

***Three Kings* (1999): An Orientalist Representation**

Morsal Shaif Haidarah

Ph.D Research Scholar in English
University of Madras

Many critics argue that the film, *Three Kings*(1999), satirizes war. They consider this film as anti-war film. Hagopian(1999) points out that “ war is hell, but in David O Russell’s picaresque action comedy-drama, it’s also hellacious”(n. page).Ram Samudrala points out that *Three Kings* is an “ effective anti-war film”(Samudrala n.page). Frakes points out that that “the film addresses man’s brutal motivation in war and force us to question the United States’ involvement in the Persian Gulf” (Frakes n.pag) Many other critics point out that the four soldiers go to war against the wish of the American army who does not want the war because of the peace treaty signed between the Iraqi and the American government. In fact, any interpretation of *Three kings* (1999) has to be in the light of Edward Said’s theory of Orientalism. When applying this theory, the interpretation of the film will change totally. It shows how the film is a pro-war film rather than an anti-war film. It shows how the film provides a complex portrayal of Arabs. It exposes the real face of the Orientalist and their cunning ways of introducing the Orient. The European Orient is seen as exotic and backward. The Orient is conceived as uncivilized humans in need for western attention and reconstruction. In fact the film shows that because the Orient is under Western control, the Orientalist starts Orientalizing it. In the process of orientalizing, the Orient remains absent and silent.

The film, *Three Kings* (1999) was produced in 1999, nine years after the end of Gulf War and four years before the invasion of Iraq. It was directed by David O. Russell starring George Clooney, Mark Wahlberg, Ice Cube and Spike Jonze. This film fails to raise the question of why Americans should involve in war rather than it approves the need of the war to continue and attain goals that are beyond what the Americans claim to come for, the liberation of Kuwait to the liberation of Iraq from the tyranny of a despotic ruler, Saddam. *Three Kings* is one of Hollywood’s anticipatory films that show how Hollywood is a tool in the hands of the politicians to carry out their propaganda. Hollywood films, as part of popular culture, are the most famous and influential films in the twentieth and early twenty-first century. It influences millions of people in the world. American policymakers exploit this industry to pave the way to their colonial tendency in different parts of the world. Hollywood conveys a partial image of the people who are the future target of the American marines. They are shown as different people who are deviant to American values. Archie Gates (George Clooney) is used to convey this message. At the beginning of the film, he raises questions like, “what did we accomplish here? Just tell me what we did?” The questions suggest that the American mission that they come for is uncompleted. Then, the film goes on to validate these questions. Gates goes to Iraq. The Americans, in the film, are welcomed by the Iraqis who think that they come to save them from the miserable conditions that they live in under the control of Saddam’s army. Troy raises a question as to why the Iraqis fight each other, it is only Gate who explains that, “Bush told the people to rise up against Saddam. They thought they would have our support. They don’t, know they’re getting slaughtered.” Here Gates criticizes Bush who inspired the Iraqis to stand against Saddam during First Gulf War and then signed a peace treaty that will result in the loss of thousands of Iraqis in the hands of the dictator Saddam. Moreover, only after four years of the

production of this film the Americans invade Iraq and topple Saddam. Therefore, considering the film as anti-war film is not accurate. The film promotes war and the Iraqis are introduced as helpless and unable to remove Saddam without the help of America.

Besides, before producing the film, Russel made an 18 month journey investigating the aftermath of First Gulf War. After the investigation, he argues that:

When I started investigating the war I only knew the official story – that we went to the Middle East and kicked Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. But when I looked at it more closely, I saw that Hussein was left in power and George Bush encouraged the Iraqi civilians to rise up against Hussein and said, ‘We’ll help you do it’. And the people did rise up, and we didn’t support them...and they got massacred by their own army. [...] I thought that this would be an interesting backdrop for a story about a band of soldiers who go into this surreal, corrupted Iraqi atmosphere after the war. They think Iraq is littered with the cell phones, luxury cars and booty stolen from rich Kuwait, and they want to steal something for themselves. But they suddenly find a situation that completely confronts their humanity and demands that they re-think what they’re doing and who they are. [...] Almost everything in the film is true. Saddam did steal all the gold from Kuwait and it was missing for a long time. When he had to return it, some was missing. Many American soldiers in Iraq didn’t get to take part in the war there, yet they were called heroes. And many American soldiers were dissatisfied about leaving Saddam in power and seeing him beat up his own people. (qtd. in Müller-Hartmann 5)

Therefore, Russel, who after investigating the achievements of the Americans army during the First Gulf War, finds that they have not achieved their main goal, ie, removing Saddam from power. Therefore, after eight years of the war, in this film, he sends four soldiers to show the worsening conditions of the Iraqis due to as the consequence of the unfinished war in Iraq. This indicates that the film recommends another war to finish what the previous wars could not.

Hence, the films can be considered as part of American popular culture that talks about the Arabs from the western point of view. The Orientalist mind, that the Other who is uncivilized and barbaric and is in need of the self who is civilized and value human life, is meticulously explained throughout the film. Said(1978) points out that “the unbroken, all-embracing Western tutelage of an Oriental country” leads the West to see “themselves as providing for, directing, and sometimes even forcing Egypt's rise from Oriental neglect to its present lonely eminence”(35).

In fact, Said’s question, “How did philology, lexicography, history, biology, political and economic theory, novel-writing, and lyric poetry come to the service of Orientalism's broadly imperialist view of the world?”(Said 1978: 15), can include movies as Orientalist works that have the same political vision of the list made in Said’s question. Films about Arabs also feed on the contrast between the Orient and the Orientalsit, the familiar and the strange and the Self and the Other. *Three Kings*, for example, emphasizes on the duty of the country of freedom, America, to make the other country free too. The view that the Other is in need for American guidance supports the United Sates political and military intervention in the Middle East.

The film opens in 1991, at the end of the Gulf War. American soldiers celebrate their victory. But had they toppled Saddam, their happiness would have been complete. The Americans check the Iraqi prisoners. They remove their cloths leaving them naked. During the check, Vig finds a rolled piece of paper in the ass of one of the Iraq prisoners. Sergeant Troy Barlow (Mark Wahlberg), Chief Elgin (Ice Cube), and Private Conrad Vig (Spike Jonze) take this map to a tent

and attempt to figure out its content. When they are in the tent, Sergeant Major Archie Gates (George Clooney) comes. They hide the map from him, but he already knows that they got a map. They find that the paper is a secret Iraqi map, which divulges the location of a bunker where Iraq has stored stolen gold and treasure from Kuwait. Though there is peace accord signed between the allies and the Iraqi government, they decide to get this gold for themselves. This might result in war between them and the Iraqi soldiers. When they reach Iraq, the Iraqis- men women and children- are very happy that the American had come to help them. The four Americans find that the Iraqi army persecutes its people.

The Americans find the gold in one of the bunkers. During their search, they find the leader of the uprising against Saddam. They free him. When they come out of the bunkers an additional Iraqi army is sent to the scene. The Iraqi army is not ready to fight the Americans. But instead they help them to transfer the gold from the bunkers to the van. The Americans get the gold and are about to leave. The Iraqi civilians appeal to the American not to leave. The wife of the Iraqi uprising leader shouts, "do not leave, they want to kill us". This irritates one of the Iraqi soldiers who shoots her dead in front of her little girl and helpless husband. The American soldiers have to choose whether to take the gold and run or to help the Iraqis. The Americans choose to help the Iraqis. They leave the gold and expose their lives to danger in order to satisfy their conscience. They dismount the vans and kill the Iraqi leader and take the Iraqis with them. The Iraqi army bombs them with tear gas. They also drive among a field full of mines. They hit one of the mines which bursts and destroys the van. No one is killed. After the incident a small Iraqi girl and a boy run among the mines, but Troy runs after them and saves them; however, the Iraqi army kidnaps him. Sergeant Major Archie Gates asks the help of the leader of the uprising to free their man, but he refuses asking their share of the gold. Gates agrees. Amir Abdullah tells Gates that they took him to a bunker full of republican guard. Then they discuss how they can solve this problem. Amir tells Gates that these guards are afraid only of Saddam. This idea is very useful. It helps them to rescue Troy. They will get good cars and go to these guards as Saddam's convoy. A car will go before them to tell the republican guards that Saddam comes to kill them because of allowing the Americans to take the gold. This plan succeeds. When they reach there, the republican guards escape believing that Saddam comes to kill them. The Americans free Troy and accompany the Iraqis to cross the Iraqi border to Iran.

The Western Hero Past and Present

The British vision, exemplified by Lawrence, is of the mainstream Orient, of peoples, political organizations, and movements guided and held in check by the White Man's expert tutelage; the Orient is "our" Orient, "our" people, "our" dominions. (Said, 1978 245)

T.E. Lawrence mentioned in the above quotation was an officer British Army. He worked for the British Museum excavating among the Hittite ruins in Iraq. He spent years in the desert developing a familiar knowledge and affection towards the Bedouin tribes in the Arabian Desert. In 1916, the Arabs regarded the participation of the Ottoman Empire in World War I as a chance to rebel and chase the Turks from their land. Grabbing this chance to tease the Turks, the British lent funding to the Arabs through shipments of arms and money, especially when they were defeated by the Turks in Gallipoli. This defeat exposed the Suez Channel to a possible attack. The revolt sizzled however and was by 1916 in danger of collapsing. The British realized that the Arabs need their guidance Lawrence was sent to bring order and direction to the Arab cause. The experience transformed the thoughtful Lawrence into one of the most colourful military figures

of the war. For two years, Lawrence and his band of Arab irregulars attacked Turkish strongholds, severed communications, destroyed railways and supported the British regular army in the drive north to Damascus.

The need for Lawrence-like western savior is highly accentuated in the film, *Three King* (1999). Without Lawrence of Arabia, the barbaric and self-divided Arabs would not have the capability to liberate themselves from the Turks. In the same way, without the American the Iraqis would not have cross the borders and escape the tyranny of Saddam's Army. In the film, When the American soldiers reach the bunkers where the gold is possibly hidden, the Iraqis women, men and children shout, "they came to save us from Saddam". Iraqi women and children kiss Vig's feet. He replies, "We are here for your protection and safety. Even the soldier says that he loves "the United States of freedom". Khatib(2006), points out that the penetration of Other's land by the Americans "can be seen as enlightenment, as the start of civilization and the end of primitiveness"(27). She points out that the film, *Three kings* suggests that the mere presence of the Americans in Iraq "brings with it new hope" (ibid 27). In fact, the mere presence of the Americans in Iraq also encourages the people to revolt against the soldiers and even cast stones at them.

The primitiveness of the Iraqis is highlighted by comparing the Iraqis to animals. They fight with each other. The authority blows the milk because they want the people to starve. They even eat the food of each other. When the American soldiers give the Iraqis some food and water, one of the American soldiers notices that whatever they give to the children and woman, the men quarrel with them and take it for themselves. This enmity and forest like living in Iraq surprises the American soldier, Troy, who exclaims, "What was going on back there major? Civilians spiting on soldiers. Soldiers shooting at civilians" (*Three Kings*).

Hence, the American soldiers go to Iraq in order to get Gold, but they find that the Iraqis are in need for their help. The husbands are held captives in the Iraqi prison leaving the children and the woman starve to death. The Americans get the gold and free some prisoners and decide to leave. The Iraqis scream and plead the Americans not to leave, "Don't leave, don't leave. Look, look, they want to kill us. Help, please help." Meanwhile, an Iraqi soldier kills a woman in front of her children and helpless husband. This scene affects the Americans who left the gold and fight the Iraqi soldier. Gates decides to carry the Iraqis with them.

Unfortunately, after saving the civilians, the Americans are attacked by the Iraqi soldiers by tear gas. This causes Troy and Vig to lose control of the vans which hit a ground mine. The Humvee and the car overturn. All are safe. Troy has to save two Iraqi children who run across a mine field screaming. Troy chases the children through the brown fog, drops one of the suitcases, catches up to the Girl and scoops her up in his left arm. He runs between land mines after the Boy, who is way ahead. He drops a bag and catches the Boy and has both children under his arms, when suddenly Troy is grabbed from behind with a cord around his neck. He is dragged to an Iraqi jeep. The Iraqis exploit this incident to put conditions on the Americans. They know that they cannot be safe without the Americans' help. They want the Americans to help them cross the Iraqi borders to Iran. The Americans accept this and at the end they help them to cross the borders.

The most significant scene that highlights the need of civilized westerner is the scene in the bunker where they find the cars. The Americans, are explaining, instructing and encouraging the Iraqis to fight Saddam. Gates is instigating the Iraqis to stand up and find for themselves and then America will fight with them:

Archie Gates. United. George Bush wants you --
Chief Elgin. To stand up for yourself.
Iraqi Soldier. George Bush.
Archie Gates. He wants you --
Chief Elgin. You.
Archie Gates. Make the fight for freedom on your own.
Chief Elgin. Oh, yes, you can.
Vig. Go, baby, go.
Archie Gates. Then America will follow.

The Theme of submissiveness

Said in his book, *Orientalism* (1978) explains how the Arabs in western culture are portrayed as submissive and the West as wise people who are always questioning. The Arabs are not trying to better themselves. Politically they are submissive to their rulers. Economically, they live in poor conditions and have no desire to work and make use of nature. The message here is that it is the American's duty to teach them democracy and make use of their raw materials and all this will be for their good.

Historically, for the West, the Eastern people are unchangeable, subservient and ruled by minority. In ancient times specifically before the wars between the Greeks and the Persians around 490 B.C.E., before this date Padgen argues that Herodotus discussed that the Persians from the East once discussed the topic of democracy but, this debate failed and despotism triumphed at the end. Padgen argues that Herodotus asserted that the Persians refused democracy because they were afraid to ape the West. This shows that the westerners think that the obstinacy of the Muslims is hereditary from their Eastern past. In fact, many of the negative images of Arabs and Muslims that are seen today were transformed during the Middle Ages and the Enlightenment from an old clash between West and East, redirected against Islam during its appearance and then against the Ottoman Empire and passed on to the Muslim World later. Herodotus gave some qualities or traits for the Persians that crippled them from being democratic. These are the same traits attributed to Muslims in modern days. Currently, Muslims are accused of adhering to a religion that cripples them from embracing modernity. Another inherited negative stereotype of Islam which is linked to the Greeks portrayal of the Persians is that Muslims believe that they are ordained and thus always attribute their failure to Destiny. Padgen points out that Herodotus narrates that at the end of the battle of Plataea, the Persian commander was invited to extricate what was left from the Persian army from the Greece. At this time, the Thebans, who supported the Persians in this conflict, invited the commander of the Persian army to the banquet. Padgen argues that Herodotus asserts that the dinner attended by Thersander, a Greek man, who told him that during the course of the dinner, the Persian commander told the Greeks that most of the Persians who are in the banquet will die due to the adventure that surround the mission attribute to them. The Greek told Herodotus that when the commander was asked that if he is sure of this, then he should retreat. It was shocking for the Greek when the commander replied, "my friend ... what God has ordained no one can by any means prevented. Many of us know what I have said is true; yet we are constrained by necessity; we continued to take orders from our commander" (qtd. in Padgen 18).

The sharp contrast made between the Persians and the Greeks is conspicuously reflected in the film as contrast between the Americans and the Iraqi soldiers. This comparison highlights the image of the Arabs as submissive, sly and deceptive whereas the Self is courageous, curious,

faithful and honest. They are not only submissive to the ruler, but to the Americans as well. Four American soldiers come into Iraq. They scare, kill and defeat hundreds of Iraqi soldiers. The American soldiers come to retrieve the gold that the Iraqis have taken from Iraq. When they reach, the American flag moves. They jump from the Humvee. Troy and Chief Elgin leap from the Humvee with pistols drawn and their free hands held up in a 'halt' sign. The two Iraqi guards look stunned as Troy and Chief Elgin simply take their machine guns and put the Iraqis face down on the ground. Troy and Chief Elgin pull out plastic twist handcuffs in order to chain the Iraqi soldiers. They are already submissive to the Americans; they never attempt to resist. The other Iraqi soldiers shiver. They are overwhelmed by fear as they raise their hands in the air. More Iraqi soldiers came from inside the bunkers raising their hands up. The Americans effortlessly make their way inside the bunkers.

Another scene that shows the brutality, submissiveness and ungratefulness of the Iraqi soldiers and the bravery and goodness of the Americans is when the Americans come from the wrong bunker where the Iraqi soldier guides them to, they come back and get the bunker. They get the gold. In front of the Iraqi soldiers, they secure a van. And also get these soldiers to load the bags into the van. Though these soldiers are completely submissive to the Americans and the ruler, they are very cruel to their own people. They torture them, and even kill them for any silly reason. After helping the Americans in loading the gold, they kill a lady in front of her husband and daughter. This scene disturbs the American leader who realizes that the other Iraqis, including the daughter and the husband of the murdered woman are under threat. Therefore, he decides to help them. He easily manages to kill the enemy and assist the civilians.

Another common theme in Orientalist works is the submissiveness to a despotic. The ruler has an absolute power. He can do anything without being questioned. According to Padgen, the laws that exist in Oriental despotisms are few and unchanging, since "when you instruct a beast, you take care not to let him change masters, training, or gait; you stamp his brain with two or three impulses and no more." (ibid 348). In this film, the Americans go without the wish of their leaders, but the laws are the thing that they are afraid of. They know that their leaders are incapable of imposing severe punishment on them only through proper channels. These channels also allow them to defend themselves. So their punishment will come only from the court. On the other hand, the Iraqis are haunted with the fear of Saddam. Saddam has the right to kill and punish without questioning. So when the Americans take the gold and go, one of the leaders comes and blames the soldier who is in charge of the bunker, "Are you crazy? Saddam is going to kill you".

Hence, the fear of the despotic is exploited well by the Americans. When the Americans lose one of their friends, they are told that he is taken to Oasis bunker guarded by much republican guard. Then the American Sergeant asks what are these soldiers afraid of? The leader of the uprising replies that they are afraid only of Saddam. Then, the Americans contrive a plan that will help them to retrieve their friend without too much fighting. They have to collect some cars and go to these guards in procession as that of Saddam. One car will go to the guards few minutes before they reach the bunker and tell the guard that Saddam is coming to kill them all because they let the Americans take the gold.

This plan works very well. When the messenger tells the guards about Saddam's arrival, they are petrified. One of the guards cannot even have a bite from the bar of chocolate that he holds. It is only few seconds that they see the procession which they think to be of Saddam. They throw the guns and everything and run for their lives.

The image of the Arab woman also is fabricated to sustain western domination of the Other. The westerners asserted that their mission (colonization) in the East is only to civilize the other and improve the status of their women who is silent, helpless and male-dependent. The same image of woman in western culture is reproduced in the American popular culture.

Jarmakani(2008), points out that:

As with many stereotypes of ethnic others, the predominant images of Arab women in U.S. popular culture lie at two opposite poles: Arab women are either represented as erotic, romanticized, magical, and sexualized, as with most images of belly dancer or harem girls, or they are portrayed as helpless, silent, secluded and male dominated as in representations of the veiled women or harem slaves. It benefits the creation and propagation of these images to make them appear to be as different, and, indeed, as opposite as possible. (Jarmakani 4)

In fact, this film belongs to the period after the 1948. The predominant image of the woman in this period is either silent or a terrorist- as explained in Chapter Three. The Arab woman here is shown as silent and marginalized. The image of the Arab woman in the film is juxtaposed with the image of the American woman. The American women are free and independent whereas the Arab women are secluded and dependent on man. In the film, the Arab woman has no voice except that of the wife of the Iraqi uprising leader who pleads in front of all the males to the Americans to help them. But this voice is shut for ever with a bullet from the male after making this appeal publically. The female sound is heard once toward the end of the film which is a special sound for happiness that the Arab woman usually produces in marriages or when they welcome dear once. Here, they produce the sound to welcome the Americans who come to help them. Vig produces the same sound when one of the Iraqis say, “No my friend! The men do not do that. Only woman.” The association of this sound to woman seems very strange to the Vig, “Why is that”, Chief Elgin clarifies Vig doubts “because it is their custom”. On the other hand, the American woman is shown as free and independent. She works as a journalist. Her voice reaches every place in the world.

The Theme of Rationality, Threat and Primitiveness.

Orientals or Arabs are thereafter shown to be naive, lazy and waiting for our help. They “are singularly deficient in the logical faculty” (38).

The theme of irrationality and primitiveness emerge from a binary opposition of the rational developed Westerner verses irrational and primitive Orient. This theme is elaborated by Said in his book *Orientalism*. Of course there must be a political message. The message of this contrast is that Arabs or the Orient is uncontrolled and unreasonable, so the Americans must control them.

The film opens with a vast barren desert in which an American soldier-before killing an Iraqi-shouts to his friends whether to kill an Iraqi in distance or not:

Troy. Are we shooting?

The officer. What?

Troy. Are we shooting people or what?

The officer. Are we shooting?

Troy. That is what I’m asking you?

The officer. What is the answer?

Troy. I do not know the answer? That is what I'm trying to find out...I think the guy has weapon...yes he does.

This dialogue presents Arabs as a source of threat. The armed Iraqi is a threat to the very existence of the Americans. The Arabs are dangerous, stupid, and irrational. Since they use whatever lays on their hands for destruction, they must be controlled. This message is only to support U.S. foreign policy that Arabs must not get the weapons of mass destruction. The reason, as it has been shown in the films is that they will use them madly and irrationally for destruction. Hence, this dialogue is a keynote to the whole film. The Arabs are shown as a product of bloody civilization. They are not like Americans. The Americans have patience and control. They can control themselves just opposite to the angry and bloody Arabs.

Furthermore, the Arabs are introduced as subhuman. The dialogue in the tent, after discovering the map at the ass of the Iraqi, is racial and contains stereotypes against Arabs. When Vig describes Arabs as "dune coon", Chief Elgin, an Africa American objects and Troy calms him down explaining that he is not educated:

Troy. He's got no high school, man, he's from a group home in Jackson -
Chief Elgin. I don't give a shit if he's from Johannesburg. I don't want to hear dune coon or sand nigger from him or anybody.

Vig. Captain uses those terms.

Troy. The point is, Conrad, 'towel head' and 'camel jockey' are perfectly good substitutes.
Chief Elgin. Exactly. (*Three Kings*)

Moreover, the theme of Arabs as uncivilized primitive beings who are incapable of embracing modernity is clear when an American soldier discovers the map of the whereabouts of the bunkers where the Kuwaiti stolen gold in. They find it in an Iraqis ass. In the age of technology, the Arabs do not have minds to think of a more sophisticated way of hiding the letter. Hence, as long as the Other is primitive, this means that we are modern and sophisticated. Said (1978) argues that the orientalist thinks that:

The European is a close reasoner; his statements of fact are devoid of any ambiguity; he is a natural logician, albeit he may not have studied logic; he is by nature sceptical and requires proof before he can accept the truth of any proposition; his trained intelligence works like a piece of mechanism. The mind of the Oriental, on the other hand, like his picturesque streets, is eminently wanting in symmetry. His reasoning is of the most slipshod description. (Said, 1978 38)

In the tent, also the contrast between the rational westerner and the primitive is established. Unlike the Arabs who could not hide the map, the American officer, Sergeant Gates, takes the map and puts some of alcohol on it, exposes it to the light. He puts it on the table, turns the light off and clicks on an infra-red flashlight and a completely different map appears in green markers.

The irrationality of the Iraqis is explored further when the Americans go to Iraq for gold. They are welcomed by the Iraqis, but unfortunately the Americans come for gold and once they get the gold, they are about leave. An Iraqi woman pleads the Americans for help. This teases the Iraqi army leader who asks one of the soldier to shoot her. Therefore, the rationality of the Iraqi soldier is questioned here. How can a perfect human being kill another human without reason? The viewer is left for a while watching what will be the reaction of the American to this brutal and illogical act of the soldier. Whether the values of kindness and respect of life that is fundamental traits of Americans will triumph or the selfishness and love for many will triumph. Sergeant Major Archie Gates dismounts the loaded with gold track. He says, "We can help these

people, then we will be on our way.” The Americans killed the Iraqi soldiers and carried the people in the Humvee.

The other contrast is made between the American soldiers and the Iraqi civilians. The Americans soldiers are not selfish. They are good and honest. Though they come for gold, the goodness of their nature triumphs. They are not greedy. Dramatically, the Arabs are turned to be greedy and irrational. They venture the gold and their life in order to save the Iraqi civilians who are oppressed by their authorities. In the process of helping them, they lose one of their friends Troy who was captured by the Iraqi soldiers. Now they need the help of the Iraqis. All they want is a vehicle. The leader of the uprising whose life was saved by the Americans is now putting conditions. He wants fifteen bags from the gold to help them. The Iraqis want our help to free them, but they are not ready to help themselves. They are greedy. In another bunker, the Iraqis welcome the Americans. They shout, “welcome America”, welcome America.” or “America! Welcome”, but when they ask them to give them cars to fight Saddam, they refuse. Archie Gates asks the Iraqi “Listen. We use these cars to go fight Saddam soldiers”. The Iraqi looks at Chief Elgin and laughs. What's so funny? “Cannot take”.

Thus, the film shares the same feature of other Orientalist piece of writing. It carries on reflecting the same image of Arabs as uncivilized barbaric and subhuman, blaming Islam for being the source of their backwardness and fanaticism. It is an extension to the policy of the American government. It creates bad, hostile, Arabic character who is a threat to the existence of the American nation in order to justify the over use of arms and power to control this threat. In fact, *Three Kings* introduces the Arabs as a challenge to American pride. They are boisterous and must be refined, they are immoral, crooked, traitors and cowards whereas the American are absolutely self-righteous, straightforward, honest and courageous.

Works Cited:

- Curtis, Michael. *Orientalism and Islam European Thinkers on Oriental Despotism in the Middle East and India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Print
- Farra, Narmeen. “Arabs and the Media.” *Journal of Media Psychology*. Vol. No. 2 (Spring 1996). Web. 23 March 2010.
- Franks, Michael. “Film Review: Three Kings”. *The Tech Online*. Vol. 119, Issue 49. 12 October 1999. Web. 23 December 2011.
- Jarmakani, Amira. *Imagining Arab Womanhood: the Cultural Mythology of Veils, Harems, and Belly Dancer in the U.S*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008. Print.
- Jordan, Glenn & Chris Weedon. *Literature into culture: Cultural Studies after Leavis*. Ed. Patricia Waugh. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006. Print.
- Hagopian, Kevin. “Three kings.” *New York State Writers Institute*. New York: New York State University, 1999. Web. 15 December 2011.
- Kamalipour, Yahyar R. *The U.S. Media and the Middle East: Image and Perception*. Westport: Greenwood, 1995. Print.
- Khatib, Lina. *Filming the Modern Middle East: Politics in the Cinema of Hollywood and the Arab World*. London and New York: I.B Tauris and Co. Ltd, 2006. print.
- Lockman, Zachary. *Contending Visions of the Middle East: The History and Politics of Orientalism*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Print.

- McAlister, Melani. *Epic Encounters: Culture, Media, & U.S Interest in the Middle East since 1945*. 2001. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 2005. Print.
- Müller-Hartmann, A. "2nd Gulf War: Three Kings". 7 March 2006. *Seminar on America at War*. Heidelberg: School of Education Heidelberg. Web. 20 December 2010.
- Padgen, Anthony. *Worlds at War: The 2,500-year Struggle between East and West*. New York: Random House, 2008. Print.
- Said, Edward. *Covering Islam: how the Media and the Experts Define How We See the Rest of the World*. 1981. New York: Vintage Books, 1997. Print.
- , *Orientalism*. London: Penguin, 1978. Print.
- Shaheen, Jack G. "Arab and Muslim stereotyping in American Popular Culture." www.ascribed.com. Web. Georgetown University Centre for Muslim-Christian Understanding, January 1997. Web. 27 March 2010.
- , *Reel Bad Arabs: Hollywood Vilifies a People*. Massachusetts: Olive Branch Press, 2001. Print.
- Samudrala, Ram. "Three Kings." [Movie ramblings](#). Web. 13 December 2011