain, and civilize the Islamic world by any possible means, even war and military attack.

In this article, by using Feyerabend's thought, we have critiqued the foundations of Bernard Lewis's views more than his conclusions and claims, as an Orientalist connected to the structure of power. What Bernard Lewis presents as certain and definitive knowledge of Islam consists of ideological propositions formed amid the maze and labyrinth of numerous factors, such as prior knowledge, the author's intentions and interests, support for the macro-policies of Western states—especially the United States—repeated reiteration and conditioning of erroneous and invalid components, and similar factors.

Bernard Lewis, by relying on and invoking these incorrect foundations and assumptions, and through the selection and extraction of one dimension of Islam, the history of Islam, and the typical personality of Muslims, has presented invalid propositions and views concerning the nature of Islamic societies. What Lewis presents as the

truth of Islam, and what he introduces as his pure and precise knowledge of Islam, is not a correct reality; rather, in Feyerabend's terms, it is a false ideology in the form of science.

In fact, as long as no separation takes place between the state and science, one cannot rely on the findings of this kind of science. Interestingly, Bernard Lewis, on the basis of these incorrect findings, attributes a mission to the West according to which the Western world must, like a savior, reform and civilize Islamic societies.

In this article, we have shown, first, that the license for the mission of the West rests on incorrect theoretical foundations. Through the image it presents of Islam, the West considers itself entitled to intervene, while this image is fundamentally mistaken and, at best, a small part of reality. Second, is it not the case that the West wants, by sending itself to the Islamic world, to bring democracy, human rights, and pluralism to Islam? Military attack and disregard for the right of Muslim nations to determine their own destiny create a self-contradiction at the very first step.

These criticisms show, more than ever, that the West has no benevolent objective toward the Islamic world. In order to survive and continue its superiority over the world, the Western world seeks to weaken and neutralize the critical and even revolutionary power of Islam against itself. This is especially significant because Islamic civilization was once not only the most important rival of the West but also, in many domains, the cause of a sense of inferiority among Westerners. This may be the most important historical factor influencing the knowledge of Bernard Lewis and Orientalists like him: bringing historical conflicts into the analysis of contemporary relations between the West and Islam. The West now wants to engage in historical retaliation: retaliation for the days when Muslims ruled the world; retaliation for the day when Abd al-Malik ibn Marwan built the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem in 691 CE; the day when “the Umayyad Caliphate was no longer merely a successor state to Byzantium and Iran; it had itself become a world government. Islam was no longer merely regarded as the successor religion to Christianity; it was the new will of God for the world. The location, architectural style, and most importantly the decorations of the Dome of the Rock made clear the intention behind its construction. This style and these dimensions were undoubtedly designed not only to compete with the Church of the Holy Sepulchre—a church in Jerusalem built on the presumed burial place of Jesus Christ—but to surpass it, though with subtle modifications specific to Muslim prayer rather than Christian worship” (13); retaliation for the day when the Church of Hagia Sophia was transformed into the Mosque of Hagia Sophia; the day when “the Sultan, mounted on a horse, entered the city through the gate that is today called Topkapi, or the Cannon Gate, and went straight toward the great Church of Hagia Sophia, where he dismounted and entered the church. The nobles and dignitaries and a Janissary guard were in attendance. There, he summoned an imam, and the imam ascended the Christian pulpit and loudly said, ‘I bear witness that there is no god but God, and I bear witness that Muhammad is the Messenger of God.’ Thus the greatest church of the Greeks was transformed into the mosque of the Turks” (23); retaliation for the day when Christians were used for service at the Ottoman court; the day when Christian-born slave boys became full members of the Ottoman court household, “boys of Christian origin who had entered Ottoman service and were called *ajami oghlan*—foreign boys—probably meaning novices or apprentices. Those selected for palace service were called *ich oghlan*, meaning inner boys, and, like the inner eunuchs, became full members of the household” (23); retaliation for the day when Sultan Suleiman the Lawgiver built the Suleymaniye Mosque and summoned Christians to watch and observe it, only in order to humiliate the infidel Franks; the day when, after the mosque was completed, its master architect said to the Sultan: “My lord, I have built for you a mosque that will remain on earth until the Day of Reckoning. The humble author of these lines himself once saw ten Frankish infidels, who had expertise in geometry and

architecture, when the shoe-keeper exchanged their shoes for slippers and took them inside the mosque for viewing. On seeing the minarets, they bit their fingers in astonishment; but when they saw the dome, they threw their hats into the air and cried, 'Maria! Maria!' [O Virgin Mary! O Virgin Mary!], and upon seeing the four arched vaults beneath the dome, their tongues were tied, and they were incapable of expressing their admiration. Then all ten, fingers in mouths, gazed at those arches in amazement for a full hour. Afterwards, while visiting the external façade of the mosque, the courtyard, the four minarets, and the six gates, they again removed their hats and circled the mosque bareheaded, which testified to the perfection of their astonishment. I asked the translators how they had found the mosque, and one of them who knew a little Turkish said that in all of Frankistan there is not a single building comparable to this one" (23).

And of course, because of its considerable military and economic power, the West's hand is largely open for this retaliation. Yet taking Orientalist propositions as correct, and surrendering to self-alienation and Westoxication, is a destructive affliction, because we must keep in mind that the views of someone like Bernard Lewis regarding the mission of the West toward Islam do not correspond to reality. Rather, they constitute an ideology for legitimizing the domination-seeking actions of Western states toward the Islamic world and a compensation for what has passed, embedded in the form of the truth of Islam and the mission of the West.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our appreciation and gratitude to all those who helped us carrying out this study.

Authors' Contributions

All authors equally contributed to this study.

Declaration of Interest

The authors of this article declared no conflict of interest.

Ethical Considerations

All ethical principles were adhered in conducting and writing this article.

Transparency of Data

In accordance with the principles of transparency and open research, we declare that all data and materials used in this study are available upon request.

Funding

This research was carried out independently with personal funding and without the financial support of any governmental or private institution or organization.

References

1. Said E. The Clash of Civilizations: Islam and the West. Gavahi A, editor. Tehran: Islamic Culture Publishing Office; 2006.
2. Lewis B. The Clash of Cultures. Oveysi B, editor. Tehran: Forouzan Rooz Publishing and Research; 2001.
3. Abrahamian E. The US media, Huntington and September 11. *Third World Quarterly*. 2003;24(3).
4. Pazouki S. Descartes and modernity. *Philosophical Quarterly*. 2000(1).
5. Ahmadi B. The Enigma of Modernity. Tehran: Markaz Publishing; 1998.
6. Chalmers AF. What Is This Thing Called Science? Zibakalam S, editor. Tehran: Scientific and Cultural Publishing Company; 1995.
7. Feyerabend P. Against Method: Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge. London: New Left Books; 1975.
8. Feyerabend P. Farewell to Reason. London: Verso; 1987.
9. Feyerabend P. Knowledge, Science and Relativism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1999.
10. Feyerabend P. How to defend society against science. *Arghanoon*. 1994(1).
11. Feyerabend P. Problems of Empiricism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1981.
12. Feyerabend P. Against Method. 4th ed: Verso; 2010.
13. Lewis B. The Middle East: Two Thousand Years of History from the Rise of Christianity to the Present Day. Kamshad H, editor. Tehran: Ney; 2002.
14. Lewis B. The Crisis of Islam: Holy War and Unholy Terror: Modern Library; 2003.
15. Feyerabend P. Science in a Free Society: New Left Books; 1978.
16. Flick U. An Introduction to Qualitative Research. 6th ed: SAGE Publications; 2018.
17. Lincoln YS, Guba EG. Naturalistic Inquiry: SAGE Publications; 1985.
18. Bicharanloo A. Representation of Iran and Islam in Hollywood. Tehran: Research Institute of Culture, Art and Communication; 2012.
19. Lewis B. The Assassins: A Radical Sect in Islam. Khakbaz Mohseni H, editor. Tehran: Ketab-e Zaman Publications; 2004.
20. Motahhari M. Imamate and Leadership. Qom: Sadra Publications; 1993.
21. Faimau G. The conflictual model of analysis in studies on the media representation of Islam and Muslims: A critical review. *Sociology Compass*. 2015;9(5).
22. Lewis B. The Political Language of Islam. Behroozlak G, editor. Qom: Islamic Publications of Qom Seminary; 1999.
23. Lewis B. Istanbul and the Civilization of the Ottoman Empire. Bahar M, editor. Tehran: Scientific and Cultural Publishing Company; 1986.