

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA
ÚSTAV ANGLOFONNÍCH LITERATUR A KULTUR

Giving a Voice to the Other: Said's Theory of Anti-Colonial Resistance

DIPLOMOVÁ PRÁCE

Vedoucí diplomové práce:
Louis Armand, PhD.

Praha, duben 2010

Zpracoval:
Ali Daghman
Studijní obor:
Anglistika a amerikanistika

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto bakalářskou práci vypracoval samostatně a pouze na základě uvedených pramenů a literatury.

I declare that the following BA thesis is my own work for which I used only the sources and literature mentioned.

V Praze dne 30. dubna 2010

Souhlasím se zapůjčením magisterské práce ke studijním účelům.

I have no objections to the MA thesis being borrowed and used for study purposes.

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr Louis Armand for his extensive help and support when writing this thesis. I would also like to thank him for his patience and motivation when discussing the issues related to my work.

My thanks also go to my colleague Mgr. Marie Knoflíčková who helped me editing the thesis.

Table of contents

1.	Introduction.....	6
2.	Constructing the Concepts of Orientalism, Power and Resistance.....	11
3.	Approaches to Power and Resistance	16
4.	Orientalism: A Discourse of power	32
5.	Said on Conrad: The Other Resisting the Self	43
6.	Said's Theory on Yeats's Resistance.....	54
7.	Conclusion	60
8.	Bibliography	64
9.	Shrnutí.....	66

1. Introduction

It has been the substantial achievement of all the intellectuals, and of course of the movements they worked with, by their historical interpretive, and analytic efforts to have identified the culture of resistance as a cultural enterprise possessing a long tradition of integrity and power in its own right, one not simply grasped as a belated reactive response to Western imperialism.¹

In comparison with colonial power and discourse, anti-colonial resistance has been approached largely inadequately. This inadequate theoretical engagement with resistance to colonialism is one of the consequences of the current conception of colonial power and discourse in postcolonial theory. Since Edward Said's and Homi Bhabha's theorisation of colonial power and resistance draws on Michel Foucault's paradigms of power and resistance, this work begins by tracing the problems of theorising resistance to Foucault's poststructuralism. Foucault's paradigms of power attenuate his resistance claims by defining resistance as a function of power. Similarly, Bhabha's resistance arguments are undermined by his dispensing with native, anti-colonial, and political intentionality and consciousness. In contrast, Said offers a more nuanced account of the colonial experience, rejects a totalised conception of the colonial power, and retrieves a space for anti-colonial subjectivity and agency.

An intelligible, adequate conception of native anti-colonial resistance is a conspicuous lacuna in postcolonial theorisations of the phenomenon of imperialism and its historically specific form of colonialism. The rigour sought after in producing analyses of colonial discourses and practices is strikingly paralleled by an undertheorised conception of

¹ Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (London: Vintage, 1994) 250.

anti-colonial resistance, both as a historical moment or movement and as an analytical discursive category. Colonial discourse analysis and postcolonial theory as developed by Said have been problematised within frameworks derived from the French critical theory. Therefore, a discussion of resistance within postcolonial theory can be most fruitfully invoked in relation to Michel Foucault's conception of the problematics of knowledge and power. Said's project of *Orientalism* directly draws on Foucault's *The Archaeology of Knowledge* and *The Order of Things*. For the very existence and operation of power entail some form of resistance, not as an effect or consequence of the functioning of power, but as a necessary condition for its operation.

To claim that Foucault and Bhabha remove the possibility of resistance as such would be an ungenerous interpretive gesture. Nevertheless, given their rigorous and unrelenting analyses of power operation, they cannot be exonerated from the charge that resistance in their schemas has remained an underdeveloped category. Resistance as conceived by Foucault is, like his other concepts of power and knowledge, very complex and an element of power itself. As he argues: "where there is power, there is resistance"². However, what distinguishes Foucault's resistance is the fact that while being an element of power, it is also a "source of perpetual disorder"³. For Bhabha, power is practiced in a variety of methods, but never in possession a particular agent. He argues that loss of colonial power and authority occurs only non-oppositionally through the inner dissention within colonial discourse. Then resistance, as viewed by Bhabha, is the name of an agency without a subject.

² Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow, *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1982) 147.

³ Dreyfus and Rabinow 147.

The problem with Bhabha's and Foucault's conceptions of power and resistance is not that the possibility of resistance is diminished due to power having no ground and opposition lacking locus. Rather, it is how, why and on what grounds resistance is to be conceived, mobilised and exercised. Moreover, in their accounts, the operation of both power and resistance seems to be processes without subjects or without subjects-as-agents in the sense that subjectivity is a matter of their effects rather than the source of them. Bhabha's dismissal of any intentionalist account of the agency leaves him with no choice but to stress that both the operation and subversion of power occur outside the subject's conscious authority.

Orientalism, Said's first and perhaps last strongly Foucauldian work, "neglects evidence of native agency in general, and indigenous resistance in particular"⁴. The project of *Orientalism* seems to be exclusively focused on Western discourses, Orientalist, colonial and imperial. Said has himself admitted his neglect of native agency in *Orientalism*: "What I left out of *Orientalism* was the response to Western dominance which culminated in the great movements of decolonisation all across the Third World"⁵. However, immediately after *Orientalism* Said started to be increasingly concerned with resistance.

It is perhaps the urgency of Said's work and the political question of what is to be done to oppose oppression, colonialism and exploitation that have made his relation to Foucault a difficult one. Said's subsequent work engages with the task of not falling within the "unique territory in which Foucault has imprisoned himself and others with him"⁶. For

⁴ Peter Childs and Patrick Williams, *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory* (London: Prentice Hall/ Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1997) 107.

⁵ Said, *Culture and Imperialism* xii.

⁶ Edward Said, *The World, the Text and the Critic* (London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1983) 183.

him, Foucault's conception of power is 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"⁷.

On the whole, Said often misses the ambiguity of Foucault, for whom, there is one thing called power that takes on a myriad of decentred forms. In this sense, power is too mercurial and elusive. Yet, for Said, even when Foucault does admit of the possibility of resistance, he seems unwilling "to take seriously his own ideas about resistance to power"⁸. It is therefore the totalising aspect of Foucault's conception of power and his "lack of interest in the forces of effective resistance"⁹ which form the basis of Said's disagreement with Foucault.

Although Foucault does not deny the possibility of resistance, his models of power and knowledge attenuate his resistance claims by defining resistance as a function of power, and thus as being always in some sense complicit with it. This has serious repercussions for conceiving and mobilising resistance as an effort to introduce a new social order. His dismissal of the dialectic of ideology and individual consciousness inevitably diminishes the effectual political status of subjects-as-agents. Said offers a more detailed account of interactive and embroiled (post-)colonial experience whether for the coloniser or the colonised. He rejects a totalised conception of colonial discourse and power, and attempts to retrieve space for anti-colonial subjectivity and agency.

7 Edward Said, *The World, the Text and the Critic* 221.

8 Edward Said, *The World, the Text and the Critic* 246.

9 Edward Said, "Foucault and the Imagination of power," *Foucault: A Critical Reader*, ed. David Hoy (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1986) 154.

Each chapter in this project looks at the conception of power and resistance from a specific angle; each chapter is autonomous but still interrelated with the others. The composite whole does not generate a comprehensive view of the conception of power and resistance; but an investigation of ideas and theories, taking W.B. Yeats, a poet of resistance, and Joseph Conrad, an imperialist and anti-imperialist novelist at the same time, as case studies in this concern. This thesis aims at providing an insight into the theory of power and resistance.

2. Constructing the Concepts of Orientalism, Power and Resistance

Throughout the work, several terms are used that are crucial for understanding the issues discussed. These terms include Orientalism, power and resistance. Although each of these concepts would deserve an in-depth treatment of its own, this chapter sets the fundamental framework indicating how these terms should be approached when reading this work. This brief examination starts with the concept of Orientalism and proceeds to the issues of power and resistance.

To start with, Orientalism, as defined by Edward Said in his path-breaking book *Orientalism*, published in 1978, is “style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between the Orient and (most of the time) the Occident”¹⁰. The Orient, Said argues, is “almost a European invention” and has been “since antiquity a place of romance, exotic beings, haunting memories and landscapes”.¹¹ The Orientalist “is a scholar devoted to the study of the Orient or the East”¹². In this usage of the term, Orientalism has positive connotations: devotion to academic scholarship, a commitment to uncovering the mysteries and secrets of another culture.

Edward Said develops the term, attempting to expose its political allegiances. For Said, the Orientalists were “complicit with imperialism and they effectively provided Europe with one of its deepest and most recurring images of the Other”¹³. Orientalism is a set of ideas that are regulated in order to achieve internal coherence rather than to achieve

¹⁰ Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (London and Henley: Routledge-Kegan Paul, 1978) 2.

¹¹ Said, *Orientalism* 1.

¹² Jeremy Hawthorne, *A Glossary of Contemporary Literary Theory* (London: Oxford University Press, 2000) 248.

¹³ Said, *Orientalism* 1.

any correspondence with the Orient. Moreover, Orientalism is premised upon exteriority. According to Said, Orientalism always involved non-Orientals, mainly Europeans doing the study: “the Orientalist is outside the Orient, both as an existentialist and as a moral fact”¹⁴. In this way, Said has certainly managed to change the resonances of the word Orientalism to the extent that its neutral or ‘innocent’ use is now very difficult.

Based on this concept of the Orient, a number of writers, among whom are poets, dramatists, novelists, theorists, political or economic, have accepted this distinction between the West and the East as the focal point of their writings about the Orient and its peoples. For Said, therefore, “Orientalism can be discussed and analyzed as the corporate institution for dealing with the Orient - dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it: in short, Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring , and having authority over the Orient”¹⁵.

European culture, Said goes on, gained power and identity by defining itself against everything the Orient incorporates (traditions, languages, thoughts, ways of life).¹⁶ That is, the Westerners define themselves against the Orientals. The former rule; the latter are ruled, which means having their countries colonised, their lives and welfare under the control of the power of the West. It is deep knowledge of the colonised (here the Orientals or peoples from the East) is what makes their rule easy and well-managed. Knowledge grants power to the one who owns it.

¹⁴ Said, *Orientalism* 21.

¹⁵ Said, *Orientalism* 3.

¹⁶ Said, *Orientalism* 3.

In this context, power refers to the authority, whether political, cultural, economic or social, that is practiced by the coloniser over the colonised. More clearly, power as defined by Steven Lukes in his *Power: A Radical View* is essentially “power over”¹⁷, which is to say that power is exercised by A over B when A affects B in a manner contrary to B’s intentions. Lukes also describes a second model of power according to which power is exercised not only by making a decision that goes against B, but also in the “no-decision” that keeps the questions that are in B’s interests, but not in A’s from even arising.¹⁸ Yet, Michel Foucault is not restricted to the previously mentioned models. For him, the technology of power does not causally determine particular actions. Therefore, A could have options open, and, similarly, both A and B would have different interests if they were not caught up in this net of ideological coercion.

The question of power is closely connected with that of knowledge. It is Foucault’s model of “power/knowledge that involves a more intimate linkage: one does not occur without the other; knowledge gives rise to power, but it is also produced by the operation of power”¹⁹. This close connection between power and knowledge challenges the appeal to real interests - if by real interests one means a set of interests existing independently of some social or political or economic organisation or set of purposes. As Foucault says “[a]nother power, another knowledge”²⁰. In brief, more power necessitates more knowledge, and so on in an unfolding, endless dialectic of information and control.

¹⁷ Said, *Orientalism* 26.

¹⁸ Said, *Orientalism* 26.

¹⁹ Childs and Williams, *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory* 98.

²⁰ Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (London: Allen Lane Penguin Books, 1977) 27.

Besides its connection to knowledge, power is also linked with the concept of resistance: “When there is power, there is resistance”²¹. Resistance, as Said argues in *Culture and Imperialism*, emerges from the idea that no matter how absolute a system of domination aspires to be, there are always areas which it cannot control. Said’s definition of resistance attempts to establish a broad sweep of the term:

Yet it was the case nearly everywhere in the non-European world that the coming of the white man brought forth some sort of resistance. What I left out of *Orientalism* was that response to Western dominance which culminated in the great movement of decolonisation all across the Third World. ... Never was it the case that the imperial encounter pitted an active Western intruder against a supine or inert non-Western native; there was always some form of active resistance, and in the overwhelming majority of cases the resistance finally won out.²²

Said distinguishes two types of resistance: “primary resistance, literally fighting against outside intrusion, [and] secondary, that is, ideological resistance, when efforts are made to reconstitute a shattered community, to save or restore the sense and fact of community against all pressures of the colonial system”²³. Clearly, much anti-colonial struggle would be labelled as primary, while in the contemporary post-colonial world the Palestinian First Uprising remains a strong example of the secondary resistance for Said.

In this context, culture can be seen as a site of struggle, of practicing power by the coloniser and talking back by the colonised (resistance); it is one of the terrains on which the coloniser and the colonised oppose one another; it is one of the ways in which each side

²¹ Dreyfus and Rabinow 147.

²² Said *Culture and Imperialism* xii.

²³ Said *Culture and Imperialism* 252-253.

conducts the struggle; it is also one of the fundamental awards of the struggle (the importance of the ability to dominate someone's culture is always there). One of the many factors that make this contest unequal is that resistance has to resort to the forms which are inherited from or infiltrated by the imperialist powers. Despite this handicap, however, significant victories over imperialism can be achieved.

3. Approaches to Power and Resistance

This chapter considers the conception of power and resistance in Michel Foucault and then shows how Edward Said's and Homi Bhabha's own conceptions overlap with, differ from, or, as is the case of Bhabha, inflate Foucault's. While the approaches of both Said and Bhabha manifest disparate agendas and different theoretical trajectories, both theorists share a developing relationship with the work of Foucault. Said's *Orientalism* directly draws on Foucault's *The Archaeology of Knowledge* and *The Order of Things*. Bhabha, on the other hand, has "refined"²⁴ Orientalism in successive, theoretical moves that owe a great deal to Foucault's theory of power and knowledge, discourse and subjectivity.

Given his deep discussions of power operation, one cannot ignore the charge that resistance in Foucault's system has remained undertheorised and underdeveloped. While resistance to the discourses of power and knowledge and the mechanisms of their operation is not an issue explored in Foucault's early work, the subsequent genealogical phase, with its emphasis on systems of domination and exploitation, has not allowed a clear conception of resistance.

For Foucault, the very existence and operation of power entail some form of resistance, not as an effect or consequence of the functioning of power, but as a necessary condition for its operation.²⁵ He argues that "there are no relations of power without

²⁴ Jennifer Wallace, "Exiled by Foes, Silenced by Friends: Perspective on Edward Said," *Times Higher Education Supplement* 17 Jan. 1997: 17.

²⁵ Barry Smart, *Foucault, Marxism and the Critique* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995) 147.

resistances”²⁶. What distinguishes Foucault’s concept of resistance is that although it is an element of power, it is also its “source of its perpetual disorder”²⁷. Yet, the exercise and resistance of power work in a disruptive rather than a dialectical relation to each other. This means that “power is a two-way process”²⁸, that is, “resistance to power is ‘heterogeneous’ inasmuch as power is itself heterogeneous”²⁹. In one sense at least, the insistence on this model rules out the kind of total resistance, revolution for instance, whereby resistance could get a grip on the whole network of which it is part. Foucault holds that “there is no single locus of great Refusal, no soul of revolt, source of all rebellions, or pure law of the revolutionary”³⁰.

As such, social change in the form of e.g. a revolution can only occur if resistances have been strategically manipulated and channelled as to effect a significant rupture in the dominant order:

Just as the network of power relation ends by forming a dense web that passes through apparatuses and institutions, without being exactly localized in them, so too the swarm of points of resistances traverses social stratifications and individual unities. And it is doubtless the strategic codification of these points of resistance that makes a revolution possible, somewhat similar to the way in which the state relies on the institutional integration of power relationships.³¹

²⁶ Michel Foucault, “Power and Strategies,” *Power/knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*, ed. Colin Gordon (Brighton: Harvester, 1980) 142.

²⁷ Dreyfus and Rabinow 147.

²⁸ Robert Young, *White Mythologies: Writing History and the West* (London and New York: Routledge, 1990) 87.

²⁹ Young 87.

³⁰ Michel Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, trans. Robert Hurley (London: Penguin Books, 1990) 95-96.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 96

This means that for a revolution to take place, there must be a particular historical and political conjuncture when all the contradictions within the social formation would nevertheless merge into a revolutionary ruptural unity.

The problem with Foucault's conception of power and resistance is not that the possibility of resistance is weak due to power having no basis and opposition lacking locus. Rather, it is means and grounds of conceiving and exercising resistance. This question remains unanswered by Foucault: "Is there or is there not a reason to revolt? Let's leave the question open"³². Elsewhere, however, Foucault seems to imply that "no such philosophical motivations or justifications are necessary"³³ or prominent. Those who resist are all "those on whom power is exercised to their detriment, all who find it intolerable"³⁴. What is ruled out here is the argument which would envisage resistance as leading to a better alternative to the system that is resisted.

Foucault states that "to imagine another system is to extend our participation in the present system"³⁵. He is driven to this conclusion by his belief that "there is no guarantee that the state of affairs brought about by resistance will be better than the present, as any social arrangement or definition of community may become oppressive even if it is instituted by acts of resistance against a previous regime"³⁶. Yet, this view fails to foreground the fact that any oppressive, social formation produced by resistance can itself be resisted in the future. If such are the problems and difficulties of Foucault's model of

³² Jon Simon, *Foucault and the Political* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995) 86.

³³ Simon 86.

³⁴ Michel Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1977) 86.

³⁵ Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice* 230.

³⁶ Simon 87.

power and resistance, surely a postcolonial literary theory that bases itself on them will be constrained to the extent to which these very models are vague and problematic. The totalised representation of the discourse of power and knowledge disallows a position outside the structures and operations of power. The critique of power can only take place within the discursive parameters that power makes possible.

In Foucault's account, the operation of both power and resistance appear to be processes without subjects in the sense that subjectivity is one of their effects rather than the source of them. Moreover, since for Foucault the subject is constituted by power, the power it resists can never be outside it; thus in resistance the subject can be said to collude with that power. Nonetheless, does not this view conflate all kinds of power? Why should power be represented so monistically? Is the form of power that constitutes subjects the same form of power that they resist? All these questions point out to the fact that Foucault's *power* is a considerably undifferentiated concept.

Bhabha's conception of power overlaps with and even inflates Foucault's. Both theorists tend to focus on the dominant rather than the resistant discourse. Bhabha distinguishes between colonial discourse and the discourse of the revolutionary struggle.³⁷ The object of his analysis, he declares, is colonial rather than anti-colonial discourse, asserting that the latter "requires an alternative set of questions, techniques and strategies in order to construct it"³⁸.

³⁷ Homi Bhabha, "The Other Question: Difference, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism," *Literature, Politics and Theory*, ed. Francis Baker (London and New York: Methuen, 1986) 155.

³⁸ Bhabha, "The Other Question: Difference, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism" 155.

Similarly to Foucault, Bhabha rejects the dialectic of the Self/Other in favour of the conception of otherness that is the same's difference from itself. Bhabha also produces a totalised representation of colonial discourse, according to which natives can only resist from within discursive space and only with the tools that it makes available. Most importantly, he insists that the resistance of the colonised is "not necessarily an oppositional set of political intention"³⁹, thus downplaying their subjectivity and agency.

Bhabha emphasizes the possibility that anti-colonial discourse "may be historically co-present with"⁴⁰, even "intervene in"⁴¹ colonial discourse. Although this is a contradictory claim for Bhabha to make, given his acceptance of Foucault's paradigms of discourse and knowledge/power, he can be criticised for not considering this possibility of co-presence and overlap of colonial and anti-colonial discourses, a possibility that he opens and closes at the same time. Indeed, Bhabha, immediately shifts his focus to colonial discourse, not only because anti-colonial discourse requires a different set of questions and techniques to construct it, but also because to accept a resistant native subjectivity as such would go against his main thesis which cannot accept intervention from a space outside the structures and operations of colonial discourse.

Consistent with Bhabha's totalised representation of colonial discourse is his conception of Otherness. For him, colonial Otherness is not constituted by a binary of "Colonialist Self" and "Colonised Other".⁴² Rather, it is formed by the Self's splitting and

³⁹ Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, (London and New York: Routledge, 1994) 110.

⁴⁰ Bhabha, "The Other Question: Difference, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism" 155.

⁴¹ Bhabha, "The Other Question: Difference, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism" 155.

⁴² Bhabha, Homi. "Remembering Fanon: Self, Psyche and the Colonial Condition." *Black Skin White Masks* by Franz Fanon, trans. Charles Lam Markmann (London: Pluto Press, 1986) xix.

multiplying, a concept that “turns on the idea of Man *as* his alienated image, not Self and Other but the Otherness of the Self inscribed in the perverse palimpsest of colonial identity”⁴³. In other words, sameness slips into Otherness, but it remains an Otherness that has nothing to do with any Other. The Other must be seen as “the necessary negation of a primordial identity - cultural or psychic [because it is] never simply an It-Self, a font of identity, truth or misrecognition”⁴⁴. The problem with Bhabha’s mode of representing Otherness is that he relegates the objective existence and difference of the colonised to the mere status of Western Man’s alienated image or his “dark reflection”⁴⁵.

Similar problems stem from Bhabha’s conception of native resistance. Although Bhabha criticised the early Said for implying that colonial power is entirely possessed by the coloniser⁴⁶, he does not suggest that the colonised possesses it too. This is one of the binary oppositions that Bhabha inherits from Foucault: the only alternative to one agency possessing power is nobody possessing it. Bhabha, like Foucault, affirms that power is exercised in a variety of ways and through multiple channels, but never in possession of a particular agent. Subversion of colonial power and loss of its authority and control occur non-intentionally through the ambivalence and inner dissension within colonial discourse itself. Resistance is therefore the name of an agency without a subject. Bhabha’s “agency” takes place at the moment of enunciation; it is “a process of circulation rather than a fixed point”⁴⁷. In this way, the coloniser’s strategies for maintaining power are thwarted by the

⁴³ Bhabha, “Remembering Fanon: Self, Psyche and the Colonial Condition” xix.

⁴⁴ Bhabha, “Remembering Fanon: Self, Psyche and the Colonial Condition” xviii.

⁴⁵ Bhabha, “Remembering Fanon: Self, Psyche and the Colonial Condition,” xiv

⁴⁶ Homi Bhabha, “Difference, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism,” *The Politics of Theory*, ed., Francis Baker and Peter Hulme (Colchester: University of Essex, 1983) 200.

⁴⁷ Bhabha, “Difference, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism” 212.

ambivalence that results from the coloniser's attempt to fix the colonised as an object of knowledge.

Bhabha's account of the operation of colonial power and the strategies of colonial discourse does not allow a conception of the native subject as existing on its own outside the structures of colonial power, nor does it allow the possibility that existing native knowledge and discourse may overlap with or impinge on the operation of colonial power and knowledge. The native subject is constituted within the colonial discursive boundaries. He returns to the possibility that native knowledge and resistance discourses may be historically co-present with and intervene in colonial discourse; a possibility that he has affirmed but never pursued or brought to bear upon his analysis of colonial discourse. Through the concept of the hybrid, Bhabha argues that native knowledge transgresses the limits of colonial discourse and subverts its authority.⁴⁸

Bhabha defines hybridity as "a problematic of colonial representation ... that reserves the effects of the colonialist disavowal, so that other 'denied' knowledge enters upon the dominant discourse and engages the basis of its authority"⁴⁹. Hybridity is thus the articulation of both colonial and native knowledge and discourse. Although this issue is a discursive condition of colonialism insofar as both are produced by colonial power, Bhabha claims that it enables native resistance by destabilising and undermining the very structures that produce it in the first place: "If the effect of colonial power is seen to be the production

⁴⁸ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* 114.

⁴⁹ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* 114.

of hybridisation [this in turn] enables a form of subversion ... that turns the discursive conditions of dominance into the ground of intervention”⁵⁰.

Therefore, Bhabha’s claim for native resistance proves problematic. Since Bhabha dismisses an “intentionalist”⁵¹ account of agency, he is left with no other option than to stress that the operation as well the subversion of colonial power and knowledge occur “outside the conscious control of the subject”⁵². Consequently, the loss of colonial authority and subversion of colonial power and knowledge turn out to be an effect of the discursive conditions and operation of colonial discourse itself, rather than an agential effort on the part of a native subject that knows what it is doing. In other words, though the native may be the unconscious agent of the change that occurs within the colonial power structures, hybridity remains a kind of agency without a subject. For at the moment of hybridity, native knowledge and discourses enter upon the dominant discourse *unaware* and the resulting change is wholly unintentional.⁵³

So far, none of the issues Bhabha has articulated, whether ambivalence or hybridity, could be accorded the political status of resistance. For resistance implies a conscious, native subject who observes the ambivalence and slippages in the discourse of the coloniser, and consciously uses them in order to destabilise the coloniser’s position and control.⁵⁴ The question is: how can Bhabha account for “strategies of subversion” or “grounds of intervention” and in the absence of conscious, native agency, what could be

⁵⁰ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* 112.

⁵¹ Young 148.

⁵² Young 152.

⁵³ Young 148.

⁵⁴ Compare Young 152.

their political status.⁵⁵ What sense does Bhabha's analysis of strategies, interventions and subversion make without positing a subject-as-agent?

In fact, in the absence of a clear differentiation between forms of politics and political analysis, Bhabha's account of resistance seems to lodge political intervention and strategies of subversion within the very act of analysing and understanding colonial discourse at present. What is shown and emphasised is Bhabha's own subjectivity and agency as interpreter when he articulates his signs of resistance. This is obvious in Bhabha's assertion that "when the words of the master become the site of hybridity ... then we may not only read between the lines but even seek to change the often coercive reality that they so lucidly contain"⁵⁶. Surely then "what such a reading reveals are the boundaries of colonial discourse and it enables a transgression of these limits"⁵⁷ from Bhabha's own "space"⁵⁸.

On the whole, Bhabha's act of intervention and subversion is neither an effect of the failure of colonial power, nor an active resistance on the part of the colonised. Rather, it is the strategy and agency of the conscious writing subject. Thus, Bhabha's desire to displace native subjectivity and agency is also a desire to replace them with his own subjectivity. If the problem of agency and intentionality made up the original grounds for Bhabha's complaint against Said, his own account of native agency and resistance remains problematic with hardly any political advance on what he has criticised in Said's representation. In fact, Bhabha himself remains vulnerable to his own criticism of Said. In

⁵⁵ See Young 152

⁵⁶ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* 121, emphasis added.

⁵⁷ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* 67.

⁵⁸ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* 67.

his insistence that “there is no knowledge, political or otherwise, outside representation”⁵⁹ he ends up constructing “[t]he World according to the Word”⁶⁰. This Word, however, is almost exclusively the coloniser’s: “Everything outside colonial culture is treated with remarkable fuzziness”⁶¹. Moreover, the hybridity of both coloniser and colonised is theorised largely by “tracing the vicissitude, or the mutations in European culture”⁶².

In view of Foucault’s and Bhabha’s claims, Said’s conception of native agency and native resistance is more elaborate than that of Foucault’s and more useful than Bhabha’s. Although Said neglects both the evidence of native agency and resistance⁶³ in *Orientalism*, he explains the reasons behind it: “What I left out of *Orientalism* was the response to Western dominance which culminated in the great movements of decolonisation all across the Third World”⁶⁴.

However, after *Orientalism*, Said started to be more concerned with the question of resistance. It may be recalled that the issue of resistance was the reason that induced him to part company with Foucault, after disagreeing with Foucault on what must be done to oppose colonialism and oppression. Foucault’s work is not geared towards producing a politics, and Said seems to be impatient with him because he does not “commit himself to

⁵⁹ Benita Parry “Signs of Our Time: Discussion of Homi Bhabha’s *The Location of Culture*,” *Third Text* 28-29 1994: 9.

⁶⁰ Parry “Signs of Our Time: Discussion of Homi Bhabha’s *The Location of Culture*” 9.

⁶¹ Anita Loomba, *Colonialism/ Postcolonialism* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998) 179.

⁶² Loomba 179 - 180.

⁶³ Childs and Williams 107.

⁶⁴ Said *Culture and Imperialism* xii.

descriptions of power and oppression with some intention of alleviating human suffering, pain or betrayed hope”⁶⁵.

For Said, Foucault’s “power” is “passive” and “sterile”.⁶⁶ Indeed, for Foucault, power is irreducible. Any claim that it serves interests beyond itself is dismissed as “functionalist” or “teleological”.⁶⁷ Said argues that Foucault’s passive view of power is ascribed to his rejection of the role of classes, “the role of insurgency and rebellion in the societies”⁶⁸ Foucault discusses. In order to go beyond Foucault’s limitations, Said moves to a position that enables the possibility of critique. Said affirms the “vulnerability of the present organisation of culture”⁶⁹ and points out that “the discursive analysis of power is premised on the recognition that if power is constructed by humans, it follows that it is neither invincible nor impervious to dismantling”⁷⁰. In other words, Said states that however saturating the hegemonic systems are, they are not unassailable or omnipotent.

Foucault, in contrast, is too pessimistic to accept that alternative methods or modes could escape the totalising embrace of discursive power. “Power”, he argues “is co-extensive with the social body; there are no primal spaces of liberty”.⁷¹ Foucault even suggests that any proposed alternatives to the existing hegemony or oppression would still be filtered by the dominant discourse. The alternative, for Foucault, are “only the

⁶⁵ Said, *The World, the Text and the Critic* 247.

⁶⁶ Said, *The World, the Text and the Critic* 244.

⁶⁷ Said, *The World, the Text and the Critic* 221.

⁶⁸ Said, *The World, the Text and the Critic* 244.

⁶⁹ Said, “Foucault and the Imagination of Power” 154.

⁷⁰ Said, “Foucault and the Imagination of Power” 154.

⁷¹ Foucault, “Power and Strategies” 142.

inventions of our civilization and result from our class system”⁷². He therefore plays down even the very idea of a social formation based on principles of justice because the very idea of justice has been “invented and put to work in different societies as an instrument of a certain political and economic power or as a weapon against the power”⁷³.

Thus, Foucault’s argument seems to do the discourse of power and knowledge too much honour by subscribing to an over-totalised and undifferentiated conception of power. As Said writes:

The disturbing circularity of Foucault’s theory of power is a form of theoretical overtotalization superficially more difficult to resist others because, unlike many others, it is formulated, reformulated and borrowed to use in what seems to be historically documented situations ... Foucault’s archaeologies ... make not even a nominal allowance for emergent movements, and none for revolutions, counter-hegemony, or historical blocs.⁷⁴

For Foucault, there is one thing called power although it is too mercurial, elusive and defuse to provide a totalised target to assault. Yet, For Said, even when Foucault does admit the possibility of resistance, he seems unwilling “to take seriously his own ideas about resistance to power”⁷⁵.

It is therefore the totalising aspect of Foucault’s conception of power and his “lack of interest in the forces of effective resistance”⁷⁶ which forms the basis of Said’s

⁷² Foucault, “Power and Strategies” 143.

⁷³ Foucault, “Power and Strategies” 150.

⁷⁴ Theodor W Adorno, *Negative Dialectics*, trans. E.B. Ashton (New York: Seabury Press, 1973) 17-18.

⁷⁵ Said, *The World, the Text and the Critic* 246.

⁷⁶ Said, “Foucault and the Imagination of Power” 151.

disagreement with Foucault. Another no less significant point of disagreement is the related question of individual subjectivity and agency. Foucault does not deny entirely individual agency⁷⁷; he just claims that the agent is itself constituted by power. This leads to downplaying the role of individual subjectivity and individual agency. For if everything is produced by power, the term is then cancelled all the way through rendering any talk of individual subject or agent meaningless. Said rejects these premises and asserts individual agency: “Unlike Michel Foucault to whose work I am greatly indebted, I do believe in the determining imprint of individual writers upon otherwise anonymous collective body of texts constituting a discursive formation like *Orientalism*”⁷⁸.

In view of his politics of anti-colonial resistance, the categories of individual subjectivity and agency are too crucial for Said to be dismissed or deflated, mainly because they are closely related to the resurgent humanist “move to reclaim human dignity and active historicity for the colonial and post-colonial subjects”⁷⁹, a move that is “at the heart of resistance movements”⁸⁰. After all, “history is not a homogeneous French-speaking territory, but a complex interaction between uneven economies, societies and ideologies”⁸¹, and Said is interested in foregrounding the subjectivity and agency of non-Western subjects

⁷⁷ Foucault does not advocate apathy; he was himself an activist, albeit of the pessimist sort. Yet, he remains unable to provide an adequate and convincing theoretical explanation of resistance. Consider this political ethic of permanent resistance: “The ethno-political choice we have to make everyday is to determine which is the main danger. ... My point is not that everything is bad, but that everything is dangerous. ... If everything is dangerous, then we always have something to do. So my position leads not apathy but to a hyper-pessimistic activism.” See Michel Foucault, “On the Genealogy of Ethics: An Overview of Work in Progress,” *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1986) 343.

⁷⁸ Said, *Orientalism* 23.

⁷⁹ Childs and Williams, *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory* 86.

⁸⁰ Childs and Williams, *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory* 86.

⁸¹ Said, *The World, the Text and the Critic* 222.

in relation to their own cultures and histories as well as to the West's colonial and imperial discourses.

Said does not only reject totalised, all-inclusive systems or discourses that ultimately have no space from which to mount critique and resistance, Said is also not interested in "the dominant inside/outside model of conventional politics"⁸². He postulates that subjects can resist from a position inside as well as outside the operation of power - the sense that subjects can resist from a *different* power position, for one can be outside power in the sense of being part of another form of power. This is why Said does not claim a straightforward, simplified, oppositional kind of resistance. He cautions about "hasty projections of a decolonised future in which Orientalism or imperialism will cease to influence the representation of the self or the other"⁸³.

Moreover, Said acknowledges that Otherness is a discursive construct, but his "insistence on empirical Others who are historically constituted rather than ontologically given also implies that the 'Other' is invocable if not definable"⁸⁴. This means that native subjects are constituted not exclusively by colonial discourse, but they are also constituted in relation to their native knowledge and discourse which overlap with and impinge on the operation of colonial power and knowledge.

Indeed, Bhabha's deep mistake is that he writes as though there was nothing else in the life of the colonised but the colonialist, which is what the latter would like to think. In

⁸² Young 86.

⁸³ Said, *Orientalism* 145.

⁸⁴ Said *The World, the Text and the Critic* 220.

contrast, Said does not only affirm the existence of native knowledge and discourse, but he also argues that they have their own power and integrity:

It has been the substantial achievement of all of the intellectuals, and of course of the movements they worked with, by their historical, interpretive and analytic efforts to have identified the culture of resistance as a cultural enterprise possessing a long tradition of integrity and power in its own right, one not simply grasped as a belated, reactive response to Western imperialism.⁸⁵

The Other inhabits different cultural and material locations. Though the Otherness of the Other is constituted within the parameters of colonial discourse, the Other exists within its own history and culture. To deny this fact would mean that the native subject is a colonial discursive product, one that came into being only upon its entry into the history and discourse of the West.

Although Michel Foucault nowhere denies the possibility of resistance, his models of power and knowledge attenuate his resistance claims by defining resistance as a function of power, and thus as being always in some sense complicit with it. This has serious ramifications for conceiving and mobilising resistance as an effort to introduce a new social order. His rejection of the dialectic of ideology and individual consciousness inevitably diminishes the effectual, political status of subjects-as-agents.

Homi Bhabha proffers a Foucauldian description of colonial discourse, and his strategies can still be identified as operating within systems that have already been demarcated by Foucault. However, Bhabha's resistance claims are undermined by his dispensing with political intentionality and awareness of imperialism on the part of the

⁸⁵ Said, *Culture and Imperialism* 250.

native subject. In contrast, Edward Said offers a subtler account of interactive and post-colonial experience for both coloniser and colonised. He dismisses a totalised notion of colonial discourse and power, and creates a space for anti-colonial subjectivity and agency.

4. Orientalism: A Discourse of power

Orientalism is not merely an academic discipline. In his book *Orientalism*, Edward Said describes it as a discourse of power, an ideology and a methodology.⁸⁶ For Said, Orientalism indicates both the parameters within which truth may be discovered about the geographical Orient and a trove of accumulated wisdom about the region. Yet, Said asserts that it is a better tool for telling the West about itself than for revealing truths about the East. It is also better at maintaining and rationalising the bipartition of the world and perpetuating a hierarchy of cultures than actually depicting the lives of Orientals.

Said asserts that the Orientalist method was grounded in, and is still based on, philology. Orientalism, as an ideology, is likewise grounded in the intellectual milieu that fostered this quasi-science, that of the eighteenth and nineteenth century. Hence, Orientalist ideology incorporates the imperialist ideals current in Western Europe at the time and upholds a view of the world based on the hierarchy of cultures and races. Orientalism combines this method and ideology as a discourse in which it is the authoritative interpretation of the Orient.

Said presents an image of Orientalism as an all-encompassing discourse:

[W]ithout examining Orientalism as a discourse one cannot possibly 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 Enlightenment period. Moreover, so authoritative a position did Orientalism have that I believe no one writing, thinking, or

⁸⁶ Said, *Orientalism*.

acting on the Orient could do so without taking of the limitations on thought and action imposed by Orientalism.⁸⁷

In support of this position, he asks: “How did philology, lexicography, history, biology, political and economic theory, novel-writing, and lyric poetry come to the service of Orientalism’s broadly imperialist view of the world?”⁸⁸ The answer is clear: Orientalism is powerful and its influence permeates society. As Said writes elsewhere, Orientalism must correctly be “perceived as a discourse of power”⁸⁹.

All of these seemingly disparate arts and sciences are therefore properly understood as supplementing and promoting the Orientalist discourse. This is an explosive and seemingly paranoid charge. Said’s underlying point in making such a charge is that Orientalism is more than an academic discipline and Orientalists are not only professors and students. To do this, he alters the understanding of ‘Orientalism’ from its conventional, academic usage⁹⁰ and freely includes in his grouping a very large mass of “writers, among whom are poets, novelists, philosophers, political theorists, economists, and imperial administrators”⁹¹.

Said believes that all of these diverse professionals were responsible, in their own spheres, for creating and maintaining the discourse of Orientalism. Consequently, all of them are in effect Orientalists. Readers must ask if this is a legitimate construct. Can people

⁸⁷ Said, *Orientalism* 3.

⁸⁸ Said, *Orientalism* 15.

⁸⁹ Said, *Orientalism* 17.

⁹⁰ “The Road to Morocco,” *The New York Review of Books* 26:27 8 Mar. 1979: 28-29. Said describes it as a simple act of demarcation: “a style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between ‘the Orient’ and (most of the time) ‘the Occident.’” Said, *Orientalism* 2.

⁹¹ Said, *Orientalism* 3.

with different goals, different motives, and different training be included in one group? There is the possibility that scholars and entertainers use the same words with different intents:

It might also be pointed out that in any complex society the various levels Said identifies could be at odds with each; that poet, scholar, and politician could be talking different languages or (utilizing similar words) could mean altogether different things.⁹²

Even people who seem to be talking about the same thing or developing the same beliefs could have completely different meanings on their minds. It is also understood that scholars and artists look at affairs in a different manner, using different sources for different purposes.

Another point is that lay people do not understand the terms that they use, and consequently use them apart from their 'scientific' connotation. Traditionally, and often subconsciously, people believe that scientists and scholars have different insights and have reached different levels of knowledge. Although the same words and concepts are used, it is that they mean different things. To this end, Clifford, who supports much of Said's argument, writes in his critique of *Orientalism*:

One cannot combine within the same analytic totality personal statements and discursive statements, even though they may be lexically identical. Said's experiment to show, to this reader at least, that when the analysis of authors and traditions is

⁹² Victor Brombert, "Orientalism and the Scandals of Scholarship," *Review of Orientalism, American Scholar* 1978-79: 533.

intermixed with the analysis of discursive formations the effect is a mutual weakening.⁹³

Other critics likewise question the varieties of sources which Said cites to establish his point of the pervasiveness of the discourse. They wonder if it really makes sense to juxtapose work done seriously, and often scrupulously, with the phases and fads of popular culture. By noting the particular example which Said gives of a class reunion costume, Brombert sums up the general tenor of argument:

The work of Gibb and Von Grunebaum should, one might think, be discussed in a somewhat different perspective from the exotic costume of a class reunion, peevish student comments in a course critique, film clichés of camel-driving natives or gas pump terrorists, and cartoons of hook-nosed venal leaders.⁹⁴

This and the previous quotes point out the different aspects of the criticism. Brombert refers to what is traditionally seen as a logical differentiation between popular and scholarly culture, and then again, between levels of popular culture. This criticism also clearly questions the validity of comparing works produced for entertainment and those for enlightenment.

However, all these protests and their like are exactly why Said stresses popular cultures and novels in *Orientalism*: he is trying to convince Orientalists of the relevance of their work for common culture and vice versa. He writes that “the hardest thing to get

⁹³ James Clifford, “Review of *Orientalism*,” *History and Theory* 1980: 204.

⁹⁴ Brombert 538.

most academic experts on Islam to admit is that what they say and do as scholars is set in a profoundly and in some ways an offensively political context”.⁹⁵

Whether this is sheer hyperbole or not, the point is that Said feels this is an incredibly important fact which is not truly realised. Said does not believe that culture is removed from history and academia. Furthermore, he sees a dynamic relationship between culture and politics. In Said’s theory, culture is by no means unimportant; he aims at demonstrating the importance of culture and discourse, that is, the importance of the superstructure, in effecting the material, the substructure. Culture both reflects and shapes the reality of the substructure. Therefore, forms of culture, like the arts or novels must be studied together with pure history. Said writes:

The idea of culture itself, as (Matthew) Arnold refined it, is designed to elevate practice to the level of theory, liberate ideological coercion against rebellious - at home and abroad - from the mundane and historical to the abstract and general.⁹⁶

Likewise, Foucault’s methodology, as in *Archaeology of Knowledge*, which has been adapted by Said, cuts “right across the science, non-science distinction”⁹⁷. Archaeology, as a means of understanding reality and history, must extend to literary, philosophical as well as scientific texts precisely because the sciences are thoroughly imbued with ideology. Moreover, according to Foucault, disciplines are simply a further means of extending a discourse: “Disciplines constitute a system of control in the

95 Said, *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World* xvii.

96 Said, *Culture and Imperialism* 131.

97 Sheridan 110.

production of discourse, fixing its limits through the action of an identity taking the form of a permanent reactivation of the rules”.⁹⁸

Said begins *Covering Islam*⁹⁹ by declaring that the “underlying theme” of *Orientalism* is “the affiliation of knowledge and power”.¹⁰⁰ Foucault’s analysis of this same problem carries an eerie denunciation of modern civilisation. He writes of the procedures that “constitute the individual as effect and object of power; as effect and object of knowledge”¹⁰¹. The amassment of records and data functions as power over the people contained, literally and figuratively, in the records:

This subjection is not only obtained by the instruments of violence or ideology; it can also be direct, physical, pitting force against force, bearing on material elements, and yet without involving violence, it may be calculated, organised, technically thought out; it may be subtle, make use neither of weapons nor of terror yet remain a physical order. That is to say, there may be a ‘knowledge’ of the body that is not exactly the science of its functioning, and a mastery of its forces that is more than the ability to conquer them: this knowledge and this mastery constitute what might be called the political technology of the body.¹⁰²

According to Foucault, power is not possessed but exercised; it is “exercised through and by the dominating”¹⁰³. Turner notes that because knowledge, according to Foucault, is not necessarily liberating, his argument differs “radically from a conventionally liberal

⁹⁸ Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972) 224.

⁹⁹ Said, *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World*.

¹⁰⁰ Said, *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World* ix.

¹⁰¹ Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of Prison* 192.

¹⁰² Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of Prison* 72.

¹⁰³ Sheridan, *Michel Foucault: The Will to Truth* 139.

perspective in which the evolution of knowledge out of ignorance requires a similar political evolution of freedom out of oppression”¹⁰⁴.

Since knowledge is produced and propagated within a discourse, power must be explicitly bound to discourse as well as knowledge. Said believes, clarifying Foucault’s thought, that there is no “hard-and-fast rule about the relationship between knowledge and politics”¹⁰⁵, understanding politics, as the method of obtaining and keeping power. Thus, while Foucault believes that power is bound to knowledge - and by extension to discourse, Said proffers that the relationship between knowledge and obtaining power is not hard-and-fast.

Either way, understanding the relationship between power and knowledge means understanding how power is actualised in society. Power exists as “an infinitely complex network of ‘micro-powers’, of power relations that permeate every aspect of social life”¹⁰⁶. That is, it should be discerned by understanding the “relays through which it [power] operates and the extent of its influence on the often insignificant aspects of the hierarchy and the forms of control”¹⁰⁷. With this explanation, one can visualise the flow of power through discourse. Power operates in this way, functioning like a chain in society, connecting all aspects and people, and the individual becomes both an effect of power and the element of its articulation. Power is, in this function, tantamount to the spread of discourse.

¹⁰⁴ Bryan Turner, “Accounting For the Orient,” *Islam in the Modern World*, ed. Denis MacEoin and Ahmed Al-Shahi (London: Croom Helm, 1983) 17.

¹⁰⁵ Said, *Orientalism* 15. Said argues instead that “each humanistic investigation must formulate the nature of that connection in the specific context of the study, the subject matter and its historical circumstances”.

¹⁰⁶ Sheridan, *Michel Foucault: The Will to Truth* 139.

¹⁰⁷ Foucault *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice* 213.

Discourse is so powerful that Foucault argues that “societies are maintained not by army, police, and a centralised, visible state apparatus, but precisely by those techniques of dressage, discipline, and diffuse power at work in ‘carceral’ institutions”¹⁰⁸. However, Foucault was initially tentative about this very connection. He seems to criticise his own *Archaeology of Knowledge* – as Sheridan notes: “If the operation of power is so fundamental to the production of discourse, then it was there - in a work specifically devoted to the elaboration of discursive theory - that its presence should have been most clearly apparent”¹⁰⁹. Foucault acknowledges this in an interview, noting:

I am struck by the difficulty I had formulating it [the relation of discourse to power]. When I think about it now I ask myself what I could have been thinking about in *Histoire de la Folie*, for example, or *Naissance de la Clinique*, if not power? Yet I am perfectly well aware that I practically never used the word and did not have that field of analysis at my disposal. This inability was certainly bound up with the political situation in which we found ourselves.¹¹⁰

He believes that the establishment and implementation of power is “directly correlated with the production and circulation of true discourse”¹¹¹, unquestionably a function of discourse. A society’s true discourse, be it shaped by such as religion or democratic ideals, is tantamount to the rationale for the right of the government to govern. Acceptance of discourse used to maintain power occurs by the failure to acknowledge and then resist it, and this is what permits the existing power relationships to continue. Thus the

¹⁰⁸ Sheridan 136.

¹⁰⁹ Sheridan 136. See also Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice* 213, where Foucault states : “The question of power remains a total enigma. Who exercises power? And in what sphere? We now know with reasonable certainty who exploits others ... But as for power ...”.

¹¹⁰ Sheridan, 115.

¹¹¹ Barry Smart, *Michel Foucault* (London and New York: Tavistock Publications, 1985) 78.

superstructure is maintained and the dominated do not even realise their position. Foucault says about it:

There is of course a Middle East studies establishment, a pool of interests, “old boy” or “expert” networks linking corporate business, the foundations, the oil companies, the missions, the military, the foreign service, the intelligence community together with the academic world.¹¹²

In the discourse of Orientalism, the relays of power, the network, includes all levels of power in society, inextricably linking the schools, academia, and their literature with the government. This criticism of the relationship between government and scholars is clear from the beginning of *Orientalism*, and again it follows Foucault’s thought. Foucault explains that intellectuals are “themselves agents of this system of power”¹¹³. Said sets the tone of the book by quoting from a speech Balfour made to the House of Commons defending England’s duty and interests in Egypt. The point which Said makes is described aptly by Brombert as “the deep connivance, in the Western establishment, between scholars, politicians, and colonial administrators”¹¹⁴.

Said continuously analyses the connections that exist between knowledge and power in his trilogy¹¹⁵. He goes even further than Foucault, criticising him for not extending his own ideas of the knowledge - power relationship between cultures. He writes:

To a great extent, Foucault’s flawed attitude to power derives from his insufficiently developed attention to the problem of historical change. Though he is right

¹¹² Said, *Orientalism* 302.

¹¹³ Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice* 207.

¹¹⁴ Brombert 532.

¹¹⁵ The trilogy includes Said’s works *Orientalism*, *Covering Islam*, *Culture and Imperialism*.

in believing that history cannot be studied exclusively as a series of violent discontinuities (produced by wars, revolutions, great men), he surely underestimates such motive forces in history as profit, ambition, ideas, the sheer love of power, and he does not seem interested in the fact that history is not a homogenous French speaking territory but a complex interaction between uneven economies, societies, and ideologies. Much of what he has studied in his work makes greatest sense not as an ethnocentric model of how power is exercised in modern society, but as part of a much larger picture involving, for example, the relationship between Europe and the rest of the world. He seems unaware of the extent to which the ideas of discourse and discipline are assertively European and how, along with the use of discipline to employ masses of detail (and human beings), discipline was used also to administer, study, and reconstruct - then subsequently to occupy, rule, and exploit – almost the whole of the non-European world.¹¹⁶

This is Said's thesis in brief. He has taken Foucault's basic understanding of the method and mechanics of discourse, power and knowledge, and his neglect of resistance, and extended it from intra-societal workings to inter-societal workings.

Said reflects that Western knowledge of the Orient both created power over the Orient and was the method of ruling the Orient. He writes that “[t]o say simply that Orientalism was a rationalization of colonial rule is to ignore the extent to which colonial rule was justified in advance by Orientalism, rather than after the fact”¹¹⁷. And it was explicitly the Orientalists' texts and amassing of knowledge that in effect created the reality which could be conquered: texts “purporting to contain knowledge about something actual ... can create not only knowledge but also the very reality they appear to describe”¹¹⁸.

¹¹⁶ Said, *The World, the Text and the Critic* 222.

¹¹⁷ Said, *Orientalism* 303.

¹¹⁸ Said, *Orientalism* 94.

Said asserts that as a tool of power, “Orientalism is a force”¹¹⁹. And since force necessitates that upon which it can act, Orientalism requires an Other. As Foucault writes, power “is always exerted in a particular direction, with some people on one side [coloniser] and some on the other [colonised]”¹²⁰. Power is used to both create and empower a group. The underpowered, the Others, are those upon whom power is exerted, the actors, the white man, are those the discourse empowers, the Orientalists, while the acted upon are the Orientals.

The ‘white man’ is the one positioned to understand and diagnose the problems in the East *since* the East *is* “incapable of defining itself”¹²¹. The East *is* silent, while the West speaks for it: Islam “is not an interlocutor”, and Muslims “cannot represent themselves, they must therefore be represented by others who know more about Islam than Islam knows about itself”¹²². While the Western media “cover” Islam in the sense of media coverage, they also cover it in the sense of concealing it.¹²³

¹¹⁹ Said, *Orientalism* 102

¹²⁰ Foucault, *Language Counter-Memory, Practice* 213.

¹²¹ “Arabs, Islam and the Dogma of the West,” *The New York Times Book Review* 31 Oct. 1976: 4.

¹²² “Arabs, Islam and the Dogma of the West” 4.

¹²³ Said, *The World. the Text and the Critic* 276.

5. Said on Conrad: The Other Resisting the Self

According to Said, the complex relationship between East and West combining elements of Otherness and hatred finds a voice in the literature of West. In the introduction to *Culture and Imperialism*, he writes that novels “were immensely important in the formation of imperial attitudes, references, and experiences.”¹²⁴ Said does not “mean that only the novel was important, but he considers it “*the* aesthetic object whose connection to the expanding societies of Britain and France is particularly interesting to study”¹²⁵.

The challenges of creating, and then confronting one’s Other were an integral part of the imperialist experience. Josef Conrad’s stories are replete with vivid imagery of the tensions created by imperialism, between and within societies. Conrad himself is in many ways a mirror of the dichotomies produced by these tensions, as his writing is full of exotic imagery for which Said criticises and therefore resists the Orientalists. At the same time, as an intellectual, Conrad was most aptly able to “articulate the truth of history that is lived only unconsciously by the proletariat”¹²⁶ and therefore able to tell of the horrors of imperialism which his society had not yet confronted. He was a writer who “discerned and gave novelistic life to those binary oppositions constituting the phylogenetic inheritance of the species and defining its existential condition”¹²⁷.

¹²⁴ Said, *Culture and Imperialism* xii.

¹²⁵ Said, *Culture and Imperialism* xii.

¹²⁶ Charles C Lemart and Garth Gillan, *Michel Foucault: Theory as Transgression* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982) 82.

¹²⁷ Benita Parry, *Conrad and Imperialism: Ideological Boundaries and Visionary Frontiers* (London: MacMillan Press, 1983) 3.

Conrad was thus able to give expression to the paradox of empire building at the time of “philosophical revolution”¹²⁸. Conrad’s writing depicts the faults inherent to imperialism while simultaneously depicting the East in typically imperialist, biased terms. In “Youth”¹²⁹, Conrad describes the East as “the consummate figure of the other, perfumed like a flower, silent like death, dark like a Grave ... so old, so mysterious, resplendent and sombre, living and unchanged, full of danger and promise”¹³⁰. In short, the East is described in a string of negatives, as “inscrutable, immovable, unchanging and old but without a past”¹³¹. Said explains that this contrast is due to Conrad’s participation in society’s discourse and his filiative culture.

Said stresses that Conrad “writes as a man whose *Western* view of the non-Western world *is* so ingrained as to blind him to other histories, other cultures, other aspirations. All Conrad can see is a world totally dominated by the Atlantic West, in which every opposition to the West only confirms the West’s wicked power. What Conrad cannot see is an alternative to this cruel tautology”¹³². And Said continues:

It is no paradox, therefore, that Conrad was both anti-imperialist and imperialist, progressive when it came to rendering fearlessly and pessimistically the self-confirming, self-deluding corruption of overseas domination, deeply reactionary when it came to conceding that Africa or South America could ever have had an

¹²⁸ Parry, *Conrad and Imperialism: Ideological Boundaries and Visionary Frontiers* 4.

¹²⁹ Joseph Conrad, “Youth,” *The Concord Edition of the Works of Joseph Conrad, A Narrative of Two Other Stories* (New York: Doubleday, 1903).

¹³⁰ Joseph Conrad, “Youth” 38-41.

¹³¹ Parry, *Conrad and Imperialism: Ideological Boundaries and Visionary Frontiers* 4.

¹³² Said, *Culture and Imperialism* xviii.

independent history or culture, which the imperialists violently disturbed but by which they were ultimately defeated.¹³³

Conrad's descriptions of exoticisms serve not to enlighten the reader with the objective reality of what the East is like, but to further ingrain attitudes about the East. These clichés do not convey knowledge, they are simply vehicles of bias, forever enlarging the chasm between the Western reader and the East, contributing to the Orientalist myth. Said likewise writes that "every statement made by Orientalists or White Men (who were usually interchangeable) conveyed the irreducible distance separating white from colored or Occidental from Oriental"¹³⁴. These statements perpetuated the myth of difference, maintaining the distance between cultures which, paradoxically, knowledge should eradicate. Conrad's novels often depict the tension and problems when this irreducible distance is so integral to imperialist thought.

In *Heart of Darkness*, Marlow, the teller of the tale, is a sea captain who gets a job working for a company which exports ivory from the Congo, which *is* described as "a place of darkness"¹³⁵. Marlow *is* advised that his mission is to rescue Mr. Kurtz, "a first-class agent"¹³⁶, a rising star in the company who *is* rumoured to be sick. After two months, Marlow describes the last leg of the journey, as he sees on-shore impenetrable forests and vegetation, as "travelling back to the earliest beginnings of the world"¹³⁷. He has entered

133 Said, *Culture and Imperialism* xviii.

134 Said, *Orientalism* 228.

135 Joseph Conrad, *Heart of Darkness* (New York: Norton and Company, 1988) 34.

136 Conrad, *Heart of Darkness* 22.

137 Conrad, *Heart of Darkness* 35.

the very heart of darkness, the depths of the jungle. Encased in fog, close to the outpost, screams sever the darkness, ominously suggesting attack by the natives.¹³⁸

It is commonplace in criticism of *Heart of Darkness* that Marlow's encounter with Kurtz implies an encounter with his own self. Marlow feels the effect of this confrontation as an illumination of his being. Prior to their meeting, Marlow's morality appears to be secure. Yet, when his "moral orbit"¹³⁹ is pierced by a "wandering star"¹⁴⁰, in the form of Kurtz, there are "disturbing consequences"¹⁴¹. Due to the way the White Man's self-declared differentness and superiority are destroyed in *Heart of Darkness*, Kurtz's self-destruction betrays the superficiality and fallacy of the racist basis of imperialism. Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* is thus described as "the most powerful literary indictment of imperialism"¹⁴². And Said believes that "the imperial attitude ... is beautifully captured in the complicated and rich narrative"¹⁴³ of this novella.

The paradoxes of imperialism are played out when Marlow, who represents Conrad's "wish to endorse the standard values of the Victorian elite"¹⁴⁴, encounters Kurtz, who reflects Conrad's forebodings about the effects of "scientific, political, and spiritual view of the world"¹⁴⁵. The confrontation between the two serves as a metaphor for the

¹³⁸ Said, *Culture and Imperialism* 112.

¹³⁹ Conrad, *Heart of Darkness* 34.

¹⁴⁰ Conrad, *Heart of Darkness* 34.

¹⁴¹ Conrad, *Heart of Darkness* 279.

¹⁴² Ian Watt, *Conrad in the Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979) 161.

¹⁴³ Said, *Culture and Imperialism* 22.

¹⁴⁴ Watt, *Conrad in the Nineteenth Century* 161.

¹⁴⁵ Watt, *Conrad in the Nineteenth Century* 148.

European world to look inward by examining its own Self, the part of itself usually hidden beyond a veil of darkness.

The Orientalists furthered the image of the East as different and strengthened the imperialist character of their discourse. According to Said, one of the primary reasons that imperialism differed from early conquests was the stark and “absolute demarcation”¹⁴⁶ posited in imperialist doctrine between East and West. He acknowledges that peoples have always demarcated themselves from each other. The difference in the imperialist age was that the demarcation by the West was consistently done from a position of power, and by a continued effort to study the Other while maintaining the Otherness, the distance, of the Other. This way, Said stresses what has been labelled an “obsessive motif”¹⁴⁷ in Conrad’s writings, light and dark.

In Conrad’s texts, the usages of light and dark act as the “dramatizations of the cultural differences, moral antagonisms and metaphysical antinomies apprehended by the Western imagination as structural to the colonial situation. It is a commonplace that in the Western thought the contrast between black and white has for centuries stood for the good, true, pure and beautiful as opposed to the evil, ignorant, corrupt and atrocious”¹⁴⁸. And in the era of imperialism the existing accretions of “dark and black were thickened and extended to establish an equivalence between ‘primitive’, ‘barbaric’ or ‘savage’ societies and moral perversity and a condition of aboriginal depravity”¹⁴⁹.

¹⁴⁶ Said, *Orientalism* 39.

¹⁴⁷ Parry, *Conrad and Imperialism: Ideological Boundaries and Visionary Frontiers* 5.

¹⁴⁸ Parry, *Conrad and Imperialism: Ideological Boundaries and Visionary Frontiers* 5.

¹⁴⁹ Said, *Orientalism* 39.

As can be understood from Conrad's ambivalence in his usage of the black/white imagery, Conrad both conforms to the "authorized image"¹⁵⁰ and subverts it. Just as white objects are symbolic of truth and reason and all that is good, so too are they the objects of imperialism, and therefore symbolic of imperialism. Said relates the theme of light/dark to imperialism, describing, for example, the kinship between Marlow and Kurtz as "sustained on a metaphysical level as a kinship between darkness and light"¹⁵¹. At the same time he extends the black/white imagery beyond the clichés and into the realm of metaphysical searching. He notes that Conrad wrote that when one ceases to think, "everything disappears and one is left only with the truth, which is a dark, sinister and fugitive shadow with no image"¹⁵².

It is within this depth of darkness, a person's own heart of darkness, that ceasing to differentiate intellectually any rational forms of human hope or regret, a person is indifferent to the outside. As a result, one develops one's "egoistic image"¹⁵³ in order to protect oneself from the "impinging confusions of the world. ... [Thought] is then the designation for the process whereby a human self-image is elevated into an idea of truth that inevitably seeks perpetuation"¹⁵⁴. As soon as a person begins to think, to use his intellect, he asserts his ego and becomes an objectified will

The highest form of the objectified will is the civilised man; the most typical faculty of his mind is the power of intellectual differentiation (the *principium*); and the highest

¹⁵⁰ Said, *Orientalism* 39.

¹⁵¹ Said, *Orientalism* 9.

¹⁵² Edward Said, *Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966) 147.

¹⁵³ Said, *Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography* 147.

¹⁵⁴ Said, *Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography* 138 – 139.

level of differentiation is the ability to say “*the world is my idea*”¹⁵⁵. The individual believes so strongly that he holds the truth, that he believes that he is serving the truth by imposing his ideas on others. Of course, Said resists this idea, regarding it an “obvious injustice”¹⁵⁶, since it is an enactment of an “imperialism of ideas”¹⁵⁷.

Said’s explanation of the connection between thought and truth is reconcilable with Foucault’s exploration of truth. A vision of truth evolves into the power by which a society is governed. Truth becomes discourse, blocking out, as Conrad describes it, any other truth, and “its realization becomes tantamount to militant egoism”¹⁵⁸. Once the truth of Orientalism was recognised as truth by the European community, the European community objectified its will and sought to actualise the truth it had discovered. Throughout his works, Said asserts and then confronts the idea that his understanding of the world is based upon the dichotomies which he perceives.

Said describes himself as a living symbol of the dichotomies, writing that “until fairly recently [he] led two quite separate lives, which has always made [him] acutely appreciative of Conrad’s *The Secret Sharer*”¹⁵⁹. *The Secret Sharer* is a tale by Joseph Conrad about a respectable captain on his maiden voyage with an unfamiliar ship and an unfamiliar crew. At night, alone on deck, while attempting to stow a ladder, he discovers a mysterious man (Leggatt) hanging on for his life to the bottom of the ladder.

¹⁵⁵ Said, *Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography* 139, italics added.

¹⁵⁶ Said, *Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography* 140.

¹⁵⁷ Said, *Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography* 140.

¹⁵⁸ Said, *Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography* 150.

¹⁵⁹ Said, *Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography* 141.

Leggatt tells the Captain how he had killed a crewman on his own ship during a furious storm, and had jumped ship to escape punishment. The Captain is intrigued and drawn into the story and lets Leggatt onto the ship. He remarks at first that “it was, in the night, as though [he] had been faced by [his] own reflection in the depths of a sombre and immense mirror”¹⁶⁰. Said understands this to mean that “Leggatt is a direct reflection of the narrator: he is a person in whom the young narrator can see himself, clearly and directly”¹⁶¹.

However, the Captain continues to describe the encounter: “[he] was not a bit like me, really: yet as we stood leaning over my bed-place, whispering side by side”¹⁶², and anyone entering the cabin would have had the “uncanny sight of a double captain busy talking in whispers with his other self”¹⁶³. While the Captain intuitively perceived Leggatt as his double, Leggatt is not his twin or brother, since the two look nothing alike, but an image of the Captain. Said writes that “while Leggatt is a real person, he is also an image according to which the young narrator can see himself in an extreme intellectual and moral perspective”¹⁶⁴.

The Captain shelters this man, or the image (the novella allows for the interpretation that Leggatt only exists in the Captain’s imagination) in his cabin, dressing the stranger in his own clothes, and feeding him his own food. The imagery of the fugitive, the Other as the shadow of the Captain in the dark waters evokes the darker side of the Captain’s benign

¹⁶⁰ Joseph Conrad, *The Secret Sharer* (New York: Viking Press, 1968) 12.

¹⁶¹ Said, *Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography* 128.

¹⁶² Conrad, *The Secret Sharer* 14.

¹⁶³ Conrad, *The Secret Sharer* 14.

¹⁶⁴ Said, *Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography* 127.

personality. The Captain captures the duality of Otherness and the reflexivity of confronting one's Other when he writes: "I was constantly watching myself, my secret self, as dependent on my own actions as my own personality".¹⁶⁵ Said writes, describing the encounter between the Captain and his double, "he [the Captain] too, like Conrad, feels the effects of the imposture"¹⁶⁶. Said interprets the encounter as the Captain being forced to confront his identity and acknowledge the masks he wears.

Said appreciates this novella as a "reflection of his own life"¹⁶⁷. He has recognized his own Other. He notes that he used to keep his career as a literary figure and professor separate from his background and political involvement in the Middle East. He describes a kind of "acrobatics which people who know [him] can manage, with [his] helping them along in order for his literary friends not to have to confront his other self, his secret sharer"¹⁶⁸.

Said's description of the relationship between the Self and the Other, in regard to the Orientalists, provides a form of resistance, a provocative level of insight into the East - West relationship. Said clearly feels attuned to the connotations of Conrad's imagery, both in his own life, and in the lives of nations, as he uses Conrad's conception of Self and Other to illustrate the relationship between Orientalist and Oriental. He even introduces his study of the Orientalists through the establishment of this relationship. Said begins *Orientalism* writing that the Orient is (among other things) the "West's cultural contestant, and one of

¹⁶⁵ Conrad, *The Secret Sharer* 16.

¹⁶⁶ Said, *Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography* 129.

¹⁶⁷ Said, *Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography* 147.

¹⁶⁸ Said, *Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography* 147.

its deepest and most recurring images of the Other. In addition, the Orient has helped to define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience”¹⁶⁹.

This Otherness stresses the Orient’s role in defining the Occident (this is why the Occident remains the key word in *Orientalism*). To this end, Said writes that the “dialectic of self-fortification and self-confirmation by which culture achieves its hegemony over society and the State is based on a constantly practiced differentiation of itself from what it believes to be not itself”¹⁷⁰. Yet, according to Said, the Self vs. the Other relationship entails more than a culture, or discourse of power, and therefore resistance, securing its hegemony via self created opposition to an Other. Said also writes:

In an important sense, we are dealing with the formation of cultural identities understood not as essentializations (although part of their enduring appeal is that they seem and are considered to be like essentializations) but as contrapuntal ensembles, for it is the case that no identity can ever exist by itself and without an array of opposites, negatives, oppositions: Greeks always require barbarians, and Europeans Africans, Orientals, etc.¹⁷¹

Said describes the East as a “cultural contestant”¹⁷² indicating his belief that as the West’s Other, the East challenges the West’s identity and values while enabling the West to identify and define itself by juxtaposition with the East.

The creation of the East as the West’s Other should be seen as the creation of a caricature of the East which would represent all that the West is not. The Orientalists’ stress on the importance of Islam in Muslim societies is a good example of all of these feelings.

¹⁶⁹ Said, *Orientalism* 1-2.

¹⁷⁰ Said, *The World, the Text and the Critic* 112.

¹⁷¹ Said, *Culture and Imperialism* 52.

¹⁷² Said, *Culture and Imperialism* 53.

By considering Islam as one of the most important factors in the society, the Orientalists, subconsciously juxtapose the Eastern society to their own. While Western culture is rational, enlightened, and based on secular ideals, the East is backwards and still in an age dominated by religion.

In the light of this cultural contest, Orientalists are categorised by Said as despising what they are not. That the Orientalists are contemptuous of the East is a constant theme of Said's. He refers to the "fact that many professional scholars of Islam spend their lives studying and still find it an impossible religion and culture to like, much less admire"¹⁷³. Said explains that the reason why they study something for which they have no love or true appreciation is cultural responsibility: "Scholars - more than, say, doctors - study what they like and what interests them; only an exaggerated sense of cultural duty drives a scholar to the study of what he does not think well of. Yet it is just such a sense of duty [towards the colonised] Orientalism has fostered..."¹⁷⁴.

Certainly, Orientalists should acknowledge that vestiges from more recent times, from the imperialist, racist nineteenth century still frame Orientalist thought. The image of the Other that Conrad so eerily describes in his novels still haunts Orientalist writings, and Said advises that there will be no end to the distortions that such beliefs cause until this is acknowledged. As Said acknowledged the Other in his own life, so too he seems to resist and recommend Orientalism to recognize the Other that it has created out of the Orient.

¹⁷³ Edward Said, "A Review of Orientalism" *Iranian Studies* 7 April 1979: 27.

¹⁷⁴ Said, *Orientalism* 289-290.

6. Said's Theory on Yeats's Resistance

“The language we are speaking is his before it is mine. How different are the words *home*, *Christ ale*, *master*, on his lips and on mine! I cannot speak or write these words without unrest of spirit. His language, so familiar and so foreign, will always be for me an acquired speech. I have not made or accepted its words. My voice holds them at bay. My soul frets in the shadow of his language.”¹⁷⁵

Post-colonial theory, a mode of thought which accepts European imperialism as a historical fact and attempts to address nations touched by colonial enterprises, has as yet failed to adequately consider Ireland as a post-colonial nation. Undoubtedly, Ireland *is* a post-colonial nation (where ‘post’-colonial refers to any consequence of colonial contact) with a body of literary work that may be read productively as post-colonial. In his influential essay “Yeats and Decolonization”¹⁷⁶, Edward Said speaks of the “cartographic”¹⁷⁷ impulse of the post-colonial writer “to seek out, to map, to invent, or to discover a third nature, which is not pristine and prehistorical ... but one that derives historically and abductively from the deprivations of the present”¹⁷⁸ This chapter considers Yeats as an example of a poet resisting the colonisation from within its own territory.

The premise of this now seminal study is that Yeats was a poet of decolonisation, a muse expressing the Irish experience of the dominant colonial power of Britain. Rather than reading Yeats's poetry from the conventional perspective of high European modernism, Said explains that “he appears to [him], and ... *many others in the Third World*,

¹⁷⁵ James Joyce, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (New York: Viking Press, 1964) 189.

¹⁷⁶ Said, *Culture and Imperialism*.

¹⁷⁷ Said, *Culture and Imperialism* 280.

¹⁷⁸ Said, *Culture and Imperialism* 281.

to belong naturally to the other cultural domain, his by virtue of Ireland's colonial status, which it shares with a host of non-European regions: cultural dependence and antagonism together"¹⁷⁹. Using this as his point of departure, Said enters into a line of argument which claims that Yeats was a central figure in debating and asserting an overt drive towards the construction of a national Irish identity as a vital act of decolonisation.

Furthermore, Said places Yeats within a global framework of anti-imperialism, drawing parallels between the Irish poet and Third World writers and theorists such as Fanon and Achebe. Said locates Ireland among territories like India, South America, Africa and Malaysia as a site of colonial contention. In doing so, he emphasises Ireland's role, and thus Irish literature, in colonial history as a member of the peripheral (from a Eurocentric viewpoint) Third World.

Said also wishes to present Ireland as a Third World nation, both England's poor Other and belonging to the cultural domain of the developing world in opposition to the First World of European modernism.¹⁸⁰ "Nationalism in Ireland, India, and Egypt, for example, was rooted in the long-standing struggle for native rights and independence by nationalist parties like the Sinn Fein, Congress, and Wafd. Similar processes occurred in other parts of Africa and Asia."¹⁸¹

What makes the Irish example so interesting and intricate for the post-colonial theorist is the fact that Ireland was victim, accomplice and beneficiary to British and European imperialism. The sense of hybridity in post-colonial culture, that "cultures are

¹⁷⁹ Said, *Culture and Imperialism* 266.

¹⁸⁰ Said, *Culture and Imperialism* 267.

¹⁸¹ Said, *Culture and Imperialism* 170.

never unitary in themselves, nor simply dualistic in relation of Self to Other”¹⁸², is essential to the understanding of Irish identity. Edward Said chooses W.B. Yeats as “a great modern Irish poet, deeply affiliated and interacting with his native traditions, the historical and political concepts of his times, and the complex situation of being a poet writing in English in a turbulently nationalist Ireland”¹⁸³.

In his pioneering essay “Yeats and Decolonization”, Said depicts Yeats as “a great *national* poet who during a period of anti-imperialist resistance articulates the experiences, the aspirations, and the restorative vision of a people suffering under the dominion of an offshore power”¹⁸⁴. Therefore Yeats’s restoration of the Irish past by bringing the national heroes to life is considered as a revitalising force for the nationalist struggle. Said bases his argument on the recognition of Ireland as a once colonised country. For him, Ireland, like Australia, is a white colony, and what Yeats did by reviving the suppressed culture and history of his country can be equated with Negritude or Islam, all various forms of resistance to colonialism.

Right at the beginning of “Yeats and Decolonization” Said quotes a passage from Neruda’s memoirs which shows that Yeats was a defender of the Spanish Republic against the oppressive regime of the dictator General Franco. Not having enough physical strength to make it to Madrid, Yeats had actually sent a letter of support to a Congress held there in 1937 in defence of the Republic. Thus Said adds a new perspective of looking at the Irish poet: “Just as Neruda saw no difficulty in thinking of himself as a poet who dealt with both

¹⁸²Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* 207.

¹⁸³Said, *Culture and Imperialism* 265.

¹⁸⁴ Said, *Culture and Imperialism* 265-266.

internal colonialism in Chile and with external imperialism throughout Latin America”¹⁸⁵. Said thinks of Yeats as an Irish poet with more than strictly local Irish meaning and applications. Said accepts him as a national poet representing Irish nation in its war against tyranny.

However, Said presents Yeats as a poet who was always in touch with the people of his country, a poet who by restoring the pre-colonial culture of his fellow countrymen and by depicting the unavoidable violence of the fight for national independence in his poetry, prose, and drama achieved the status of a writer of decolonisation. Moreover, Said’s Yeats was not only fighting against British colonialism in Ireland, but also against the wrongs of international colonialism and fascism. For Said, Yeats presents the Irish “culture of resistance [whose focus] was to reclaim, rename, and reinhabit the land”¹⁸⁶.

Yeats’s predicament was “sharing a language with the colonial overlord”¹⁸⁷. No wonder that Yeats instructs Irish poets to

Scorn the sort now growing

All out of shape from toe to top

Their unremembering hearts and heads

Base-born products of base beds.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁵ Said, *Culture and Imperialism* 265-266.

¹⁸⁶ Said, *Culture and Imperialism* 273.

¹⁸⁷ Said, *Culture and Imperialism* 274.

¹⁸⁸ William B. Yeats, *Collected Poems*, ed. Colin Gordon (New York: Macmillan, 1959) 146.

Based on such thoughts, Said argues that Yeats resists the British colonisation by his insistence on a “new narrative for his Irish people”¹⁸⁹ as central to the emergence of Irish nationalism, his anger at England’s plans to divide Ireland, and “the celebration and commemoration of violence”¹⁹⁰ in creating a new order. The reclaiming of Ireland, of the geographical space and the imagination of a community in his poetry, acts as resistance to colonialism.

For Said, “Leda and the Swan”¹⁹¹ represents Yeats “at his most powerful” where “he imagines and renders”¹⁹² the results of the colonial relationship between Ireland and Britain. Said suggests various meanings for the poem grounded in ambiguity. If one takes the Swan to be colonial Britain and Leda a feminised and dominated Ireland it would appear that Yeats was offering a deep and prophetic commentary on the consequences of colonialism.

According to Greek mythology, following the rape of Leda, Clytemnestra was born who would later kill Agamemnon. Yeats indicates that the birth of the new nation of Ireland after the withdrawal of England, the dropping from the “indifferent beak”¹⁹³, was destined to a chaotic and violent life. Anti-colonial nationalism, in effect based on a colonial model of state, searching for a return to a pre-colonial Ireland without acknowledging the hybridity of a new Irish culture, would inevitably lead to civil war. Unfortunately, Yeats does not offer a solution to the problems of reasserting an Irish nation after colonialism, but

¹⁸⁹ Yeats, *Collected Poems* 146.

¹⁹⁰ Yeats, *Collected Poems* 280.

¹⁹¹ Yeats, *Collected Poems*.

¹⁹² Yeats, *Collected Poems* 286.

¹⁹³ Said, *Culture and Imperialism* 276.

his commentary offers an insight into the complexities a post-colonial nation may encounter.

“Yeats and Decolonization” bears witness to the fact that post-colonial discourse has only begun to contribute to both Irish culture and an understanding of that culture. The example of Ireland should warp and twist the shape of current models of post-colonial thought. Certainly, Ireland shall add to post-colonial discourse while post-colonialism will open up new critical spaces for the study of Irish literature and culture. “Yeats and Decolonization” is significant for the dual effect it had of bringing post-colonial theory into Irish cultural criticism and for moving Ireland closer to the post-colonial arena. And this is not to forget the most positive element of Said’s essay: his placing of Yeats as an important artist within the Irish context of nationalist aspirations and decolonising enterprises.

7. Conclusion

Compared to the detailed theoretical analysis of colonial power and discourse, the conception of anti-colonial resistance has been generally underdeveloped and undertheorised. This inadequate, theoretical concern with resistance to colonialism has led to the current conception of colonial power and discourse in postcolonial theory. This argument is illustrated on the analysis of the approaches to resistance in the works of Foucault and Bhabha, who have paid the major attention to the issues of power, knowledge and colonialism. They are countered by the work of Edward Said who brings resistance to the focal point of the post- and anti-colonial discourse.

Foucault argues that resistance is neither defined by terms of its object, nor is it the result of intentionality on the part of the subject, whether this subject is collective or individual. He thinks of power as an intentional question without a subject, as if he were talking about purposefulness without purpose or action without agency. Yet, Foucault's theory of resistance remains inadequately explored. For Foucault, resistance is not integral but rather a necessary condition for the operation of power. Power itself is viewed as an undifferentiated conception: he tends to think of power from the standpoint of its actual realisation, not the opposition to it. Foucault implicitly claims that power disguises itself by producing a discourse that is only seemingly opposed to or critical of it. Such an oppositional discourse, according to Foucault, can be no more than a ruse within a more efficient reconfiguration.

Homi Bhabha's conceptions of power and resistance overlap with and inflate Foucault's. Taking Homi Bhabha's analysis on colonial discourse as a case in point, it

becomes obvious that his theoretical engagement with anti-colonial resistance stems from the particular, current conception of colonial discourse. Similarly to Foucault, Bhabha produces a totalised representation of colonial discourse. For Bhabha,

[r]esistance is not necessarily an oppositional act of political intention; nor is it the simple negation ... of another culture. ... It is the effect of an ambivalence produced within the rules of recognising dominant discourses as they articulate the signs of cultural difference and reimplicate them within the differential relations of colonial power - hierarchy, normalisation and so forth”¹⁹⁴.

Bhabha argues that colonial discourse does not discriminate between the Self and the Other, but between the Self and its copies or multiples.

Said’s conception of power and resistance is illustrated in his analyses of Conrad and Yeats, which reveal that neither of these are fully developed nor fairly theorised by Foucault and Bhabha. Conrad’s image of the Other, as it is enunciated in *Heart of Darkness* and *The Secret Sharer*, is multi-faceted. Said’s analysis of Conrad shows the importance of conceptualisation and inclusion the concept of the Other, which both Foucault and Bhabha fail to do, otherwise the theory of power and resistance is incomplete. As an Orientalist, Conrad does not see that power, embodied in his works by imperialism, has to end so that the resisting natives can lead lives free from Western dominance. His concept of the Other and its resistance is viewed from the coloniser’s perspective, yet, the acknowledgment of its existence provides vital dynamics to the discourse.

Unlike Conrad, whose works fail to grant the natives their freedom, Edward Said discusses how W. B. Yeats’s poetry can be associated with both decolonisation and

¹⁹⁴ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* 110-111.

resisting power. Said analyses how Yeats insists on creating a new narrative for his people, rejects England's plans to split Ireland, and how he emerges as a national poet representing the Irish nation in its war against tyranny. In his poetry, Yeats resists the English colonisation by describing the birth of a new Ireland, an Ireland that is ideal, crystallised and pure.

Yeats's ideas and thoughts prove that Foucault's and Bhabha's claims that change originates only from within the coloniser's systems of power, and their neglect of the intentionality of the Other (i.e. the colonised) run short of the complexity of the issue, as they view resistance in such simplified terms. Needless to say they go against the facts of history, which, particularly in that case of Ireland, reveal that change can and indeed it does come from the colonised Others, as Said aptly points out.

In connection to the conceptions of power and resistance in Foucault and Bhabha, Said's conception is more deeply theorised. Said maintains that even in the most absolute, dominating systems some areas cannot be controlled. In other words, according to Said, no matter how dominant a social system is, the very meaning of its domination involves a limitation or selection of the activities it covers. Therefore, it cannot exhaust all social experience which contains a space for alternative modes and acts that might gradually undermine the existing system.

Unlike Foucault and Bhabha who do not give much importance to individual agency, in Said's view the categories of individual subjectivity and agency are too important to be dismissed or deflated. Thus, Said regains a space for native, anti-colonial subjects; since, for Said, native subjects are constituted in close connection to their

knowledge and discourse. This provides other theoreticians with the basic principles about the dichotomy of power and knowledge that they can use to extend the existing post-colonial discourse and capture its principles and workings in a refined manner. Such balanced approach will allow overcoming any attempt to neglect the conception of resistance of the Other to the colonial power, thus giving the Other the voice it deserves.

8. Bibliography

- “Arabs, Islam and the Dogma of the West.” *The New York Times Book Review* 31 October, 1976.
- “The Road to Morocco,” *The New York Review of Books*. March.1979: 26-27.
- Adorno, Theodor W. *Negative Dialectics*. Translated by E. B. Ashton. New York: Seasbury Press, 1973.
- Bhabha, Homi, “The Other Question: Difference, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism.” *Literature, Politics and Theory*. Ed. Francis Baker. London and New York: Methuen, 1986.
- . “Remembering Fanon: Self, Psyche and the Colonial Condition.” *Black Skin White Masks*. By Franz Fanon. Translated by Charles Lam Markmann. London: Pluto Press, 1986.
- . *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Brombert, Victor. “Orientalism and the Scandals of Scholarship.” *Review of Orientalism, American Scholar*, 1978-79.
- Childs, Peter and Patrick Williams. *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory*. London: Prentice Hall/ Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1997.
- Clifford, James. “Review of Orientalism.” *History and Theory*. Sept.1980.
- Conrad, Joseph. “Youth.” *The Concord Edition of the Works of Joseph Conrad, A Narrative of Two Other Stories*. New York: Doubleday, 1903.
- . *Heart of Darkness*. New York: Norton and Company, 1988.
- . *The Secret Sharer*. New York: Viking Press, 1968.
- Dreyfus, Hubert L. and Paul Rabinow. *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1982.
- Foucault, Michel. “Power and Strategies.” *Power/knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Ed. Colin Gordon. Brighton: Harvester, 1980.
- . *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. London: Allen Lane Penguin Books, 1977.
- . *History of Sexuality*. Translated by Robert Hurley. London: Penguin Books, 1990.
- . *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*. Ed. Donald F. Bouchard. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- . *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Translated by A.M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972
- Joyce, James. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. New York: Viking Press, 1964.
- Lemart, Charles C. and Garth Gillan. *Michel Foucault: Theory as Transgression*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.
- Loomba, Anita. *Colonialism/ Postcolonialism*. London and New York: Routledge. 1998.
- Parry, Benita. “Signs of Our Time: Discussion of Homi Bhabha’s *The Location of Culture*.” *Third Text* 28-29.1994.
- . *Conrad and Imperialism: Ideological Boundaries and Visionary Frontiers*. London: MacMillan Press, 1983.
- Said, Edward W. “Foucault and the Imagination of Power.” *Foucault: A Critical Reader*. Ed. David Hoy. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1986.
- . *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1981.
- . *Culture and Imperialism* .London: Vintage, 1994.

- . *Orientalism*. London and Henley: Routledge-Kegan Paul, 1978.
- . *The World, the Text and the Critic*. London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1983.
- . "A Review of Orientalism." *Iranian Studies* 7 April. 1979.
- . *Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- Sheridan, Alan. *Michel Foucault: The Will to Truth*. London and New York: Tavistock Publications, 1980.
- Simon, Jon. *Foucault and the Political*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Smart, Barry. *Foucault, Marxism and the Critique*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.
- . *Michel Foucault*. London and New York: Tavistock Publications, 1985.
- Turner, Bryan. "Accounting for the Orient." *Islam in the Modern World*. Ed. Denis MacEoin and Ahmed Al-Shahi. London: Croom Helm, 1983.
- Wallace, Jennifer. "Exiled by Foes, Silenced by Friends: Perspective on Edward Said." *Times Higher Education Supplement*. 17 Jan. 1997.
- Watt, Ian. *Conrad in the Nineteenth Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.
- Yeats, William B. *Collected Poems*. Ed. Colin Gordon. New York: Macmillan, 1959.
- Young, Robert. *White Mythologies: Writing History and the West*. London and New York: Routledge, 1990.

9. Shrnutí

Tato práce se zabývá analýzou problematiky protikoloniálního odporu, jak jej zpracovávají Michel Foucault, Homi Bhabha a Edward Said. Konceptu protikoloniálního odporu se v porovnání s tématy koloniální moci a koloniálního diskursu dostává podstatně méně pozornosti. Tato diskrepance je jedním z důsledků současného pojetí koloniální moci a koloniálního diskursu v rámci postkoloniálních teorií. Teoretické zpracování koloniální moci a odporu proti ní v díle Edwarda Saida a Homi K. Bhabhy vychází z díla Michela Foucaulta. Foucaultova koncepce moci se s otázkou odporu vyrovnává tak, že definuje odpor jako funkci moci, čímž omezuje možnosti odporu a přesouvá odpor z dosahu kolonizovaného do rukou kolonizátora. Podobně oslabuje Bhabhovu koncepci odporu absence úvah o domorodém, protikoloniálním a politickém vědomí. Said nabízí ve svém díle podstatně diferencovanější popis koloniální zkušenosti, odmítá jednotnou koncepci koloniální moci a naopak vytváří prostor pro protikoloniální subjektivitu a konání.

Tato práce se nejprve zamýšlí nad pojetím moci a odporu v díle Michela Foucaulta a následně analyzuje, jak s ním ve svém díle pracují Edward Said a Homi Bhabha: kde se s Foucaultovým pojetím prolínají, kde se od něj liší nebo jej, v Bhabhově případě, naplňují. I když Saidův a Bhabhův přístup charakterizují odlišné cíle a rozdílné teoretické postupy, oba teoretici sdílejí rozvíjející se vztah k Foucaultovu dílu. Saidovo dílo *Orientalism* přímo vychází z Foucaultových děl *The Archeology of Knowledge* a *The Order of Things*. Bhabha následně vychází ze Saidova díla *Orientalism* postupnými teoretickými úvahami, které v mnohém vyrůstají z Foucaultovy teorie moci a vědění, diskursu a subjektivity.

Foucault a Bhabha se ve svém díle zaměřují spíše na koncept dominantní moci, než na odpor proti ní. Bhabha rozlišuje mezi koloniálním diskursem a diskursem revolučního

boje. Předmětem jeho analýzy je koloniální, spíše než protikoloniální diskurs, neboť pro jeho analýzu by bylo zapotřebí zcela odlišného způsobu tázání a teoretického postupu. Podobně jako Foucault odmítá Bhabha dialektiku My – Oni ve prospěch koncepce Jinakosti, která spočívá v odlišnostech v rámci dané skupiny. Bhabha také uceleným způsobem znázorňuje koloniální diskurs, ve kterém mají domorodci možnost odporu pouze v rámci koloniálního diskursu moci a pouze nástroji, které jim tento diskurs poskytuje.

Bhabha kritizuje rané Saidovo dílo kvůli předpokladu, že koloniální moc je zcela ve vlastnictví kolonizátora, což vylučuje možnost podílu kolonizovaných na koloniální moci. Toto je jedna z dualit, kterou Bhabha přejal z Foucaultova díla: jedinou alternativou k situaci, kdy jedna skupina má moc a druhá ne, je situace, kdy moc nenáleží ani jedné ze skupin. Podobně jako Foucault, uznává i Bhabha, že moc je vykonávána nejrůznějšími způsoby a prostřednictvím různých kanálů, ale nikdy není bezvýhradně ve vlastnictví jedné skupiny. Ke svržení koloniální moci a její autority a kontroly dochází vždy neúmyslně v důsledku rozpolcenosti a rozkolu uvnitř koloniálního diskursu samého.

Avšak tvrdit, že Foucault a Bhabha vylučují možnost odporu, by bylo přehnané. Nicméně jejich pečlivé a neúprosné analýzy procesu moci neospravedlňují nedostatek pozornosti věnované otázce odporu. Ve své kritice Said často opomíná dvojakost obsaženou ve Foucaultově díle, která spočívá v tom, že moc na sebe bere bezpočet decentralizovaných forem. Moc ve Foucaultově pojetí je velmi nestabilním jevem, který neustále uniká konceptualizaci. A i když Foucault uznává možnost odporu, ze Saidova pohledu nebere dostatečně vážně své vlastní myšlenky o odporu a moci. Ve Foucaultově díle představuje odpor, podobně jako moc a vědění, velmi komplexní koncept, který je prvkem moci samé.

Právě tento souhrnný Foucaultův pohled na moc a nedostatek zájmu o síly účinného odporu tvoří základ Saidova rozporu s Foucaultem.

Přestože Foucault zcela nevylučuje možnost odporu, jeho model moci a vědění oslabuje možnosti odporu, neboť definuje odpor jako funkci moci, která je vždy její součástí a do jisté míry ji umocňuje. Tento fakt má významný dopad na možnosti využití odporu k vytvoření nového řádu. Foucault ve své teorii neuznává individuální vědomí, což oslabuje politický statut subjektu jakožto *agens*. Said na rozdíl od Foucaulta podává ve svém díle detailní popis (post)koloniální zkušenosti, která je charakterizována vzájemnou oboustrannou interakcí mezi kolonizátorem a kolonizovaným. Said odmítá absolutní koncepci koloniální moci a diskursu a naopak otevírá prostor pro protikoloniální subjektivitu a konání.

Saidova teorii Orientalismu vyjadřuje jeho vztah k Foucaultově pojetí moci a odporu, které kritizuje pro nedostatečnou komplexitu a dále rozvíjí. Ve svém stejnojmenném díle Said popisuje diskurs moci, ideologii, ze které Orientalismus vychází a její principy. Orientalismus podle Saida není pouhou akademickou disciplínou. V jeho podání poskytuje Orientalismus postupy, které umožňují opravdové poznání Orientu, a zároveň je studnicí nasbírané moudrosti o tomto regionu. I přesto však Said tvrdí, že je Orientalismus nástrojem vhodným spíše k popisu Západu, než k odhalení pravdy o Východu.

Orientalismus poskytuje spíše ideální prostředek k udržení a zdůvodnění bipolárního rozdělení světa na Západ a Východ a k udržení hierarchie kultur, než k věrnému a přesnému popisu Orientálců. Said tvrdí, že metoda Orientalismu byla a stále je založena na filologii. Jakožto ideologie vychází Orientalismus z intelektuálního prostředí osmnáctého a

devatenáctého století, v němž tato kvazi-teorie vznikla. Proto Orientalismus staví na imperialistických ideálech typických pro Západní Evropu té doby, a je tudíž vystavěn na dobovém pohledu na svět vycházejícím z hierarchie kultur a ras, tak jak je vnímala Evropa.

Vzhledem k tomu, že vědění je produkováno a šířeno v rámci diskursu, musí být moc spjata nejen s diskursem, ale také s věděním. Said je přesvědčen, že neexistují žádná pevně daná pravidla, která by určovala vztah mezi věděním a politikou, přičemž politiku vnímá jako metodu získávání a udržování moci. A tak zatímco Foucault věří, že moc je svázána s věděním (a tedy s diskursem), Said je přesvědčen, že vztah mezi věděním a získáním moci není jednoznačně určen. V jeho pojetí funguje moc jako řetěz, který spojuje všechny aspekty společnosti a jednotlivce, ze kterých se stávají jak produkty moci, tak prostředky jejího vykonávání.

Said se ve svém díle průběžně věnuje vztahům, které podle jeho názoru mezi věděním a mocí existují. Ve svém uvažování jde dokonce ještě dále než Foucault, kterého kritizuje pro nedostatečné rozpracování jeho vlastních postojů k moci a mocenským vztahům mezi kulturami. Foucaultovy základní závěry o metodách a fungování diskursu, moci a vědění rozvíjí Said směrem od intra-společenských k inter-společenským strukturám. Navíc si Said uvědomuje, že Západní vědění o Orientu nejen zakládá moc Západu nad Orientem, ale funguje také jako metoda nadvlády nad ním. Said tvrdí, že jakožto nástroj moci je Orientalismus nesmírně účinnou silou.

Vzhledem k tomu, že síla předpokládá objekt, na který je uplatňována, předpokládá Orientalismus existenci Druhého v rámci dichotomie My-Oni. Jak píše Foucault, moc je vždy uplatňována v určitém směru, s vykonavateli moci – vládci – na straně jedné a příjemci moci – ovládanými – na straně druhé. Moci se využívá při tvorbě i při posílení

skupin. Ti, kterým se moci nedostává, Druzí, jsou ti, nad kterými je moc uplatňována; vykonatelé, běloši, jsou ti, kterým diskurs naopak moc dodává. V terminologii Orientalismu odpovídá vládnoucí skupina Orientalistům, zatímco ovládanou skupinu tvoří Orientálci. Orientalisté jsou ti, kdo mají vhled, chápou a diagnostikují problémy Východu, který není schopen určit sám sebe. Východ je němý a Západ za něj promlouvá.

Podle Saida je komplikovaný vztah mezi Východem a Západem, který v sobě zahrnuje elementy Jinakosti a nenávisti, moci a odporu, charakterizován také v literatuře Západu. Toto tvrzení je ilustrováno např. jeho analýzou W.B. Yeatse, básníka odporu, a J. Conrada, prozaika spojujícího ve svém díle imperialismus a anti-imperialistický odpor. Analýza Saidova přístupu k těmto dvěma autorům poskytuje případovou studii Saidova rozporu s Foucaultem a Bhabhou, kteří se ve svých dílech zaměřují na principy a fungování moci, aniž by věnovali dostatečnou pozornost odporu.

Imperialistická zkušenost v sobě spojuje výzvy v podobě stvoření vlastního Druhého a následné konfrontace s tímto výtvořem. Příběhy Josefa Conrada jsou plné živých obrazů tenzí vyvolaných imperialismem v rámci společností i mezi nimi. Conrad sám v mnoha případech odráží dichotomie vytvořené těmito tenzemi, které se projevují v jeho exotické obrazotvornosti, kterou Said podrobuje kritice a společně s ní také Orientalisty. I přes ukotvení v diskursu kolonizátora zachycuje Conrad velmi věrně skutečnou historii, tak jak ji zažívá pouze proletariát. Conradovi se tak daří vyjádřit paradox obsažený v tvorbě impéria v době filosofické revoluce.

Conradovo dílo zachycuje nedostatky imperialismu a zároveň popisuje Východ typicky imperialistickým způsobem a není tudíž schopen nedostatky imperialismu dále analyzovat, kritizovat a teoreticky uchopit. Said ve své kritice vysvětluje, že tento rozpor je

důsledkem přímé účasti Conrada jakožto spisovatele na společenském diskursu dominantní kultury a na jejím vnímání Východu. Conradův popis exotického Východu neslouží k poučení čtenáře o objektivní realitě Východu, ale k předání a upevnění hluboko zakořeněných představ o Východu. Cílem těchto klíšé není sdělovat vědění. Naopak, jsou to nástroje k šíření předsudků, které dále zvětšují propast mezi Západními čtenáři a Východem a rozvíjejí mýtus Orientalismu.

Podle Saida je jedním z hlavních důvodů, proč se imperialismus odlišuje od prvotního dobývání, jasné vyznačení hranice, která odděluje Západ a Východ. Said připouští, že lidé se vždy jeden od druhého snažili nějakým způsobem oddělit. Ovšem v době imperialismu je toto oddělení Východu od Západu vykonáváno výhradně z pozice moci, jejímž nástrojem je nepřetržitá snaha poznat druhou stranu, přičemž je však důsledně zachovávána její Jinakost, je zachovávána propast oddělující Druhé.

Dalším příkladem, toho, že Conrad na jedné straně podléhá imperiální ideologii a na straně druhé ji podvrací, je jeho ambivalentní postoj k dichotomii bílá – černá. Bílá, tradiční symbol pravdy, rozumu a dobra, je v Conradově pojetí přiřazena bílému imperialismu a zároveň se tedy stává i symbolem utlačovatele. I Said vztahuje problematiku dichotomie bílá-černá k imperiálnímu diskursu a popisuje vztah mezi Marlowem a Kurtzem, hlavními postavami svého románu *Srdce temnoty*, jako vztah, který je na metafyzické úrovni vztahem mezi temnotou a světlem. Zároveň se mu ale daří vymanit tuto dichotomii z oblasti obvyklých klíšé a posunout ji do oblasti metafyzického pátrání.

Saidův popis vztahu mezi Já a Druhý představuje ve vztahu k Orientalismu jistý druh odporu v podobně provokativního pohledu na vztah mezi Východem a Západem. Said zcela jednoznačně souzní s Conradovými obrazy jak ve svém vlastním životě, tak při svém

zkoumání života národů, neboť využívá Conradovo pojetí Já a Druhého při popisu vztahu mezi Orientalisty a Orientálci. Analýzu Orientalistů dokonce otevírá tím, že tento vztah vymezuje. Své dílo *Orientalism* uvádí prohlášením, že Orient je mimo jiné odpůrcem Západu a jednou z nejhluběji a nejčastěji se vyskytujících forem Druhého. Zároveň však připouští, že tento vztah Já a Druhého není určen jen vztahem mezi kulturami nebo diskursem moci (a tudíž také odporu), který zachovává hegemonii Já nad Druhým.

Tím, že Said charakterizuje Východ jako odpůrce nebo protivníka Západu, naznačuje, že Východ, jakožto Druhý vzhledem k Západu, problematizuje identitu a hodnoty Západu, čímž poskytuje Západu možnost definovat sám sebe právě v opozici k Východu. Orientalisté by rozhodně měli uznat, že i současný Orientalismus je poznamenán pozůstatky imperialistického a rasisticky zabarveného myšlení devatenáctého století. Obraz temného Druhého, který ve svém díle sugestivně vykreslil Conrad, stále pronásleduje orientalistické práce. Said upozorňuje, že tento pokřivený obraz, který takové myšlení vytváří, nebude překonán, dokud temné dědictví Orientalismu nebude pojmenováno a uznáno. Stejně jako uznává a pojmenovává své osobní Druhé, odolává Said temnému obrazu, jehož je součástí, a nutí Orientalisty, aby uznali pokřivenost Druhého, kterou vytvořili v rámci imperialistického diskursu Orientu.

Další oblastí Saidovy práce na poli Orientalismu je analýza moci a odporu prostřednictvím díla W.B. Yeatse. Said vnímá Yeatse jako básníka dekolonizace, jako múzu, která vyjadřuje irskou zkušenost s dominantní koloniální mocí uplatněnou Velkou Británií. Při studiu Yeatsova díla se Said nesoustřeďuje na Yeatse jakožto vrcholného představitele evropského modernismu, ale vnímá jej spíše jako příslušníka Druhé kulturní domény, což je dáno koloniálním statutem Irska, který tato země sdílí s mnoha

mimoevropskými zeměmi. Irsko tak v sobě spojuje kulturní antagonismus a závislost s prospěchem z kolonialismu. Na základě tohoto stanoviska staví Said Yeatse do středu diskuse o imperiální moci a ustavuje irskou národní identitu jakožto zásadní čin dekolonizace.

Said navíc umisťuje Yeatse do globálního anti-imperialistického rámce a spojuje tohoto irského básníka se spisovateli a teoretiky Třetího světa, jakými jsou např. Chinua Achebe nebo Franz Fanon. Irsko se tedy v Saidově očích stává zemí podléhající reprezentující svár imperialismu a připodobňuje je k zemím, jakými jsou Indie, Jižní Amerika, Afrika a Malajsie, čímž zdůrazňuje roli Irska a jeho literatury v imperiální historii jakožto příslušníka periferního Třetího světa. Zároveň se Said snaží poukázat na tuto příslušnost Irska ke Třetímu světu jakožto chudého Druhého Anglie, který stojí v opozici k evropskému modernismu.

W.B. Yeats je v Saidově pojetí velkým irským básníkem, který je silně spjatý s vlastními národními tradicemi, historií a politickými otázkami své doby, a který se nachází v nesmírně složité situaci básníka píšícího anglicky (tedy jazykem kolonizátora) v rozbouraném nacionalistickém Irsku. Yeatsovo dílo psané v období anti-imperialistického odporu jasně vyjadřuje zkušenost, naději a obnovující se vizi národa, který trpí pod nadvládou zámožské moci. Proto Said považuje Yeatsovo oživení irské historie a národních hrdinů za obnovující sílu národního odporu. Irsko, stejně jako Austrálie, je v jeho pojetí bílou kolonií a Yeats je díky oživení potlačené národní kultury a historie konajícím subjektem odporu proti kolonialismu, který ve svém díle odmítá jak Foucault tak Bhabha.

Said tedy Yeatse vykresluje jako básníka, který je ve stálém kontaktu s lidmi své země, jako básníka, který obnovením před-koloniální kultury a vykreslením nevyhnutelného násilí boje za národní nezávislost dosahuje svými básněmi, prózou a dramaty pozice spisovatele dekolonizace. Avšak v Saidových očích Yeats nebojuje pouze proti britské kolonizaci Irska, ale proti všem křivdám mezinárodního kolonialismu a fašismu. Yeats je pro Saida představitelem kultury odporu, jejímž cílem je znovu získat, pojmenovat a osídlit zemi, která byla zabrána a ovládnuta imperiální mocností. Znovuzískání Irska, jakožto geografické jednotky a imaginativního prostoru komunity, plní v Yeatsově poezii funkci odporu vůči kolonialismu. Yeats však ve svém díle bohužel nenabízí řešení problémů vyvstávajících z obnovené irské národnosti po kolonialismu. Přesto jeho poznámky nabízejí vhled do komplexnosti situace, v níž se post-koloniální národ může ocitnout.

Saidova analýza Yeatsova díla je důkazem toho, že post-koloniální teorie a diskurs teprve začínají obohacovat irskou kulturu a přispívat k jejímu pochopení. Příklad Irska by měl podle Saida nalomit a pozměnit současné modely post-koloniálního smýšlení. Irsko by rozhodně mohlo post-koloniální diskurs obohatit o mnoho nového, zatímco post-koloniální diskurs by mohl otevřít nový prostor pro kritické zkoumání irské literatury a kultury. Saidovo vnímání Yeatse je zásadní z hlediska efektu na zapojení post-koloniální teorie do irské kulturní kritiky a na přiblížení Irska post-koloniální sféře. Nejdůležitějším přínosem Saidovy analýzy díla a významu W. B. Yeatse je vymezení role Yeatse jako významné umělecké osobnosti v kontextu irských národních nadějí a odporu proti kolonizaci.

Ve srovnání s pojetím moci a odporu v díle Foucaulta a Bhabhy jsou Saidovy postoje založeny na teoreticky podstatně rozvinutější základě. Podle Saida existují i v

nejtvrdších absolutistických systémech dominance oblasti, které se vymykají kontrole. Jinými slovy, Said tvrdí, že bez ohledu na to, jak dominantní společenský systém je, zahrnuje rozsah jeho dominance vždy omezení. Není tedy možné, aby zabral veškerý prostor pro společenskou zkušenost, jehož součástí je i prostor pro alternativní postoje a činy, které mohou podryvat dominantní systém samotný.

Na rozdíl od Foucaulta a Bhabhy, kteří nepřikládají velký význam osobnímu, individuálnímu *agens*, vnímá Said kategorii subjektivity a individuálního konání jako klíčovou kategorii, která nemůže být v žádném případě opomenuta. Said tak vytváří ve své teorii prostor pro domorodé, proti-koloniální subjekty, které jsou konstituovány v úzkém vztahu s jejich vlastním věděním a diskursem. Said tedy nabízí dalším teoretikům základní principy dichotomie moci a vědění, které mohou využít a dále rozvinout v rámci existujícího post-koloniálního diskursu a zachytit tak jeho principy a mechanismy podstatně přesnějším způsobem. Vyrovnaný přístup k analýze imperialismu, kolonialismu a koloniálnímu odporu, který se věnuje nejen kolonizátorům, ale také kolonizovaným, umožní překonat nedostatečné teoretické zpracování odporu proti koloniální moci, čímž kolonizovaný Druhý získá svůj hlas potřebný k vyjádření sebe sama.