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Introduction

I first heard the name of Edward W. Said in a university seminar two years ago. His name was mentioned by one of my American teachers and not many of us knew who Edward Said was. After trying to find out who he was I was amazed that I had never heard about one of the most widely known and controversial intellectuals of the twentieth century. I was very surprised that this influential author within the fields of literary theory, post-colonial and cultural studies is so little known within the Czech academic sphere. One of the most striking facts is that as of September 2007, there were only five entries by Said in the Czech National Library. Similarly, only three of his brief essays were translated into Czech.

Thus the purpose of this thesis is to grant appropriate attention to Edward W. Said and present an interpretive overview of his work which is necessary before one can begin to place Said in proper perspectives as the individual whom many have claimed as a centrally important twentieth century figure. It will explore Said’s contribution to many disciplines ranging from literary theory and criticism to cultural history to postcolonial studies, as well as the literary, cultural, social, and aesthetic roles he has played as an academic intellectual. It will also attempt to interpret the key moments in Said’s thinking and explore his change from a literary critic to a cultural theorist, political commentator, aesthete, and public intellectual. It will focus on the literary and cultural aspects of Said’s works and it will purposefully leave out Said’s engagement in the practical political life.

1 The following works are available: Culture and Resistance; Orientalism; Out of Place; Reflections on Exile; The World, the Text, and the Critic.
2 Reflections on Exile (Přemítání o exilu 2001), The Clash of Ignorance (Střet nevědomosti 2001), The Public Role of Writers and Intellectuals (Veřejná role 2003).
1. Who is Edward W. Said?

In order to understand Said's work and analyze his role it is important to ask the following questions: Who is Edward W. Said and why is it important to study and understand his work? Why is he considered to be one of the most influential thinkers of the second half of the twentieth century? And why do his works spark so much controversy?

In order to understand Said it is essential to be acquainted with his personal history. The fact that he was born in Jerusalem, considered himself to be Palestinian, and publicly commented on Middle Eastern politics undoubtedly contributes to the controversy about Said. In the current political situation in the world, almost anything connected with Palestine is controversial. Said is therefore considered controversial because of his origin and his involvement in solving the question of Palestine. Even though Said spent most of his life in the United States, it is crucial to understand that he had lived most of his life in exile belonging everywhere and anywhere. In the following passage Said speaks about belonging. “What must it be like to be completely at home?” and he answers “I don't know. I suppose it's sour grapes that I now think it's maybe not worth the effort to find out” (More Writers and Company 78). In many other works Said mentions that he had never felt completely at home anywhere. Mustapha Marrouchi, one of the Said scholars, describes Said as a composite of contradictions. According to him, Said is “a Protestant and a skeptic; an outwardly conventional ‘Arab’ who seems most comfortable in exile from Palestine; an anti-American with scads of American friends; a leftist battling against a fierce internal and/or external Western misconception of ‘lesser races’; a man of
almost eighteen-century charm, sophistication, and wit, completely urbane yet always projecting the sense that somewhere underneath all of that is a hair shirt, a need to suffer; a grown man with a schoolboy's sense of fun” (15). And indeed, Said confirms that even though he was able to function in and even enjoy many environments, he permanently felt that he was “out of place” (Out of Place 3).

In the quotations above, the key themes of Said's life-long work come to light. Indeed, the themes of identity, exile and belonging re-occur throughout his works and they are “the key to the intellectual force of his writings, locating them firmly in a world in which ideology has material consequences and in which human life does not conform neatly to abstract theory” (Ashcroft 2).

Who then was Edward W. Said and where did he belong? Edward Wadie Said was born on 1 November 1935 in Jerusalem Said's parents were Palestinian Christians, his father from Jerusalem and his mother from Nazareth. Said tells us that his father “was born in Jerusalem as were his parents, grandparents, and all his family back in time to a distant vanishing point, he was a child of the Old City” (After the Last Sky 14). Said himself is not sure about the process of conversion of his families and he observes; “My guess is that both their families had converted in the 1870s or 1880s, my father's from the Greek Orthodox church, my mother's from the Greek Catholic, or Melkite. The Saids became stolidly Anglican, whereas my mother's family – slightly more adventurous – were Baptists (Cairo Recalled 24). Thus Said was an Arab and a Christian and an American citizen. Said's family left Palestine when he was a two-year old child seeking what they thought would be a temporary refuge in Egypt where his father ran a stationary store. However, the post-war turmoil lead to Israel's declaration of Independence and the Israeli-Arab war of 1948. His family would travel to their extended home in Jerusalem to visit family
and to the Lebanese mountain town Dhour el-Shweir where his father liked to spend summers. However, Said's family would never return to live in Palestine.

Thus Said and his family members had to think about and fight for his identity from his early childhood. He recalls what happened to his mother after marrying his father in 1932. When his parents went to register the marriage to the Palestine Government Mandatory office, an English officer ripped up his mother's passport saying: "You're travel on your husband's passport... Your place is going to be given to a Jewish emigrant to Palestine." Said remembers this incident with bitter irony and observes that his mother's identity "was, just by the simple act of tearing up a piece of paper, taken away from her by a foreigner. And she lived through the consequences of that for thirty years" (The Voice of a Palestinian in Exile 42). Said describes looking for his own identity in various books and articles, one of the most significant of his works commenting on his growing up is his memoir Out of Place.

Said himself has experienced redefining his identity several times. When he was a young boy, his parents sent him to a British school in Cairo – Gezira Preparatory School and later on to American St.George's School and Victoria College. Even his name has separated him from the rest of his classmates. He recollects that "with an unexpectedly Arab family name connected to an improbably British first name ... I was an uncomfortably anomalous student all through my early years" (Between Worlds 3). He had thus experienced the feeling of not belonging from his very early childhood. Young Said found escape in reading novels and listening to classical music on the BBC. From what he said in his memoir Out of Place, his parents considered him to be a troublemaker and after he was expelled from Victoria College, they decided to send him to an American high school. He attended Mount Hermon in Massachusetts in order to prepare for studying at
university. As he was an excellent student, he graduated from Princeton and attended Harvard, where he received his Ph.D. Said started his life-long career at Columbia University where he taught until the end of his life, traveling vastly around the United States and the rest of the world, lecturing and teaching at such institutions as Johns Hopkins University, University of Cairo, Yale University, University of Toronto, Stanford University, Birzeit University, or Oxford University.

When the Arab-Israeli war started in 1967, many things changed for the young literary critic Edward W. Said. He realized that he was living in the country where Arabs and anything connected with them were not welcome. Once again, Said had to confront his two identities – the one of an Arab and the other of an American citizen. This moment was very significant for him as “for the first time he began to construct himself as a Palestinian, consciously articulating the sense of a cultural origin which has been suppressed since his childhood” (Ashcroft 3). Said himself talks about the impact the beginning of the war had on him: “I began to feel that what happened in the Arab World concerned me personally and could no longer be accepted with a passive political disengagement” (The Politics of Dispossession xiv). Ten years later, in 1977, Said as an engaged public intellectual was elected to Palestinian National Council as an independent who chose not to join any party (Bayoumi xxiii). Once again, Said's decision not to join any party shows his will to maintain certain distance and objectivity. According to Said his joining Palestinian National Council was “an act of solidarity” with the Palestinian people (Hovsepian 13). Said resigned from the Palestinian National Council in 1991 and became a public critic of Yasir Arafat and the so-called peace process (Barsamian x).

Politicisation affected Edward Said and his works - he realized that literary theory could not be isolated from the world in which it was written. Thus we can
trace Said's concern for the state of Palestine in many of his works whether we look at *Orientalism, Question of Palestine, or Covering Islam* or at the countless number of his essays. As we cannot separate Said's concern about Palestine from his literary work, we cannot separate Palestine and the European imperialism and colonialism. These issues are interconnected and inseparable.

Because Said was not afraid to openly present his opinions and ideas on Palestine and the political situation, he was often revered. He was vilified in the public press, he has been “dubbed “a professor of terror,” and Arafat's man in New York.” His Columbia University office has been ransacked, he received numerous death threats” (Bayoumi xii). Despite the threats, Said insisted on his principles and opinions and he resisted being seduced by authority. One of the examples of his persistence to his principles is the signing ceremony of the Oslo accords held in the White House on September 13, 1993. As Said did not believe that the Oslo accords would help to solve the question of Palestine, he refused to attend the ceremony even though he was invited. Said remarked on behalf of the ceremony:

“The fashion-show vulgarities of the White House ceremony, the degrading spectacle of Yasir Arafat thanking everyone for the suspension of most of his people's rights, and the fatuous solemnity of Bill Clinton's performance, like a 20th-century Roman emperor shepherdng two vassal kings through rituals of reconciliation and obeisance: all these only temporarily obscure the truly astonishing proportions of the Palest capitulation” (The Morning After 3).

Even though the world was rejoicing over the success of the peace agreement Said realized the disadvantages it implied for the Palestinian people and he criticized its initiators openly. Because of publicly expressing his opinions and criticizing Yasir
Arafat, Said's books were seized from all the bookstores in the Palestinian Autonomous Zones in Gaza and the West Bank. Selling Said's book was forbidden there as well as in Palestinian bookstores in East Jerusalem (Marrouchi 255). This shows us that Said respects his principles under all conditions. Said notion's of bringing the truth to light and speaking truth to power can be found not only in his works as a political activist but they are visible in almost all of his works whether on literary theory, theory of music or cultural theory.

He commented on the role of criticism in his work *The World, the Text, and the Critic* saying that “criticism must think of itself as life-enhancing and constitutively opposed to every form of tyranny, domination, and abuse; its social goals are non-coercive knowledge produced in the interests of human freedom” and he also states that the adjective that we should connect with criticism should be “oppositional” (29). Said's view of the oppositional criticism is also reflected in his *Representations of the Intellectual* where he observes that “[l]east of all should an intellectual be there to make his/her audiences feel good” and an intellectual should be “embarrassing, contrary, even unpleasant” (12). As Mustafa Bayoumi and Andrew Rubin point out, Said believed that all people should have their dignity and their human rights should be respected. Moreover, Said believed that it was the role of academic scholarship to analyze and interpret all the angles of human existence – especially the ones that are marginalized and suppressed (xiv). Thus Said's oppositional stand was not a deliberately radical position but rather a way in which he lived his life.

In 1992 Said's life changed once more when he was diagnosed as having a very rare kind of leukemia. Nevertheless, Said did not give up, he fought the illness, continued teaching, lecturing, and writing. He realized that his time was limited but
he had to learn to live with the illness on behalf of which he said: "I think the big battle is to try to not make it the center of your every wakening moment, put it aside and press on with the tasks at hand" (The Pen and the Sword 170). He also felt an urge to examine his past and to share the experience of his growing up. Speaking about the variations of his illness Said writes:

As I grew weaker, the more the number of infections and bouts of side-effects increased, the more the memoir was my way of constructing something in prose while in my physical and emotional life I grappled with the anxieties and pains of degeneration. Both tasks resolved themselves into details: to write is to get from word to word, to suffer illness is to go through the infinite steps that take you from one state to another. With other sorts of work I did, essays, lectures, teaching, journalism, I was going across the illness, punctuating it almost forcibly with deadlines and cycles of beginning, middle and end: with this memoir I was borne along by the episodes of treatment, hospital stay, physical pain and mental anguish, letting those dictate how and when I could write, for how long and where” (On Writing a Memoir).

Thus central theme of Said's life is his restless anxiety and to some extent a narcissistic pattern of self-concern and self-examination. Said died in New York on September 25, 2003 after a long battle with leukemia.

2. The True Homeland – the Text

Many times Said remarked that he did not feel completely at home in any place. Even though he selected New York, a very cosmopolitan city, for his adopted home he did not consider it to be his homeland. He also knew that he would not want to live in Palestine despite the fact that he was born there. His works consisting of
more than twenty books, countless articles, essays, interviews, and editorials show that his true homeland was the text. He loved books and he found escape in them during his childhood and teenage years, he chose to study literature even though he could also have studied music, he became a professor of literature and he wrote a giant body of texts.

2.1 On Conrad and Beginnings

His first work *Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography* was published in 1996 and it was a revision of his doctoral thesis from Harvard. It examines Conrad's life and works as well as "operation of imperialism in an ostensibly anti-colonial novelist" (Ashcroft 143). It is an interplay of Conrad's fiction and his correspondence. The fact that Said chose Conrad as an object of study is very interesting from two points of view. First of all, in Conrad's works Said examines how imperialism functions – a theme that will be present in many of his later works. Second, it is interesting that Said chose Conrad – an exile from Poland. Like Said, Conrad moved to a foreign country where he spent the rest of his life and mastered its language. Said observes that Conrad "was a man of action urgently in need of a role to play so that he could locate himself solidly in existence" (qtd. in Bayoumi 12). He read and analyzed eight volumes of Conrad's correspondence in order to reconstruct Conrad's conception of his identity – a process very similar to the one that Said had to undergo.

In *Between Worlds* Said writes about Conrad: "Over the years, I have found myself writing about Conrad like a cantus firmus, a steady groundbass to much that I have experienced" (3). Said further remarks on Conrad: "I felt, first coming across Conrad when I was a teenager, that in a certain sense I was reading, not so much my
own story, but a story written out of bits of my life and put together in a haunting and fantastically obsessive way. He has a particular kind of vision which increases in intensity every time I read him, so that now it's almost unbearable for me to read him" (qtd in Maarouchi 140).

Beginnings: Intention and Method clearly reveal Said's ambition to become a significant critic. It is Said's first and very difficult theoretical book. It examines the poststructuralist language, pastiche, fragmentation, textuality and difference. Said explains why he chose beginnings as an object of study:

For in isolating beginnings as a subject of study my whole attempt was precisely to set a beginning off as rational and enabling, and far from being principally interested in logical failures and, by extension, ahistorical absurdities, I was trying to describe the immense effort that goes into historical retrospection as it set out to describe things from the beginning, in history (Beginnings xi-xii).

In his analysis of beginnings, Said concentrates on the difference between 'beginning' which is “secular, humanly produced, and ceaselessly re-examined” and 'origin' which is “divine, mythical and privileged” (ibid xiii). His analysis of beginnings is influenced by works of Italian philosopher Giambattista Vico who thus becomes very central to Beginnings. Said also focuses on critique of domination, the re-examination of suppressed history, the cross-disciplinary interest in textuality, the notion of counter-memory and archive and analysis of tradition. Most of these themes that Said discussed in Beginnings will later reappear in Said's later works. As Mustafa Bayoumi points out “For Said, Beginnings was an attempt to work through the conditions of his political awakening in literary terms” (xxii). Hence Said's interest in beginnings leads him to examine his own past as will be shown later on in this essay.
2.2. Worldliness

The texts are enmeshed in circumstances, time, and place in society: "in short, they are in the world, and hence worldly" (The Word, the Text, and the Critic 35). And similarly, according to Said, critics are thus not only mere translators of texts into circumstancial reality. The critics are also bound in circumstances, in worldliness. The notion of worldliness is very important for both the post-colonial writer as well as the post-colonial critic as "the manner and target of its address, its oppositionality, its revelatory powers of representation, its liminality are fundamental features of its being in the world" (Ashcroft 22).

Said also considers the relationship between speech and writing. By text, Said usually means written texts and he does not separate them from the world but suggests that texts serves as the link of verbality. For Said, texts have the same situatedness as speech, they are material and worldly.

It is important to look at the way the texts exist in the world. On one hand it is very tempting to say that texts simply refer to the world out there. - that would be a realist position. However, this position is very limiting as it does not allow to look at the many ways in which the language mediates what is 'seen' by the way it talks about it and describes it. On the other hand, there is a position inspired by the structuralists which sees the world as having no absolute existence and it is wholly constructed by the text. This position then does not allow any non-textual experience of the world or existence of the world outside the text. Said sees a mediation of these extreme positions: the text is significant in mediating our experience of the world, but the text's worldliness and circumstantiality, "the text's status as an event having sensuous particularity as well as historical contingency, are considered as being incorporated in the text, an infrangible part of its capacity for conveying and
producing meaning (The Word, the Text... 39). This shows that the text is crucial in terms of the way we 'have' a world, the world exists and the worldliness is constructed within the text. Moreover, the text always has a specific situation that exposes certain limitations on the interpreter “not because the situation is hidden within the text as a mystery but because the situation exists at the same level of surface particularity as the textual object itself” (ibid. 39). Thus text does not exist outside the world as the realistic and structuralist positions suggest. It is rather a part of the world which it describes and speaks about.

Worldliness is a characteristic of all the texts and it is a part of their formation. Because the texts are in the world, they exist in certain circumstances and thus should not be isolated. In this manner, Said underlines the political and social significance of the text which are extremely important for the post-colonial criticism, reading and interpreting of texts.

2.3. Filiation and Affiliation

When considering the text's worldliness it is important to look at the complex interrelations of filiation and affiliation as they can suggest different possibilities for critical reading. Filiation refers to lines of descent in nature while affiliation refers to processes of identification in culture. Said suggests that English literature had been read filiatively - the works studied were compared to those that had preceded them (Ashcroft 25). However, Said argues, that processes of filiation have been replaced by processes of affiliation. For Said, affiliation is the “implicit network of peculiarly cultural associations between forms, statements, and other aesthetic elaborations on the one hand and, on the other, institutions, agencies, classes and amorphous social forces (ibid. 174). Thus affiliative reading allows Said
to see a literary work as a phenomenon in the world, placed in a network of non-literary and non-canonical affiliations. From this point of view affiliation is seen as a positive element. It serves as a basis of new criticism that allows the critic to cross the boundaries of the European canon and see the literary work in broader circumstances.

In this manner, affiliative critical activity opens the critic the fields of social and political world and thus the critic is not limited only to the literary, canonical, European dimension of literature. Like worldliness, affiliation is also a feature of the text. According to Said, “affiliation is what enables the text to maintain itself as a text” which is made possible by a broad range of circumstances: “status of the author, historical moment, conditions of publication, diffusion and reception, values drawn upon, values and ideas assumed, a framework of consensually held tacit assumptions, presumed background, and so on” (ibid, 174-5). Affiliation crosses the boundaries of literary theory and opens political, social, and cultural fields to the critic.

Thus reconstructing the affiliative network means “to make visible, to give materiality back to, the strands holding the text to society, author, and culture” (ibid. 175). Said's concern with the materiality enables him to read the texts of the English literature contrapuntally – to examine to what extent are the texts implicated in the broad project of imperialism. Even though the texts such as Jane Austen's *Mansfield's Park* had been traditionally studied filiatively as a part of the English canon, affiliative method of reading enables the critic to place such text within the historical, cultural and social circumstances in which it was created and read. Moreover, Said uses affiliation for “describing the ways in which colonised societies replace filiative connections to indigenous cultural traditions with affiliations to the
social, political, and cultural institutions of empire” (Ashcroft 26). In this manner Said uses the methods and concepts from literary theory and applies them to his work in cultural studies and post-colonial studies.

Once again, for Edward Said, the world in which the text originated and thus the world to which it was connected and affiliated cannot be isolated from the reading of the text. The text has a material presence, social and cultural history, political and even economic being as well as numerous connections to other texts. Thus the text is firmly embedded in its world and the connections that the text has with its world are very important to its meaning and to its identity as a text.

3. Reorienting Orientalism

In one of his post-Orientalism essays, Said explains that Orientalism has as intimate connection with his autobiography as any of his other writings:

I remember one of my earliest experiences, which had a lot to do with the writing of Orientalism, when I was walking in the Gezira Club of which we were members. It was a famous enclave built by the British. The members were mostly foreign, although there were some local members. I was thrown out by the secretary, who was a friend of my father's .... He said, “Don't you know that Arabs are not allowed here?” And I said, “Yes, but we're members.” And he said, “Don't argue with me boy, get out!” It was that sense of forbidden space that really sowed, I think, the seeds of my rebellion against the hieratic and the fetishistic and the ritualized and the idolatrous. I felt the need always to go against those prohibitions and those statues and those forbidden places. The urge to enter those places where I wasn't wanted, which is what I felt I was doing in Orientalism. (qtd. in Sprinker 28)
3.1. The Structure of *Orientalism*

*Orientalism* is divided into three main parts. In the first part Said establishes the scope and significance of Orientalism. It is a discourse that has been in existence for over two centuries and it continues to the present. In this part Said also examines the question of representation.

In the second part of the book, Said analyzes Orientalist structures. Said shows here how the main philological, historical, and creative writers in the nineteenth century drew upon a tradition of knowledge that allowed them to construct and control Orient. As Said points out, this construction of the Orient served the colonial administration that utilized this knowledge to establish a system of rule.

The third part is an examination of 'Modern Orientalism'. It shows how the British and French legacies of Orientalism were adopted and adjusted in the United States of America. For Said, these legacies are most apparent in the US foreign policy.

Said offers three distinct yet interrelated manifestations of Orientalism. The first one is academic discipline, the second is a style of thought and the third one is a corporate institution that deals with the Orient. All of these three pursuits are interconnected. According to Said, Orientalism is “the discipline by which the Orient was (and is) approached systematically, as a topic of learning, discovery and practice” (*Orientalism* 73). As a style it is “based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction” between the Occident and the Orient (ibid. 2). As a corporate institution Orientalism is used to dominate and control the Orient. Thus, Orientalism is linked to colonialism.
This three-dimensional definition of Orientalism illustrates that it is a complex web of representations about the Orient. The first two dimensions embody the textual creation of the Orient while the third one illustrates how Orientalism has been used to execute authority and domination over the Orient. These three dimensions are interconnected which is especially visible when we realize that the domination entailed in the third dimension relies on and is justified by the textual establishment of the Orient.

3.2. The Extent of Orientalism

The core of Said's argument is in the link between knowledge and power. Said illustrates this by quoting British Prime Minister Arthur Balfour's defense of Britain's occupation of Egypt in 1910 when he declared: “We know the civilization of Egypt better than we know any other country” (qtd. in Orientalism 32). Thus for Balfour, knowledge did not mean only surveying a civilization from its origin, it was also being able to do that. As he further claimed: “To have a knowledge of such a thing [as Egypt] is to dominate it, to have authority over it ... since we know it and it exists, in a sense, as we know it” (ibid. 32). According to Said, this Balfour's premise demonstrates how knowledge and dominance are connected:

England knows Egypt: Egypt is what England knows; England knows that Egypt cannot have self-government; England confirms that by occupying Egypt; for the Egyptians, Egypt is what England has occupied and now governs; foreign occupation therefore becomes 'the very basis' of contemporary Egyptian civilization (ibid. 34).

However, to view Orientalism as a simple rationalization of colonial rule would be ignoring the fact that colonialism was justified in advance by Orientalism (ibid. 39). The division of the world into East and West had existed for centuries and it
expressed the fundamental binary division on which all dealing with the Orient was based. One side had the power to determine what the reality for both East and West would be. Thus the knowledge of the Orient which was created outside of Orient “in a sense creates the Orient, the Oriental and his world” (ibid. 40). With this assertion we come close to the heart of Orientalism. Said sees the Orient and the Oriental as constructions of various disciplines by which they are known to Europeans. This narrows down an extremely complex phenomenon to a simple question of power and imperial relations and it also provides no room for self-representations of the Oriental.

Furthermore, Said points out that the upsurge in Orientalist study coincided with the period of European expansion from 1815 to 1914. His emphasis on its political nature can be seen in his focus on the beginnings of modern Orientalism. He does not choose William Jones's disruption of linguistic orthodoxy but he starts from Napoleonic invasion of Egypt in 1798 which “was in many ways the very model of a truly scientific appropriation of one culture by another, apparently stronger one” (ibid. 43). Said believes that the consequences of this were profound in many ways: “Quite literally, the occupation gave birth to the entire modern experience of the Orient as interpreted from within the universe of discourse founded by Napoleon in Egypt” (ibid. 87). Said also shows that after Napoleon, the language of Orientalism changed, too: “Its descriptive realism was upgraded and became not merely a style of representation but a language, indeed a means of creation” (ibid. 87).

Said also points out that Orientalism started to impose limits upon thoughts about the Orient since “Orientalism was ultimately a political vision of reality whose structure promoted the difference between the familiar (Europe, the West, “we”) and the strange (Orient, the East, “them”)” (ibid. 43). It worked this way because the
intellectual accomplishments of Orientalist discourse served the interests of imperial power.

Crucial to the emergence of the Orientalist discourse was the imaginative existence of 'the Orient'. Said points out that this 'Orient' exists in what he calls "imaginative geography" as the boundaries between the Orient and the Occident exist only in our heads. It is highly improbable that there will be a new discipline called Occidental studies. Thus Said argues that the idea of the Orient exists in order to define the European: "One big division, as between West and Orient, leads to other smaller ones' and the experience of travelers, writers, and statements become "the lenses through which the Orient is experienced, and they shape the language, perception, and form of the encounter between East and West" (ibid. 58). The variety of these experiences is held together by the sense of sharing something other, something different which is called 'the Orient'.

This analysis of the binary nature of Orientalism has been the source of criticism of the book as it seems to suggest that there is only one Europe or one West that constructs the Orient or the East. However, if we perceive this homogenization as the way the Orientalist discourse simplifies the world rather than the way the world is, we realize the discursive power of Orientalism.

A metaphor of theater can help us to understand the way we comprehend 'the other'. Ashcroft points out that "the Orient is the stage on which the whole East is confined" (60). And indeed, Said says that "on this stage will appear figures whose role it is to represent the larger whole from which they emanate. The Orient then seems to be, not an unlimited extension beyond the familiar European world, but rather a closed field, a theatrical stage affixed to Europe" (Orientalism 63). In this
way some images represent what is otherwise an impossibly diffusive entity (68). They are also characters who conform to certain typical characteristics. Thus, Orientalism

shares with magic and with mythology the self-containing, self-reinforcing character of a closed system, in which objects are what they are because they are what they are, for once, for all time, for ontological reasons that no empirical material can either dislodge or alter (ibid. 70).

Imaginative geography thus enables the rise of a vocabulary and a specific representative discourse that becomes the way in which Orient is known. Orientalism thus becomes a form of “radical realism” by which an aspect of the Orient is fixed with a word or phrase “which then is considered either to have acquire, or more simply be, reality” (ibid. 72).

3.3. The Discourse of Orientalism

Orientalism is best interpreted and understood in Foucauldian terms as a discourse: a manifestation of power and knowledge. Said himself says that without examining Orientalism as a discourse, it is not possible to understand “the enormously systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage - and even produce – the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively during the post Enlightenment period” (Orientalism 3). The definition of Orientalism by Said leads us to make a link between Orientalism and colonialism. What is colonial discourse then?

Bill Ashcroft and Pal Ahluwalia define discourse as “a system of statements within which and by which the world can be known” (14). They also point out that Foucauldian discourse does not refer to speech but to the area of social knowledge.

3 For an overview of the controversy see Ashcroft and Ahluwalia 69-81.
Colonial discourse, then, is a system of statements about colonies and colonial people, about colonizing powers and about the relationship between these two, and the system of knowledge and belief within which acts of colonization take place. Even though this knowledge and belief is created in the society and culture of the colonizers, it also may become the discourse within which the colonized may see themselves. It also may create a conflict in the consciousness of the colonized because it clashes with other knowledges of the world.

As a discourse, Orientalism is accorded the authority of academics, institutions and governments. Such authority raises the discourse to a level of importance and prestige that guarantees its identification with ‘truth’. In time, the knowledge and reality created by the Orientalist discipline produce a discourse “whose material presence or weight, not the originality of a given author, is really responsible for the texts produced out of it” (Orientalism 94). Said then argues that by means of this discourse Western cultural institutions are responsible for the creation of those ‘others’, the Orientals. Their difference from the Occident helps establish a binary opposition by which Europe’s own identity can be established. Making such a demarcation between the Orient and the Occident is “less a fact of nature than it is a fact of human production” (ibid. 2). Thus it is the human effort operating within the imaginary geography that is crucial to constructing entities such as the Orient. It also requires maintaining strict boundaries in order to differentiate between the East and the West. This process thus enables orientalizing regions.

Essential part of Orientalism is the relationship of power between the Occident and the Orient in which the former has a great supremacy. This power is very closely connected with the construction of knowledge about the Orient. It is possible because the “knowledge of subject races” or “Orientals” makes their
management easy and profitable; “knowledge gives power, more power requires more knowledge, and so on in an increasingly profitable dialectic of information and control” (ibid. 36). The knowledge of the Orient created by and embodied within the discourse of Orientalism serves to construct an image of the Orient and the Orientals as subservient and subject to domination by the Occident. Thus, knowledge of the Orient in a sense creates the Orient:

In Cromer’s and Balfour’s language, the Oriental is depicted as something one judges (as in a court of law), something one studies and depicts (as in a curriculum), something one disciplines (as in a school or prison), something one illustrates (as in a zoological manual). The point is that in each case the Oriental is contained and represented by dominating frameworks” (Orientalism 40).

Said thus shows that the creation of the Orient as the other is necessary so that the Occident can define itself and strengthen its own identity by invoking such a juxtaposition.

Said also points out that the Orientalist representation has been reinforced by academic disciplines such as anthropology, history, and linguistics as well as by the “Darwinian thesis on survival and natural selection” (ibid. 227). Within the Orientalist discourse, the Orient has always been studied from an Occidental or Western perspective. To the Westerner, according to Said,

the Oriental was always like some aspect of the West; to some German Romantics, for example, Indian religion was essentially an Oriental version of Germano-Christian pantheism. Yet the Orientalist makes his work to be always converting the Orient from something into something else: he does this for himself, for the sake of his culture (ibid. 67).

When Said compares the Orient and the West, he shows that the Oriental culture and perspective is always viewed as a deviation and thus is accorded an inferior status.
Another important part of Orientalist discourse is the objectification of both the Orient and the Oriental. They are treated as objects that can be scrutinized and comprehended, and this objectification is best visible in the term ‘Orient’. Objectification of this area assumes that it is monolithic and with an unchanging history while the Occident is diverse with a changing history; Orientals are also seen as passive objects of study. In fact, the concept of the ‘Orient’ covers a geographical area that is much larger in terms of geographical area and population as well as much more diverse in terms of culture than Europe.

Thus this construction has also a very clear political dimension as it assumes that the Western knowledge entails political significance. This is very well exemplified in the rise of Oriental studies and the emergence of Western imperialism. The Englishmen in India or Egypt in the latter nineteenth century took interest in the countries that were founded on their status as the British colonies. This may seem quite different, suggests Said, “from saying that all academic knowledge about India and Egypt is somehow tinged and impressed with, violated by, the gross political fact – and yet that is what I am saying in this study of Orientalism” (ibid. 11). Said can say this because he is convinced about the worldliness of the discourse: “no production of knowledge in the human sciences can ever ignore or disclaim its author’s involvement as a human subject in his own circumstances (ibid. 11). Hence in the colonialist context, every pursuit of knowledge is affected by the ideological assumptions of imperialism. Knowledge is a matter of representation and representation is a process of giving form to ideological concepts. In other words, it is making certain signifiers stand for the signified. The power that underlines these representations is connected with the operations of political force.
Thus a power imbalance exists not only in the characteristics of imperialism but also in cultural discourse. Said is interested in showing how the Orientalist “makes the Orients speak, describes the Orient, renders its mysteries plain for and to the West” (ibid. 20-1). His methodology is thus rooted in ‘textualism’ which allows him to see the Orient as a textual creation. In Orientalist discourse, the affiliations of the text force it to produce the West as a site of power and a center distinctly marked from ‘the other’ which is the object of knowledge and consequently of subordination. This hidden political function of the Orientalist text is a feature of its worldliness and Said thus focuses on the establishment of Orient as a textual construct.

In order to understand discourses within which knowledge is constructed, we have to understand the issue of representation. According to Said it is questionable whether a true representation is possible (ibid. 272). If all representations are rooted in the language, culture and institution of the one who makes representations “then we must be prepared to accept the fact that a representation is *eo ipso* implicated, intertwined, embedded, interwoven with a great many other things besides the ‘truth’ which is itself a representation” (ibid. 272). This is what happens when an Orientalist text is held to represent the truth. The Orient is kept silent and the reality is communicated by the Orientalist. As the Orientalist’s texts offer familiarity with the distant reality, they are granted a high status and they often gain more importance than the objects they describe. Said claims that “such texts can create not only knowledge but also the very reality they appear to describe” (ibid. 94). Therefore, it is the texts that describe and create the reality of the Orient, given that the Orientals themselves are prohibited from speaking.

The latest phase of Orientalism corresponds with the displacement of France and Britain on the world stage by the United States of America. Even though the
centre of power shifted and the Orientalist strategies changed, the discourse of Orientalism stays unchanged. In this latest phase, the Arab Muslim occupies the central position in American popular images and social sciences. Said claims that this was possible by the “transference of a popular anti-Semitic animus from Jewish to an Arab target ... since the figure was essentially the same” (ibid. 286). The social sciences became dominant after the World War II and they ensured that the region was “conceptually emasculated, reduced to ‘attitudes,’ ‘trends,’ statistics: in short dehumanized” (ibid. 291). Then, Orientalism in its different phases is an “Eurocentric discourse that constructs the ‘Orient’ by the accumulated knowledge of generations of scholars and writers who are secure in power of their ‘superior’ wisdom” (Ashcroft 66-7). Thus Said urges continual alertness in fighting the dominance of Orientalism. For Said, the answer is to be “sensitive to what is involved in representation, in studying the Other, in racial thinking, in unthinking and uncritical acceptance of authority and authoritative ideas, in the socio-political role of intellectuals, in the great value of skeptical consciousness” (ibid. 327). Thus one of the greatest obligations of an intellectual is to resist the attractions of power and authority – a notion that will be discussed in the last chapter of this thesis.

3.4. Said and Foucault

It is clearly visible that in his discussion of knowledge and power in Orientalism Edward Said was inspired by the French philosopher Michel Foucault. However, there are also several points in which these two great thinkers of the second half of the twentieth century departed.
Most importantly, Said thought that Foucault’s works lacked political commitment. Said suggests that Foucault “takes a curiously passive and sterile view not so much of the uses of power, but of how and why power is gained, used, and held onto” (The World, The Text, and The Critic 221). The problem Said has with Foucault is “a lingering sense that he is more fascinated with the way power operates than committed to trying to change power relations in society” (Ashcroft 67). Indeed, Foucault’s concept of power which operates at every level of society leaves no room for resistance. Said characterizes it as a “conception [which] has drawn a circle around itself, constituting a unique territory in which Foucault has imprisoned himself and others with him” (The World... 245). In contrast, Said does not want to be trapped and he wants to articulate the potential to resist and recreate. This is implicit in Orientalism which stresses the relationship between power and knowledge.

Said thinks that the power of Orientalists lays in their knowledge of the Orient. Knowing the Orient embodies the power and it is also an exercise of power. Thus for Said there are two steps of resistance. The first step is to know the Orient outside the Orientalist discourse and the second step is to articulate this knowledge to the Orientalists. The reason why this two-step procedure is necessary is that ‘an Oriental’ was not an intended reader of the Orientalist writings Said examined. He claims that “the discourse of Orientalism, its internal consistency and rigorous procedures, were all designed for readers and consumers in the metropolitan West” (Orientalism 336). Said writes back to the Orientalists but he realizes he is not writing an authentic story of the Orient because only an Oriental has the capacity to do so. Said rather communicates the deception of authenticity as there is no ‘real’ Orient as
‘the Orient’ is itself a constituted entity, and the notion that there are geographical spaces with indigenous, radically ‘different’ inhabitants who can be defined on the basis of some religion, culture or racial essence proper to that geographical space is equally a highly debatable idea (ibid. 322).

Even though Said is indebted to Foucault in term of methodology, he was able to maintain distance from Foucault which enabled him to employ his authorial creativity. Said comments on this: “I didn’t want Foucault’s method, or anybody’s method to override what I was trying to put forward” (qtd. in Ashcroft 69). He voiced his distance from Foulcauld even more explicitly at the end of Orientalism, where he coined the concept of non-coercive knowledge that “was deliberately anti-Foucauldian” (qtd. in Ashcroft 69).

This strategy of resistance is premised upon intellectuals who exercise their critical consciousness, not only to reject imperial discourse but to intervene critically “within the intrinsic conditions on which knowledge is made possible” (The Problem of Textuality 673). For Said, the critical consciousness means challenging the hegemonic nature of dominant culture as well as “the sovereignty of the systematic method” (ibid. 673). Said argues that when a critic adopts such a position, it is possible to deal with texts in two ways – to describe not only what is visible in the text but also that what is invisible. When one detaches from the dominant culture and adopts a responsible adversarial position, then one begins to “account for, and rationally to discover and know, the force of statements in texts (ibid. 713). Thus developing of critical consciousness is essential for Said’s strategy of resistance.
4. Culture and Imperialism

Said realizes the role that culture played in keeping imperialism intact. He shows that the institutional, political and economical operations of imperialism are dependent on culture.

In this book Said does not propose a certain thesis which he tried to prove. The narrative becomes the argument, it embodies it and thus it is not possible to determine where theory ends and exemplifications begin. The result for a reader is a very engaging reading in which there are “neither lines of national demarcation nor the possibility of a no-man's land” and where “the pursuit of culture is by no means an alternative space to the symbolic and actual fact of colonial practice (Marrouchi 101). Said analyzes fiction of British and French canon and demonstrates how it is influenced by the functions of imperialism. Said claims that “the European culture often, if not always, characterized itself in such a way as simultaneously validate its own preferences in conjunction with distant imperial rule” (Culture and Imperialism 81).

This work can be characterized by its attempt to take everything into its orbit with lucidity and also compassion. The result is both dazzling and dizzying as Said works with his way through a compendium of cultural readings. Sara Suleri compares Orientalism and Culture and Imperialism two structurally very different works:

Whereas Orientalism attempted to reconstruct the plot through which the “Orient” was made into a textual object, Culture and Imperialism concerns the diverse complicities that dictate the mutual histories of Orient and Occident. The sequel, in other words, belies easy misconceptions of Orientalism, although few contemporary critics
have seemed prepared to acknowledge that the very flaws of *Culture and Imperialism* make it an exemplary articulation of development that must occur in cultural criticism" (31).

Suleri then continues and claims that the introductory chapter of *Culture and Imperialism* proposes a very much needed reconsideration of the discipline called comparative literature. Previously considered as making secure distinctions between nations and national literatures, in this global world it has to change to a broader reading of the problem of culture. In this manner, Said makes us look at various issues from different perspectives and he makes us consider them in broader cultural circumstances.

First of all, for Said, culture means “all those practices, like the arts of description, communication, and representation that have relative autonomy from the economic, social, and political realms and that often exist in aesthetic forms” (xii). The form on which Said focuses is the novel as he believes that it is narratives and stories that reflect what is going on in the strange regions of the world. Said also considers it very important as it is through narratives that the colonized people assert their own identity and tell the stories of their past. Said points out that “the power to narrate, or to block other narratives from forming and emerging is very important to culture and imperialism, and constitutes one of the main connections between them” (ibid. xiii). Said concentrates on British, French, and American imperialism and analyzes the works of British and French author such as Jane Austen, Rudyard Kipling, Joseph Conrad or Albert Camus.

Secondly, culture is a “concept that includes a refining and elevating element, each society's reservoir of the best that has been known and though” (ibid. xiii). It is usually connected with a nation or state and thus culture is both, the
function and the source of identity. Said also explores the relationship between imperialism and resistance and tries to show these forces together.

In the first half of the book Said establishes that domination is connected with subjugation as much as with profit. In the second half, he tries to answer the question of how was the tradition of textual 'Englishness' or 'Frenchness' formed and upheld by the conditions of empire. He also articulates the urgency with which Culture and Imperialism pose questions to the study of post-colonialism. “Theoretically, we are only at the stage of trying to inventory the interpellation of culture by empire ... as the study of culture extends into the mass media, popular culture, micropolitics ... the focus on modes of power and hegemony grows sharper” (ibid. 81). In other words, the list of the cultural interplays has to be formed. Thus Culture and Imperialism is an evocative beginning for revisionary readings of the cultural intersections between literature and empire.

More importantly, in Culture and Imperialism Said offers a new way of reading, an interpretative method, that he calls contrapuntal reading which examines the subtexts that compel imperial narratives. It is a way of “reading back” from the perspective of the colonised to show how the submerged but crucial presence of the empire emerges in texts. Therefore, it is necessary to read contrapuntally and not univocally and to be aware of the subjected and concealed histories standing against the metropolitan history (ibid. 59).

Each of Said's four chapters of Culture and Imperialism is divided into textual and interpretative sections. The texts that Said analyzes are very well known (e.g. Austen’s Mansfield Park, Conrad’s Heart of the Darkness, Camus’s L’Étranger) but Said reads them in a way in which they have never been read before.
He pays very detailed attention to the primary texts he analyzes and his readings bring to life new perspectives.

4.1. Contrapuntal reading

Salman Rushdie once said about Edward W. Said: "Edward has always had the distinguished feature that he reads the world as closely as he reads books" (Rushdie 166). Indeed, Said's ability to read texts carefully and his ability to read the world around him enabled him to see things that others did not see and make connections that others would never dream of making.

When describing his method of reading texts, Said borrowed the term 'contrapuntal' from the field of classical music. In music it means "composed of two or more relatively independent melodies sounded together" (dictionary.com). As Said points out,

in the counterpoint of Western classical music, various themes play off one another, with only a provisional privilege being given to any particular one; yet in the resulting polyphony there is concert and order, an organized interplay that derives from the themes, not from a rigorous melodic or formal principle outside the work (Culture and Imperialism 59-60).

Thus Said adapts the term used in music and applies it to the way he reads texts. Like in music, Said sees in texts various more or less independent currents and undercurrents. He lets them sound in polyphony but he also tries to find the most inclusive perspective by embracing all of the currents.

We could claim that contrapuntality emerges out of the tension and complexity of Said's own identity, which is like a text that requires constant writing and re-writing. His identity is complicated and consists of many characteristics and
roles and thus it is inevitable to have a continual dialogue between the different and sometimes even contradictory dimensions of his own worldliness.

Nevertheless, contrapuntal reading in the field of cultural and post-colonial studies is Said's most innovative contribution to identifying the nature of the interrelations between European culture and the imperialism. This method is appropriate mainly for reading novels as novels have a very special relationship with imperialism but Said applies it also to reading other texts – for example even Giuseppe Verdi's opera *Aida*.

We read a text contrapuntally, for example, "when we read it with an understanding of what is involved when an author shows, for instance, that a colonial sugar plantation is seen as important to the process of maintaining a particular style of life in England" (Culture and Imperialism 78). Thus when we read contrapuntally, we have to place the text into its circumstances and this brings us back to the notion of the worldliness of text and to the notion of affiliative readings which were discussed in the first chapter of this thesis.

Said's sense of the contrapuntal process is that it is a way of "rethinking geography" (qtd. in Ashcroft 94). Geography is very important for both *Orientalism* and *Culture and Imperialism* because covering the local realities that are essential for forming a text is a feature of the process of domination. Said believes that most cultural historians and literary scholars were not very successful in noticing the geographical notation and what we could call theoretical mapping of the colonized territory in Western fiction or history.

There is first the authority of the European observer – traveler, merchant, scholar, historian, novelist. Then there is the hierarchy of spaces by which the metropolitan economy are seen as dependent upon an overseas system of territorial control, economic exploitation, and socio-cultural vision; without
these stability and prosperity at 'home' ... would not be possible (Culture and Imperialism 69).

Said also points out that when the empire appears in novels, “the facts of empire are associated with sustained possession, with far-flung and sometimes unknown spaces, with eccentric or unacceptable human beings, with fortune-enhancing or fantasized activities like emigration, money-making, and sexual adventure” (ibid. 75). The inhabitants of many far-away places are often depicted as primitives or cannibals, even though they are no less human than the people of the West. The perspective of these colonized people is pushed to the edge of the Western consciousness as it is not the primary interest of Western novels. When reading contrapuntally, Said focuses especially on the perspective of the colonized people and he brings it from the margin to the center.

4.2. Mansfield Park

One of the best-know examples of Said’s contrapuntal analysis is his reading of Jane Austen’s Mansfield Park. Sir Thomas Bertram leaves Mansfield Park in order to solve problems at his Antiguan plantations. When he unexpectedly returns home, he finds his children and their friends in the middle of rehearsing the performance of a play called Lover’s Vows. He methodically puts things in order, like “Crusoe setting things in order” or “an early Protestant eliminating all traces of frivolous behavior” as he wants to maintain control and authority in his home (Culture and Imperialism 104). Contrapuntal reading focuses on the reality of Antigua in the process of putting things in order. After his return, Sir Thomas methodically tried to organize things in the state he wanted to have them. Thus we
can assume that he does the same thing on his Antiguan plantations where he wants to maintain control and authority:

More clearly than anywhere else in her fiction, Austen here synchronizes domestic with international authority, making it plain that the values associated with such higher things as ordination, law, and propriety must be grounded firmly in actual rule over and possession of territory. She sees that to hold and rule Masfield Park is to hold and rule an imperial estate in close, not to say inevitable association with it. What assures the domestic tranquility and attractive harmony of one is the productivity and regulated discipline of the other (ibid. 104).

Thus for Said, Mansfield Park exists as a metaphor of the colonial domain of Sir Thomas without whose overseas properties the life of the Mansfield Park would not function properly.

Said also points out the connection between the story of Fanny Price, empire and imperialism. Fanny is a poor niece of Sir Thomas and she lives with his family in Mansfield Park. Even though she is much poorer than her relatives, she shows characteristics that make her superior to her rich relatives. Her forced return home to Portsmouth is a “rediscovery of the limitation, the confinement, the meanness of situation and spirit the poverty entails” (Ashcroft 97). In her return home, Said sees an imperial message: “To earn the right to Mansfield Park you must first leave home as a kind of transported commodity ... but then you have the promise of future wealth” (Culture and Imperialism 106). Thus for Said, Fanny’s movement is a small-scale version of the colonial movements of Sir Thomas.

Thus references to Antigua revealed the hidden dependency of Britain on its holdings. It is very interesting to explore why Austen gave Antigua such importance. Said examines this question and points out that Britain and, to certain degree, France wanted to make their empires long-term and prosperous enterprises. Hence Said
shows that both Britain and France competed for dominance in the sugar industry (ibid. 107). In this manner, Antigua is a way of signifying “contests of ideas, struggles with Napoleonic France, awareness of seismic economic and social change during a revolutionary period in world history” (ibid. 112). Moreover, connection of Bertrams with Antigua reveals that their fortune would not be possible without the slave trade and sugar industry in the colonies. Thus Mansfield Park “steadily, if unobtrusively opens up a broad expanse of domestic imperialist culture without which Britain’s subsequent acquisition of territory would not have been possible” (ibid. 114). However, the structure of attitudes and references can be discovered and accessed only by reading the novel very closely. When reading carefully,

we can sense how ideas about dependent races and territories were held both by foreign office executives, colonial bureaucrats, and military strategists and by intelligent novel-readers educating themselves in the fine points of moral evaluation, literary balance, and stylistic finish (ibid. 114)

4.3 Kim

One of the most useful features of the method of contrapuntal reading is its ability to disclose a text’s dependence on political structures and institutions of imperialism through clues that might otherwise continue to be hidden. When reading and analyzing Rudyard Kipling’s Kim contrapuntal reading must operate in somewhat different ways as the empire is evidently present in the novel. However, contrapuntal reading can still present two fundamental observations. First, Kipling is not writing from the authoritative viewpoint of a White man in a colony but from the perspective of “a massive colonial system whose economy, functioning, and history had acquired the status of a virtual fact of nature” (Culture and Imperialism, 162). Second, Kim was written at a specific time in history when the relationship between
India and Britain was changing. Contrapuntal reading of the novel thus attempts to analyze closely the colonial context of the novel. It does not simply contextualize it but it shows how its specific themes reflect the specific historical conditions. “We are naturally entitled to read *Kim* as a novel belonging to the world’s greatest literature” claims Said, yet “by the same token, we must not unilaterally abrogate the connections *in it*” (ibid. 175).

One of these connections is the overpowering maleness in the novel. It may not be a surprising feature of a book written at the turn of the twentieth century but in *Kim* it suggests the specific importance to empire as it embodies male metaphors of sport and competition. One of the most powerful metaphors is the “Great Game” of the imperial mission about which Kim thinks that it “is best played by men alone” (qtd. in Culture and Imperialism 165). Connections between this metaphor and the operations of the Secret Service are very relevant to the role of the empire in India.

Another contrapuntal observation is that Kipling did not see a conflict between his empathy for India and its inhabitants and his belief in the rightness of British rule. Even though Edmund Wilson suggests that the reader might expect that Kim will one day come to see that he is “delivering into bondage to the British invaders those whom he has always considered his own people”, Said claims that any such conflict may stay unsolved in the novel (ibid. 175). For Kim, being under the British rule was the best destiny for India as “there were no appreciable deterrents to the imperialist world view Kipling held” (ibid. 176). In this sense, Kipling’s novel demonstrates some contrapuntal ironies despite its overwhelming presence of the empire. One of the examples of such ironies would be the ‘Indian Mutiny’ which was a catastrophe that underlined the division between the British administration and the
Indian population. It would be unusual for an Indian not to feel repugnance for the British reprisals. Yet, Kipling shows an old veteran telling Kim and his companion that “a madness ate into the army” that “chose to kill the Sahib’s wives and children. Then came the Sahibs from over the sea and called them to most strict account” (qtd. in Culture and Imperialism 178). Thus the British view of the mutiny enters “the world of imperialistic polemic, in which the native is naturally a delinquent, the white a stern but moral judge and parent” (ibid. 178). Kipling does not show us two worlds in conflict, “he has studiously given us only one, and eliminated any chance of conflict appearing altogether” (ibid. 179). Contrapuntal reading helps to reveal this fact.

Moreover, Said suggests that if we read the novel in the traditional way, as a boy’s adventure or a rich and detailed panorama of Indian life, we are not reading the novel Kipling wrote (ibid. 180). British believed in their civilizing mission and thus these fantasies of approval reflect the idea of permanence of their empire. As Francis Hutchins says, “An India of the imagination was created which contained no elements of either social change or political menace” (qtd. in Culture and Imperialism 180). This does not mean that Kipling purposefully constructed a propagandist view of India. However, his own belief in the efficacy and righteousness of the British rule and the imperialist dominance of narrative took part in constructing the image of India for both Europeans as well as Indians.

At the same time, the novel is quite different from the rest of writings produced in the same period which tended to focus on the “debasement of contemporary life, the extinction of all dreams of passion, success, and exotic adventure” (ibid. 192). In contrast, Kim shows how an expatriate European can enjoy a life of “lush complexity” in India (ibid. 192). Another interesting aspect of the
novel is the concept of time. While other contemporary novels have “tight, relentlessly unforgiving temporal structure[s]”, in *Kim* time is not a limiting factor (ibid 193). This is because the geography is so vast and open, and to some extent, it reflects freedom of movement. Said believes that *Kim* is the realization of a: great and cumulative process, which in the closing years of the nineteenth century is reaching its last major moment before Indian independence: on the one hand, surveillance and control over India; on the other, love for and fascinated attention to its every detail (Culture and Imperialism 195).

Thus Kipling’s *Kim* is not propaganda or a political tract. It is an engagement with India that Kipling loved but could not have.

4.4. *Aida*

Even though the method of contrapuntal reading is most relevant for analyzing novels, it can also be applied to other cultural works. Said’s analysis of Verdi’s opera *Aida* is the best example of such contrapuntal analysis. Said who was a very good pianist himself was interested in classical music since he was a child. His tendency to overstep the boundaries of disciplines is clearly exhibited in his contrapuntal analysis of *Aida*.

*Aida* is a very well known and very popular opera and it is performed all over the world. Its popularity raises questions about “what connects it to its historical and cultural moment in the West” (Culture and Imperialism 135). Said believes that its “subject matter and setting, its monumental grandeur, its strangely affecting visual and musical efforts, its overdeveloped music and constricted domestic situation, its eccentric place in Verdi’s career” require a contrapuntal reading (ibid. 137). This kind of reading should help to come to terms with its location in history of culture.
and also in history of overseas domination. "A highly specialized form of aesthetic memory, *Aida* embodies, as it was intended to do, the authority of Europe's version of Egypt at a moment in its nineteenth-century history" (ibid. 151). The story of *Aida* reflects the rivalry of the imperial powers in the Middle East. Its first performance was planned for the opening of the opera house in Cairo and it was "a luxury purchased by credit for a tiny clientele, mostly European, whose entertainment was incidental to their real purposes which was to supply credit to Ismail's development plans" (Ashcroft 100-1). Even though the British were suspicious about Khedive Ismail's expansive policies towards Ethiopia, they supported him because it meant blocking the French and the Italian from their expansion in Somalia and Ethiopia. Moreover, Ismail started a huge reform of internal systems such as customs and railroads which also concerned rebuilding of the City of Cairo and Alexandria. However, his modernizing ambitions in Cairo resulted in "splitting of Cairo into a medieval 'native city' without amenities, and a colonial city that attempted to emulate the great European cities" (ibid. 100). Thus Said sees *Aida* in the political and social circumstances it was first presented. When seen in this manner, the opera recalls "a precise historical movement and a specifically dated aesthetic form, an imperial spectacle designed to alienate and impress almost exclusively European audience"(Culture and Imperialism 156). Said claims that even though the original circumstances are now mostly forgotten, "the empire remains, in inflection, and traces, to be read, seen and heard" (ibid 157).

Said reminds us that it is very easy for those who belong to the dominant culture not to see or to ignore what is happening outside the orbit of their own culture, especially when the circumstances are not particularly pleasant. The
tendency to place the dominant culture and its values to the center of the universe helps to cover the imperial politics.

5. His Palestine

As it was stated before, the Arab – Israeli war of 1967 stirred Edward Said into political activism. In 1969 Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir declared: “It was not as though there was a Palestinian people. ... They did not exist.” Said decided to take on “the slightly preposterous challenge of disproving her, of beginning to articulate a history of loss and dispossession that had to be extricated, minute by minute, word by word, inch by inch” (qtd. in Barsamian ix). And indeed, for many years Said was one of the loudest voices defending the Palestinian cause in the West. “Beginning in 1968,” he writes in the introduction to The Politics of Dispossession, “I started to think, write, and travel as someone who felt himself to be directly involved in the renaissance of Palestine life and politics” (xv). Not only was Said trying to be in contact with Palestinians in exile, he also traveled to Amman in 1969 and 1970, and in 1972 to 1973 he spent his sabbatical year in Beirut to re-educate himself in Arabic language and literature (Marrouchi 10).

In 1972 I had a sabbatical and took the opportunity of spending a year in Beirut, where most of my time was taken up with the study of Arabic philology and literature, something I had never done before, at least not at that level, out of a feeling that I had allowed the disparity between my acquired identity and the culture into which I was born, and from which I had been removed, to become too great. In other words, there was an existential as well as a felt political need to bring oneself into harmony with the other (qtd. in Marrouchi 63).
This return to the Middle East is characteristic of Said's personal engagement in his theoretical and academic pursuits and it also further influenced the development of his ideas and arguments.

Said also regularly wrote for the Egyptian *Al-Ahram* in Arabic. This has enabled him to reach wider audience worldwide. Said publicly spoke about the Palestinian cause as well as about other dispossessed, oppressed and suppressed people. Christopher Hitchens characterized Said as “a lone individual, who might have done very well for himself either by keeping silent or by playing along … [but who] chose instead to place the emphasis on unwelcome truth, on what people did not want to hear” (v). He kept his independent position advocating liberation but he avoided nationalism. His works pointed at the connections between Western culture and imperialism. In sum, Said took up in life what he considered “as desirable to further the counterdiscourse of resistance to coercive powers and hegemonic systems” (Marrouchi 11).

5.1. Exile

Since Said had to face the question of displacement, exile, identity and memory, he tried to explore his own past and his own history as well as the past and history of the Palestinian people. When he was asked about patriotism he answered: “I've never felt that I belonged exclusively to one country, nor have I been able to identify “patriotically” with any other than losing causes” (qtd. in Marrouchi 135). Even though he lived and wrote in the United States which became his 'adopted home', Said still felt connections to his homeland in Palestine to which he could not return.
It is important to realize that Said knew that his exile was not a typical one and that it was more or less a chosen position: “I think exile seems to me a more liberated state, but, I have to admit, I am privileged and can afford to experience the pleasures, rather than the burdens, of exile (Palestine, Then and Now 55). Even though Said enjoyed the advantages of living in the comfort in New York, the constant experience of exile fuelled his interest in constructing/reconstructing his past. Said explains his interest and need to return to his past and to the country of his origin:

As the author of a book called Beginnings: Intention and Method, I found myself drawn to my early days as a boy in Jerusalem, Cairo and Dhour el Shweir, the Lebanese mountain village which I loathed but where for years my father took us to spend our summers. I found myself reliving the narrative quandaries of my early years, my sense of doubt and of being out of place, of always feeling myself standing in the wrong corner, in a place that seemed to be slipping away from me just as I tried to define or describe it (Between Worlds 5).

In his essays, Said asks “to what extent it is possible for individuals to live with the memory of enormous suffering and how it is possible for an entire community, at the same time, to forget it so quickly” (Marrouchi 108). More specifically, Said concentrates on being displaced and homeless not only as an individual but also as a group. He tries to define what not being at home means, how it influences the identity and what impact it has on memory. He analyzes this “disorder of identity” and tries to see whether it supports memorizing or creates fantastic and idealized memories, whether it represses or liberalizes. He carefully chooses what he wants to say and when, he writes about both Palestinians and non-Palestinians and chooses a suitable voice to present their and his story. Some of his
most influential essays on this topic are *After the Last Sky: Between Worlds; Palestine, Then and Now;* and *The Mind of Winter.*

5.2. Essays

Said believes that the form of essay is the best tool for criticism. According to him, “the essay – a comparatively short, investigative, radically skeptical form – is the principal way in which to write criticism” (The Word, the Text, and the Critic 26). Marrouchi thinks that Saidian essay is a very specific form that is difficult to classify – just like its author, and that it is a blend of German and French philosophy (113). And indeed, Said presents the significant questions, explores them and presents the findings in a very concise format. Thus Said combines a figure of an essayist who is a thinker and an essayist who is a critic. Andre Glucksmann remarks that “the style of the essayist ... is not to have set rules” (qtd. in Marrouchi 113). It is also one of the reasons why the form of essay is essential to Said. It gives him the freedom to think and to write without being limited by focusing on the method or technical procedure. In his essays Said not only finds a suitable form to write on the topic of exile but he is able to show his brilliant skills of composition and expression.

Thus for Said the form of essay becomes central as it allows him to combine various narratives in order to tell the painful story of exile. The form of essay allows him to use his own person as a beginning of digression and his sentences mimic the stories he wants to share. He picks up fragments of stories that have been buried and forgotten and brings them back to life in order to let the reader weave these pieces together and comprehend the story of Said's youth and the story of his people. Said purposefully chooses “fragments over wholes” as he wants to tell his “story in pieces, as it is” (After the Last Sky 150). His sentences tend to be short and easy to
understand, he does not need any ornaments to make the stories compelling. The power of the narrative is in the nuances of the voices he uses when sharing his experience of exile with his readers.

5.3 After the Last Sky.

*After the Last Sky* is a very special book as it is a combination of Said's brilliant essays and Jean Mohr's captivating photographs creating a very delicate relationship between the text and the pictures. As Arif Dirlik points out, this work "was written for Western readers, to impart to them a sense of Palestinian life in all its variety and in order to humanize Palestinians against their de-humanization in a hostile environment" (121). And indeed, both authors succeeded to create a work that makes the reader compare these subjective testimonies and the 'objective' historical facts when thinking about a loss of home which is presented in various guises. The authors had to make many choices in terms of what they decided to portray and what they decided to withhold, in choosing the mode and tone of addressing the audience and in selecting the authorial voice that speaks to the reader and can be easily recognized. As Said remarks, "exile is a series of portraits without names, without contexts. Images that are largely unexplained, nameless, mute" (*After the Last Sky* 12). And indeed, Mohr's photographs are presented without captions under them and they do not illustrate Said's texts. The elements that connect them are Palestine and exile.

Both Said and Mohr offer fragments of text and photographs and it is up to readers to work with them and connect these personal testimonies with the historical facts in order to create a more complex account. W.J.T. Mitchell comments that "the writer acknowledges that he himself is the 'cracked lens' unable to see, quite literally,
the native country he longs for except in fragmentary glimpses provided by others" (The Ethics of Form... 12). Thus Said realizes that his own memories are to some extent inaccurate and idealized by the flow of time. That is why he does not focus only on his personal memories but also presents the experience of others who have to face displacement, exile, and non-belonging.

After the Last Sky consists of four chapters but the themes are mutually interconnected. The first chapter entitled “States” focuses on the fragmented Palestinian identity while the second chapter “Interiors” examines the differences between those who left Palestine and those who stayed to live there. “Emergence” traces the changes in the way of life of Palestinians who have undergone the transition from mostly agricultural population to self-conscious people who are politically active; while “Past and Future” brings the various topics of the book together. The book also examines the role of women in the Palestinian resistance movement and it also explores the ways in which the Palestinians interact with the outside world.

As W.J.T. Mitchell points out, the purpose of After the Last Sky is also “to help bring the Palestinians into existence for themselves as much as for others; it is that most ambitious of books, a nation-making text” (12). And indeed, Said feels the need to address the question of the Palestinian identity. Here is an excerpt from the essay commenting on identity:

Identity – who we are, where we come from, what we are – is difficult to maintain in exile. Most other people take their identity for granted. Not the Palestinian, who is required to show proofs of identity more or less constantly. It is not only that we are regarded as terrorists, but that our existence as native Arab inhabitants of Palestine, with primordial rights there (and not elsewhere), is either denied or challenged. And there is more. Such as it is, our existence
is linked negatively to encomiums about Israel's democracy, achievements, excitement; in much Western rhetoric we have slipped into the place occupied by Nazis and anti-Semites; collectively we can aspire to little except political anonymity and resettlement; we are known for no actual achievement, no characteristic worthy of esteem, except the effrontery of disrupting Middle East peace... We have known no Einstein, no Chagall, no Freud or Rubinstein to protect us with the world's compassion. We are "other," and opposite, a flaw in the geometry of resettlement and exodus (After the Last Sky 16-17).

When discussing the question of identity it is interesting to look at the question of identity and the relationship between identity and place. In Living On Jacques Derrida juxtaposes the "narrative voice" and the "narratorial voice". The "narrative voice" is "a ... voice that utters the work from the placeless place" while the "narratorial voice" is the "voice of a subject recounting something, remembering an event or a historical sequence, knowing who he is, where he is, and what he is talking about" (101). In After the Last Sky the "narratorial voice" is the voice of Said, it can be identified and it leaves a mark on the text and makes it recognizable. On the other hand, the "narrative voice" is very difficult to identify. As Marrouchi points out, "it is both nowhere and everywhere at once" (119). The "narrative voice" in After the Last Sky has some ghostlike qualities, it follows the "narratorial voice," causes certain uneasiness and tension, and it does not let the work to close or end.

In addition to being very powerful and intensive, After the Last Sky is also a very honest essay. Said shows that a certain degree of objectivity is very important to him even when he is writing about such a sensitive topic as the question of Palestine. Even though he believes that a great injustice was done and is being done to the Palestinians, he does not put himself and the Palestinians into a position of a powerless victim who has never done any wrong. Said openly admits that he realizes
the mistakes and faults of the Palestinians and other Arabs. Moreover, he realizes that in order to achieve peace both sides have to agree on a compromise. Even though Said mostly discusses the experience of Palestinian people, a great number of issues and problems he addresses could be applied to the wider area of the Middle East as many regimes in this area try to repress and manipulate the people.

Said himself admits that his identity as a Palestinian influences – wittingly or unwittingly – his writing on every topic, as part of the worldliness of his own texts. Taking a stand in the controversy over Palestine not only influences many aspects of his literary and cultural theories, but also leads him to reconsider the role of the intellectual in society.

6. Intellectuals

In 1993 Edward W. Said delivered the Reith Lectures – a series of annual lectures by contemporary thinkers for the BBC. In these six lectures Said formulates his ideas about the role of the intellectual in the present postcolonial and postmodern world. Throughout the lectures Said comments on the performance of several well-known writers and intellectuals from various countries such as Jean Paul Sartre, Virginia Woolf, James Baldwin, Noam Chomsky or Aimé Césaire. According to Said, intellectual in the world today should be like an “outsider, ‘amateur’, and disturber of the status quo” (Reflections x).

After Anne Winder of the BBC offered Said the opportunity to present the Reith Lectures, there was a wave of protest against choosing Said claiming that he cannot deliver these lectures because of his connections with Palestine (Reflections, x). Moreover, Said was suspected that his lectures would have contained “a veiled
autobiographical message" (xii). However, this criticism and suspicion only confirm Said’s ideas about the role of the intellectual in today’s society.

By accepting the possibility to deliver the Reith Lectures Said disturbs the status quo. He is a Palestinian American who presents his ideas about intellectuals on the waves of the British Broadcasting Company. Because of his Palestinian origin and critical attitude towards American foreign policies and Israel Said is not very acceptable for many people and institutions. However, he decides to deliver these lectures where he examines the change of the role of the intellectual in the twentieth century focusing especially on the postwar developments. Apart from discussing European and American intellectuals Said does not forget to include a discussion about Third World intellectuals. He also dedicates one lecture to intellectuals in exile as this is a very close topic to him.

The originality and distinctive contribution of Said’s discussion of the intellectual in exile will be most discernible when viewed in the context of other influential twentieth-century thinkers. Among those who dealt with the social and political positions and roles of an intellectual and who influenced Said or were influenced by him, or who set the context in which his writings were read and interpreted, were figures such as Antonio Gramsci, Michel Foucault, and Václav Havel.

6.1. Intellectual as a Function

Italian Marxist thinker Antonio Gramsci formulated his ideas about intellectuals in one chapter of his Prison Notebooks. Even though they were first published in 1949 Gramsci’s notion of the intellectual resonates in the works of such influential thinkers as Michel Foucault.
Gramsci claims that “all men are intellectuals, ... but not all men have in society the function of intellectuals”(9). As everyone at some point cooks a meal or a delicious dinner so every man thinks. However, cooking at home does not make us cooks. It is not our profession or our function in the society even though we have the ability to do that. It is very similar with intellectuals. Many people think and analyze matters but we do not necessarily say that they are intellectuals.

Gramsci describes certain hierarchy that places “creators of the various sciences, philosophy, art” in the highest place in the society. On the opposite side of the scale are the “administrators’ and divulgators of pre-existing, traditional accumulated intellectual wealth” (14). He also differentiates between “traditional” and “organic” intellectuals whom he places into rural and urban contexts. Traditional intellectuals are the literary or scientific ones. Their position in the society is ‘higher’. Gramsci thinks that most of the intellectuals in rural areas are the traditional bearers of knowledge such as teachers, lawyers and priests. They are respected in their communities and they mediate the flow of communication between “the mass of country people and the town … petite bourgeoisie” (15). Because of this function in the society Gramsci ascribes them a very important socio-political status.

On the other hand, there are “organic” intellectuals who are more of an urban type. Organic intellectuals are part of a specific social class. They belong to this class and they have developed in it. Thus they are organically connected to it. Thus it is their role to direct ideas and aspirations of the class to which they belong. Gramsci argues that even the working class is able to develop its own intellectuals.

Said is definitely an ‘organic’ intellectual in that sense, that he is a thinker who ‘organically’ belongs to a cultural/ethnic group and he is able and willing to address its issues publicly despite many obstacles. Said remarked that he wanted to
establish a Palestinian state so he could bring it under critical scrutiny (qtd. in Marrouchi 118). Later on we were able to see what he meant by this.

In Palestine the situation had deteriorated considerably. Arafat's security police seemed everywhere on the West Bank. He had requisitioned the entire six-storey Ministry of Education for his "Presidential" office in Ramallah and in addition caused a demonstration in the city by confiscating several acres for a new personal residence there. Mrs Arafat was spending the summer in Deauville... . Thanks to his total control of the Authority's money and the security services he was getting away with murder. Literally. A few days ago a spokesman admitted to having killed seven Palestinians under torture. Hundreds are picked up and detained, so much so that in late July Arafat's men were finding themselves - like Israeli soldiers during the Intifada - shooting at stone-throwing crowds in Nablus and Tulkaram (The Politics of Dispossession 14).

Said brings to public his anger at the present state of affairs in Palestine, where the government which is supposed to protect its people is corrupted and unjust.

6.2 Intellectual as an Interpreter of the World

Pavel Barša writes about Foucault's and Deleuze's involvement in the Groupe d'information sur les prisons, which in the beginning only aimed to support a hunger-strike of the imprisoned Maoists but soon started to be involved in the defense of the rights of other prisoners, including the non-political ones, and they wanted everyone to have the possibility to reflect upon their conditions. Barša claims that in this episode we can see the dramatic change in the role of the intellectual. Traditionally, intellectuals were understood as those who bear knowledge and are supposed to tell the truth to those who do not know it (Barša 81). In informing the prisoners about their rights Foucault and Deleuze did not want to impose any
external truth of them. They did not want to speak for them as everybody should speak for himself or herself. In this case, the intellectuals ensured that the prisoners had a possibility to speak about their condition for themselves.

Foucault claims that for a long time, intellectual was perceived "as the spokesman of the universal" and to be an intellectual meant "something like being the consciousness/conscience of us all" (67). Thus an intellectual was a bearer of knowledge who tried to explain the world and whose responsibility was to formulate public issues. Universal intellectual says what is bad and what is good and what we should do in order to move from the first one to the second one.

However, the role of the intellectual has changed significantly especially after the Second World War. It shifted from knowing to thinking. Intellectuals changed from those who know everything about the world from a theoretical point of view to those who are here to interpret the world and explicate it from their practical contexts. Foucault speaks about the new and specific stratum of intellectuals:

A new mode of the 'connection between theory and practice' has been established. Intellectuals have become used to working, not in the modality of the 'universal,' the 'exemplary,' the 'just-and-true-for-all,' but within specific sectors, at the precise points where their own conditions of life or work situate them (housing, the hospital, the asylum, the laboratory, the university, family, and sexual relations)(68).

Thus specific intellectual does not criticize the system from the outside based on a theoretical concept but from the inside – from his institutional experience.

When we look at the transformation of the role of the intellectual according to Michel Foucault it is visible that with the change of his role or function in the society, the intellectual also looses his privileged position. In Foucault's understanding of the intellectual, anybody can become an intellectual. The person
must be able to think critically, develop this ability, and act in a non-conformist way. Thus as Barśa concludes, every man can be his own intellectual (84). This also reflects Gramsci’s ideas about all men being intellectuals.

Said believes that “uncompromising freedom of opinion and expression is the secular intellectual’s main bastion” (89). Thus intellectuals should try to keep their objectivity and be very careful with which institutions they are associated. Once intellectuals work for certain institutions, it is expected that they maintain a certain degree of loyalty which, however, can be entangling and limiting and it can negatively influence their work.

He realizes that intellectuals also have to make their living and they “are paid for their opinions” (68). However, he still thinks that they “ought to be stirring up debate and if possible controversy” (69). Hence for Said, the attempt to point at the problem and to start discussion about it is crucial in terms of the role of the intellectual in today’s world. Intellectuals should not be worried about crossing the invisible boundaries of their profession and they should voice their opinions. One specific example of Said’s criticism of American intellectuals is this excerpt from *The Politics of Dispossession* where Said criticizes American intellectuals for abandoning their responsibility to question and criticize those in power. In an interview that was published after the Gulf War, Said complained: The intellectual community doesn't operate according to principles and doesn't consider itself bound by responsibilities toward the common weal... . The large body of American intellectuals is basically provincial, drawn only by virtue of expertise” (305). The last sentence leads us to another issue in Said’s view of the intellectuals.

Said differentiates between professional and amateur intellectuals. He criticizes those intellectuals who have become too concerned with their own matter
of study and who are not interested in the world around them. He calls them "classroom technicians" and he reprehends their narrow focus (Representations 72). Since scholars tend to specialize only in one subject or field they often do not feel competent to criticize the issues they do not fully understand. This is a very unfortunate posture as it limits intellectual's possibilities.

Specialization makes experts in a certain field but on the other hand it limits in voicing the opinions, doubts, and criticism. Said thus believes that "amateur" intellectuals are freer to criticize as they do not bear the burden of specialization. According to him "specialization means losing sight of the raw effort of constructing either art or knowledge.... [and it] also kills your sense of excitement and discovery" (77). Thus intellectuals should be interested even in matters that are not the focus of their specialization and they should "try to deal with the impingements of modern professionalization ... not by pretending that they are not there, or denying their influence, but by representing a different set of values and prerogatives" (82). It is clear that Said believes in amateurism as a starting point to crossing the boundaries between disciplines and fields. For Said, amateurism means commitment to bring the forgotten back to light, to connect what had been kept separate, to question and doubt the official statement, and to envision the next course of action. Thus an intellectual should be an amateur committed to ideas and not a calculating professional.

6.3. Intellectual as a Rebel

Said’s ideas about the role of the intellectual are also very similar to those of Vaclav Havel. Even though Havel is now remembered as the first president of democratic Czechoslovak Federative Republic, he himself had been a dissident in communist Czechoslovakia and had experienced the hardship of being in prison. To
certain extent Havel was what Said calls an intellectual in exile as his books were prohibited and he could not publish.

Expressing one’s opinion often resulted in persecution of the bold person and also of their family members. Thus speaking up against authorities requires a great degree of courage and boldness. Havel articulates his ideas about the role of the intellectual in the society as follows:

[T]he intellectual should constantly disturb, should bear witness to the misery of the world, should be provocative by being independent, should rebel against the hidden and open pressure and manipulations, should be the chief doubter of systems, of power and its incantations, should be a witness to their mendacity. For this very reason, an intellectual cannot fit into any role that might be assigned to him, nor can he ever be made to fit into any of the histories written by the victors (Havel 167).

Havel believes that intellectuals should keep their freedom of opinion and independence under any conditions. Even if it is dangerous, intellectuals should question the authorities and thus function as the voice of the public. Intellectuals should be visible, provocative and stand behind their words even if it is not comfortable. This is very similar to Said’s notion of the role of the intellectual.

Said also believes that intellectuals should follow things happening in the society and serve as public doubters and critics of the system. Said realizes that this is a very challenging task but he still thinks that intellectuals should be:

... maintaining a state of constant alertness, of a perpetual willingness not to left half-truths or received ideas steer one along. That this involves a steady realism, an almost athletic rational energy, and a complicated struggle to balance the problems of one’s own selfhood against the demands of publishing and speaking out in the public sphere is what makes it an everlasting effort, constitutively unfinished and necessarily imperfect (Representations 23).
Thus he comprehends the task of an intellectual as a vocation. It is not a job that one can quit when he is tired or dissatisfied. Being an intellectual is not temporary and one needs to dedicate his whole life to this vocation. Hence being an intellectual requires a whole person and a full-time attention.

Both Havel and Said believe that intellectuals should voice their opinions despite the risk of being persecuted and punished. Only as persistent and independent public critics can intellectuals focus the attention of the authorities on the problematic issues in the society and thus hope for a change.

Moreover, Said has turned living in truth into a specific mark of the intellectual as an individual with a specific public role. Intellectuals' arena are ideas. Values play an important role in this arena, however, they alone cannot define it as intellectuals are recognized because of their ideas and not because of their moral qualities. Said insists that the intellectual is an individual with a specific public role in the society that cannot be reduced simply to being a faceless professional, a competent member of a class just going about her/his business. The central fact for me is, I think, that the intellectual is an individual endowed with a faculty for representing, embodying, articulating a message, a view, an attitude, philosophy or opinion to, as well as for, a public. And this role has an edge to it, and cannot be played without a sense of being someone whose place it is publicly to raise embarrassing questions, to confront orthodoxy and dogma (rather than to produce them), to be someone who cannot easily be co-opted by governments or corporations, and whose raison d'être is to represent all those people and issues that are routinely forgotten or swept under the rug. The intellectual does so on the basis of universal principles: that all human beings are entitled to expect decent standards of behavior concerning freedom and justice from worldly powers or nations, and that deliberate or inadvertent
violations of these standards need to be testified and fought against courageously (Representations 11-12).

Thus it is quite natural, that the intellectuals who are the originators and bearers of ideas do participate in politics. It is visible in Said's own case and in the cases of many other intellectuals. However, in his essay *Against the Orthodoxies* published in a collection of essays *For Rushdie: Essays by Arab and Muslim Writers in Defense of Free Speech* Said asks questions that have no easy answers. One of the most compelling questions is the one about a committed intellectual:

How far should an intellectual go in getting involved? Should one join a party, serve an idea as it is embodied in actual political process, personalities, jobs, and therefore become a true believer? Or on the other hand is there some more discrete – but no less serious and involved – way of joining up without suffering the pain of later betrayal and disillusionment? How far should one's loyalty to a cause take one in being consistently faithful to it? Can one retain independence of mind and, at the same time *not* go through the agonies of public recantation and confession? (Against the Orthodoxies 263).

The weight of this question is too much for Said as well as for anyone else. Said himself had to bear the responsibility. From his position of a respected academic he was an advocate of the Palestinian question however, he refused to be just a loudspeaker. His disagreement with Arafat's actions ended in Said leaving the Palestinian National Council. In fulfillment of his role as a public intellectual, Said pointed out the contradictions and mistakes that the thirty years of the Palestinian cause have brought.

6.4. Intellectual in Exile

Said feels the importance to discuss the issue of being an intellectual in exile as he himself spent his life in one. Being a Palestinian Arab who was an
American citizen living in New York, Said belonged everywhere and anywhere and thus he lived in permanent exile. However, Said realizes that his case is a very specific one: “I think exile seems to me a more liberated state, but, I have to admit, I am privileged and can afford to experience the pleasures, rather than the burdens, of exile” (Palestine Then and Now 55). As a university professor who chose the United States for his home, he was in a completely different situation than for example Palestinians in refugee camps, or intellectuals being persecuted by the governments in their countries.

When speaking about intellectuals in exile, Said sees possible advantages of exile. Said remarks on the differences between those who never experienced exile and those who did:

Most people are principally aware of one culture, one setting, one home; exiles are aware of at least two, and this plurality of vision give rise to an awareness of simultaneous dimensions, an awareness that – to borrow a phrase from music – is contrapuntal ... There is a unique pleasure in this sort of apprehension, especially if the exile is conscious of other contrapuntal juxtapositions that diminish orthodox judgment and elevate appreciative sympathy. There is also a particular sense of achievement in acting as if one were at home wherever one happens to be” (The Mind of Winter 55).

Thus exile can also be an enriching experience. The person in exile is exposed to two cultures and when learning about the new culture, one tends to notice details and things that are considered common. One also has to ask many questions when comparing the two cultures and thus becomes more sensitive to differences. Said suggests that because “the exile sees things both in terms of what has been left behind and what is actual here and now, there is a double perspective that never sees things in isolation” (60). Indeed, one develops a special plurality of vision - being able to look at one’s own culture through the eyes of the original one and vice versa.
The ability to see more perspectives can be thus seen as an advantage that the position of exile brings.

Looking at one's culture through the eyes of somebody else is very important. In his *Minima Moralia* Theodor Adorno says: “It is a part of morality not to be at home in one's home” (39). Similarly, Said encourages intellectuals to look at their 'home' as if through the eyes of somebody else, somebody who does not belong to the community or country. This enables a new and fresher look at the known or accepted issues and one gains more distance to think and question the issues that may rise. Thus being in exile becomes a need of an intellectual that grants certain originality of vision. Being in exile can thus help to develop capacities for criticism and the way of thinking freed from debilitating political, national, or cultural circumstances.

However, exile is also a very ambivalent state. Said remarks that exile exists in “a median state, neither completely at one with the new setting nor fully disencumbered of the old, beset with half-involvements and half-detachments” (Representations of the Intellectual 49). Said probably refers to his own experience here when he finds himself in a median state – he is a Palestinian American not completely at home in America, not at home in Palestine. Being in exile is also connected with being torn from one's home country and in many cases not being able to return there. According to Marrouchi, “Said has chosen to remain the misunderstood stranger” (153), he chose to live in exile and to speak truth to power. He remarked that “the achievements of any exile are permanently undermined by his or her sense of loss” (The Mind of Winter 49). Even though Said celebrates exile as a possibility to gain an original vision, he realizes that the cost of it is very high.
Conclusion

Edward Said had crossed the boundaries between the academic and public life. Respected by his colleagues from academia and recognized by the public, he had definitely influenced the contemporary cultural terrain and his impact is clearly visible in the contemporary theory, where his concept of worldliness greatly influenced the way we perceive, read and interpret intellectual works.

Said had been considered controversial, he was both respected and resented, but he definitely cannot be overlooked or ignored. His impact can be traced in various disciplines of social sciences and humanities. Especially the term 'orientalism' is linked clearly to his name and his works. Even though his *Orientalism* was first published in 1978 it continues to be important and much debated book and it is one of the founding books of post-colonial studies.

Edward Said was a very visible public intellectual unlike many of his contemporaries. He was known for his oppositional stand that was based on his notion of the role of an intellectual in the society. For Said, this meant constant crossing of borders and boundaries. Since *Orientalism* started his career of a public intellectual Said's aim was to speak 'truth to power'. His career reflects his paradoxical identity of an American Arab from Palestine and the need to be heard which is very closely tied to his identity. According to Ashcroft, Said's intellectual career “celebrates the culture of resistance while rejecting doctrinaire rhetoric, and reaffirms the principles of human liberation while criticizing the 'politics of blame'” (142). Indeed, Said believed that there are also other alternatives than blaming others: “Instead of saying that all of them are on one side and all of us are on the
other, there may be another mode that can come into play at a level of intellectual
and cultural discrimination and elaboration that establishes a different relationship
from the purely adversarial or oppositional one” (Criticism and the Art of Politics
129). Said's works are committed to looking at issues from various perspectives,
looking for new possibilities and universal application of human rights and thus his
ideas have found a huge audience worldwide.

The fact that Said's works are appreciated and that there is a need to listen to
a critic like Said unfortunately points out to the fact that human rights are not being
respected by the political powers in many countries of the world. People need to hear
the ideas challenging colonialism as well as various nationalist ideologies. The need
to engage with Said is especially felt today when people all around the world have to
face globalization often connected with the cultural, political, economic, and military
reaches of the United States of America. Said's works based on the notion of
coexistence and recognition help us to understand not only the case of Palestine but
also other similar conflicts around the world. Said's books were translated into more
than thirty languages (Bayoumi xv). The fact that Said's works are read all over the
world suggests that Said's notion of justice and dignity do have their listeners and
thus future possibilities.
Bibliography


Summary – zhrnutie

Cieľom tejto diplomovej práce bolo identifikovať a interpretovať klíčové momenty v diele literárneho teoretika, kultúrneho kritika a v neposlednom rade politického mysliteľa Edwarda W. Saida. Táto práca sa tak venuje literárno-kultúrnej rovine Saidovho diela a vyeháva rovinu politického života, ktorá je tiež dôležitou súčasťou Saidovej biografie. Prácu som rozdelila do šiestich kapitol, ktoré mapujú premenu Saida z literárňa kritika na angažovaného intelektuála.

Prvá kapitola sa zaobera Saidovým životom a jeho kultúrnym pozadím. Pre pochopenie Saidovho diela je totiž nevyhnutné poznať jeho osobnú históriu. Said, ktorý sa narodil v Jeruzaleme a striedavo vyrastal v Egypte, Palestine a Libanone je hlubo poznačený skutočnosťou, že po vytvoreni štátu Izrael sa jeho rodina nemohla vrátiť do Palestíny a na zvyšok života stráca „Domov“.


Tretia kapitola je analýzou snád najznámejšieho a najviac prekladaného Saidovho diela Orientalizmus, ktoré sa stalo zasadným textom v oblasti postkoloniálnych štúdií a kultúrnych štúdií. Said v ňom analyzuje spôsoby, ktorými je Orient zobrazovaný v západnom svete. Táto kapitola sa zaobrá štruktúrou diela, rozsahom orientalizmu a jeho diskurzom.
Štvrťá kapitola sa zameriava na Kultúru a imperializmus, kde Said analyzuje známe diela západného literárneho kánonu a predstavuje svoju metódu kontrapuntálneho čítania. Kontrapuntálna analýza umožňuje čítať texty z pozície kolonizovaných a tak demaskuje prítomnosť imperialismu i v zdanlivo nezávislých oblastiach literatúry a umenia.

Piata kapitola sa venuje Saidovmu vzťahu k Palestíne a exílu, ktoré úzko súvisia so Saidovým pohľadom na rolu intelektuála v postkoloniálnej spoločnosti, a ktorá je zameraním záverečnej kapitoly.