I point to is the contradiction of how Jordanian (indeed, all anticolonial) nationalists adopt colonially imposed aspects of their national identity while claiming to oppose colonialism simultaneously.

Contrary to Shryock's interminable series of misrepresentations, my book spends much time speaking about precolonial identities and cultural practices that were either repressed and eliminated or were taken over by the nation-state as marks of the new national identity. This especially relates to the bedouin way of life that was destroyed and those elements of it that were appropriated by the nation-state and Jordanian nationalists themselves (the whole book engages precisely these points). It also relates to gender and how precolonial forms of masculinity and femininity were nationalized by the nation-state. As gender analysis is central to the entire book and its method, it is surprising that Shryock did not make any reference to it in his review, anymore than he did to the large amount of space dedicated to analyzing cultural products—sports, music, songs, television, tea and coffee drinking, and so on—and not only to law and the military *tout court*. It is indeed in the realm of culture where I locate much nationalist agency and anticolonial resistance among Jordanians (more apparent in the political field and in the military, which I also discuss at length), whether bedouins, urbanites, women, or men. It is regrettable that *IJMES* readers will not be able to identify the substantive arguments of my book from the serious misrepresentations of Shryock's review.

DOI: 10.1017.S0020743806391337

A REPLY TO JOSEPH MASSAD

ANDREW SHRYOCK

In noting that Joseph Massad's identity as a Palestinian Jordanian should be central to any critical evaluation of *Colonial Effects*, I am taking seriously his claim that writing the book entailed, for him, a gradual "coming to terms" with this identity. I am also reapplying Massad's own interpretive method. "Throughout the book," he tells us, "you will notice that I identify the geographic origins and the religious and ethnic backgrounds of people. This is done deliberately" (p. 16). Why? Because such specificity is needed to "interrogate" the claims people make about "Jordanian national identity and Jordanian national culture" (p. 16). I find it bizarre that Massad would cry "foul" when I conclude that his own (self-announced) "subject position" influenced his thinking on these topics.

In a move that suggests misrecognition and reflexive panic, Massad tries to recast my observations as a grand struggle between exemplary Orientalist and exemplary Other. It is a powerful motif; it is also a fantasy. If I disagree with Massad on many points, this does not mean I am treating him like a "native," nor does it mean that I think I am more objective than he is because I am an "outsider." There are many Jordanians who read Massad's book as I do, and this is hardly because they are "outsiders" or "Western scholars," and even less because they do or do not consider themselves "objective." These terms shaped Massad's reaction to my review, but not my reading of his book. Likewise, I never said (nor did it occur to me) that Massad's work is not scholarship. The latter is a genre "outsiders" and "natives," and certainly "Palestinian Jordanians," are all equally capable of.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020743807222573 Published online by Cambridge University Press

As for Massad's characterizations of my own work—a bonus feature of his letter—I see little point in responding to them, except to say that my research is done among *living* tribal and bedouin populations. These are the Jordanians whose identities and "way of life," Massad reminds us, were "destroyed" by the British, then appropriated by the state (and Jordanian nationalists) for use as a weapon against Palestinians. Given this model of cultural erasure and ideological redeployment, Massad is prone to fixate on those aspects of tribal/bedouin and Jordanian identity he finds delusory, threatening, British in origin, artificial, invented, politically ill-conceived, and otherwise "dissimulated" (p. 15). This analytical tendency is overdeveloped in Massad's book, and it explains why his claim that he is not about exposing "false consciousness" rings hollow. In fact, this critical, debunking agenda is essential to *Colonial Effects*. It is what makes the book incisive and (in my opinion) intellectually problematic.

For a fuller sense of what *Colonial Effects* is about, I recommend that you read it. My review, although shorter than Massad's response to it, is a reliable account of his book, emphasizing what I found most useful and most troubling about it, which is what most of us expect of this genre.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020743807222573 Published online by Cambridge University Press