Enigmas of Exile

Reflections on Edward Said

The idea of ‘exile’ formed the principal narrative behind Edward Said’s life and work. In Said’s own words, his early life was a series of displacements; later in life, he came to see western culture as fundamentally a creation of exiles. But to understand the idea of exile as Said construed it, would entail a ‘contrapuntal’ reading of it. For Said, exile was a ‘permanent’ state and not as conventionally understood, a transient stage. While this contrasted ironically with his empathy for the Palestinian cause – a nation of people in exile – for Said, the exilic mind was one that refuses to habituate itself to academic pieties, to accepted readings of texts, to the satisfactions of power and to the comforts of surrender to some transcendent force.
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When Edward Said, a public intellectual and professor of literature at Columbia for over three decades, passed away in late autumn 2003, an era appeared to have come to an end. The worldwide outpouring of grief upon his death is ample testimony to the extraordinary, indeed magisterial, presence that Said came to exercise on the American intellectual scene, and the widespread approbation with which his peerless efforts to secure justice to the Palestinians were received. As anyone who has used Orientalism in the classroom can attest, some in the present generation of students still experience Said as the intellectual figure who, uniquely, introduced them to critical thinking and instilled in them a form of political awareness they hardly thought possible. Partha Chatterjee, whose own imprint on postcolonial studies and the study of history is palpable to them a form of political awareness they hardly thought possible, would have been startled to receive a hearing often denied to others of like sensibility.

Yet, for all their similarities, and their guaranteed place in certain segments of American public life, Said and Chomsky furnish vastly different conceptions of the life of the mind, the role of the public intellectual, and political and intellectual ecumenism. Easily the most commanding figure in the field of linguistics, Chomsky nonetheless wrote nothing that would have as wide an application, in disciplines across the humanities and the social sciences, as Thomas Kuhn’s notion of the ‘paradigm shift’ or, two decades later, Said’s notion of Orientalism.2 One of the most startling things about Orientalism is how widely it came to be read in fields as varied as film studies, literature, history, and anthropology, not to mention area studies – barring, of course, the professional and lay study alike of west Asia, whose exponents remained largely impervious to the withering critique Said directed principally at them. On the other hand, if Said’s worldwide reputation may reasonably be viewed as arising from a keen awareness of his political views rather than from any sustained acquaintance, even among moderately well-educated people, with his more scholarly books, then one cannot doubt that Chomsky retained a much wider outlook on world politics. Whatever the limitations of Chomsky’s world view, such as his abiding (and, some would aver, morally necessary) faith in the American people as a repository of goodness who have been simply led astray by corporate fat dogs and jingoistic politicians, or his inability to offer a systemic critique of modern knowledge systems as the bedrock of the institutionalised forms of violence so widely prevalent today, one cannot but be wholly admiring of his political and moral sensitivities which ensured that no form of injustice was outside the ambit of his concern.

Said, by contrast, leaves behind a different impression. He commented ceaselessly on Israel’s atrocities and rightfully condemned Arafat’s authoritarianism; and he was visibly angered by the wars waged upon Iraq in 1991 and 2003. Said had only undisguised scorn for the ‘leaders’ of the Arab world. Yet, as far as his overtly political writings are in question, most of the rest of the world seemed to matter relatively little. Said was inclined to view Israel’s policies towards Palestinians as genocidal, and one would think that this would have brought him to a broader engagement with the genocidal violence of the 20th century. Yet, from the dozen interviews that Said gave in the second half of the 1990s, no one would have known that 8,00,000 people were brutally dispatched to their graves over a short period of three months of 1994 in Rwanda.3 Why should it matter? Should we have expected Said to comment on everything, and would it not be reasonable to infer that someone with his broad humanistic outlook, political commitments, and moral sympathies would have felt the injustices wherever they might have been taking place? It matters because, in an ironic and even disturbing reversal, the suffering of
the Palestinians became for Said the paradigmatic case of oppression in our times just as the Holocaust became for the Jewish people (and the state of Israel) the paradigmatic case of ‘exterminationist’ violence in the 20th century.

However hazardous this suggestion, is it all that much of a stretch to think that Said’s obsession with the oppression unleashed upon Palestinians, and his visceral contempt for Zionism, at least partly blinded him to other forms of injustice? Said, by his own admission, came to politics comparatively late in his life and the turbulence of the 1960s left no impact on his life. When he did turn to politics, he did so with the proverbial zeal of the convert – and with the convert’s extraordinary partiality for the chosen cause. Said became convinced, and said so often, that Arabs and Muslims were the only cultural or ethnic group against whom vile and racist nonsense could be uttered with nearly utter impunity in the west. “There’s an ugly phenomenon in this country”, he told an interviewer in 1987, and it “is this: The last permissible racism here – and by permissible, I mean it’s okay publicly in the media and elsewhere – is to be racist against Arabs.” Five years later, complaining about representations of Muslims as ‘depraved’, Said reaffirmed that such commentaries “could not be written about any other ethnic cultural group in the world today”. Considering that only this year the Harvard political scientist Samuel Huntington has published, to wide recognition, a large book whose central theme is that the growing Hispanic population is calculated to degrade the Anglo foundations of American democracy and thus suck the life blood of this country, one can only conclude that Said was unaware, which seems altogether improbable, of the contempt with which Hispanics and blacks are still viewed by large segments of white Americans, or that he was, without much justification, inclined to view the racism directed at Arabs and Muslims as sui generis.

The aforementioned collection of interviews furnishes other instances where Said’s vision became peculiarly partial: to take one example, where for the rest of the world Martin Luther King, Jr is chiefly and justly remembered as one of the chief architects of the civil rights movement, the pre-eminent prophetic voice of an aggrieved black America, King appears in Said’s text twice only as an unequivocal supporter of Zionism. As far as I am aware, most of King’s biographers have nothing to say on the subject. Doubtless, King had public differences with Stokey Carmichael and such members of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) whose critique of Zionist imperialism verged, in King’s view, on anti-Semitism. “You cannot substitute one tyranny for another,” he explained, “and for the black man to be struggling for justice and then turn around and be anti-Semitic is not only a very irrational course but it is a very immoral course, and wherever we have seen anti-Semitism we have condemned it with all our might.” But, supposing that King were a virulent Zionist, should not Said have asked himself how King, whose adherence to the principle that freedom is indivisible seems unquestionable, came to embrace this anomalous position? And is King’s Zionism all that we need to know of him?

Nevertheless, in thinking of Said that cliched expression, ‘larger than life’, readily comes to mind. The photograph that appeared of him on the front page of the New York Times in March 2001, hurling a stone from the Lebanese border at Israeli soldiers – so said the caption, quite incorrectly – is indelibly etched in the minds of his admirers and detractors alike. Many a stone had been hurled at Said, but no one had previously seen an eminent public intellectual throw a stone. Said was, evidently, a man of immense passion, not to mention erudition and cultivation. He read widely, and his love of literature, music, and art permeates his voluminous writings. When someone such as Christopher Hitchens, who is accustomed to thinking of himself as an unusually daring, perspicacious, and enlightened Marxist, admits to feeling humbled in the presence of Said, one can be certain that Said justly came to be viewed as a man of immense erudition. He had little patience for those who shouted themselves hoarse over ‘dead white men’, but his love of the classics never prevented him from engaging in close and critical readings of texts. How else, as Said would have said, could one read them? At the same time, Said eagerly embraced what he deemed to be progressive, innovative, and politically enabling interpretations of texts or intellectual traditions, as his enthusiastic advocacy of the ‘Subaltern School’ of Indian history demonstrates. He made a genuine effort to acquire versatility in at least the ‘high’ end of various cultural and literary traditions, and did so without ever conveying the appearance of being a consumer. The publication of Orientalism in 1978 gave him a readership that extended beyond the circle of literary scholars and other humanists; his writings on Islam and Palestine made him well known outside the academy; and his ruminations on music earned him still new audiences. He wrote for the Nation for many years; contributed frequently to the London Review of Books, and became a columnist for al-Ahram Weekly in the last decade of his life.

Course of Defiance

Had Said achieved only this, he would have been exceptional; but, remarkably, his accomplishments grew as he struggled with an illness that eventually claimed him at 67. Diagnosed with leukaemia during the Persian Gulf War of 1991, and warned by his physician to curtail his intellectual activities, Said scarcely slowed down. Quite to the contrary, he appeared to be set on a course of defiance. He wrote, lectured, and travelled at a frenetic pace, and periodically had himself admitted to a hospital for recovery and treatment. One suspects that, by plunging himself into his passions, Said prolonged his life by several years. In the last years of his life, Said entered into an unusual musical partnership with the famous Jewish pianist and life conductor of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, Daniel Barenboim. The West-Eastern Divan Orchestra stood forth as a striking testimony of the collaboration possible between an Israeli and a Palestinian, though one wonders what Said would have made of the bubbly enthusiasm with which all such enterprises are received by some people as expressions of ‘the essential goodness of the human spirit’, the quest for ‘universalism’, the supposed ability of art to transcend the political divide, and so on. Even in his illness, and amidst the large range of activities into which he had thrown himself, Said also managed to retain the sartorial elegance for which he became equally famous among friends. Interestingly, the growing interest in the cultural and political history of material objects, no commentator has sought to inquire into the relationship between Said’s tastes in music and literature and his dress sense. If one considers, by way of comparison, the life of Gandhi, it is abundantly clear that his endeavour to simplify his life, and his gradual transformation from a man in coat-tails and top hat to the “half-naked fakir” of Churchill’s infamous expression, is inextricably tied...
to his advocacy of ‘ahimsa’ (non-violence) and ‘aparigraha’ (non-possession). Despite the catholicity of his intellectual interests, it is striking that Said never had any time for lowbrow literature, mass culture, popular music, or even those social and political movements which did not have in them the sense of the epic that one associates with the Palestinian struggle in an ancient land or with the resistance, in war-torn Iraq, of a people battered in the last few decades by the naked aggression of the US.16

Whether one is speaking of Said’s politics, his aesthetic sensibilities, his capacity for public engagements, or his steadfast and principled critique of identity politics, it is unequivocally clear that Said was seldom tentative in his outlook or in the expression of his views. At one time, he worked closely alongside Arafat; but when they drifted apart, Said not only never looked back but was unerringly harsh in his denunciation of Arafat’s shortsightedness, authoritarian tendencies and hunger for power. But is there a major political figure anywhere that one would not be inclined to indict? Or consider these other examples. In a long interview in the early 1990s, he described as “utter nonsense”, and as a species of “sentimentalism”, discussions and evocations of “universal values”.17 He thought the notion that the media had encouraged the intifada to be “total nonsense”, and used precisely the same expression to characterise the view, attributed to the likes of William Bennett and Dinesh D’Souza, that western culture can be hermetically sealed from all other cultures.18 In his defence, it can be averred that Said had generally good reasons, and particularly in the spoken and more informal medium of the interview, to take the positions that he did. The idea of ‘universal values’ doesn’t have much analytical purchase, and one can usefully inquire into the alleged universalism of ‘universal values’. As Said noted on another occasion, he could not speak in “favour of an abstract universalism, because it’s usually the universalism of whoever happens to be most powerful”.19 Might Said’s unease with ‘universal values’ have stemmed, in part, from his transparent reluctance to engage with the language of transcendence, or with his fear that, considering the prerogative that religion claims over ‘universal values’, he would have had to enter into a dialogue for which he had absolutely no inclination? Still, in view of his advocacy of in-betweenness and delight in liminality, and his conviction that, so to speak, the problem of modern culture is the conflict “between the unhoused and housed”,20 Said’s unwavering firmness of opinion is at least a trifle surprising.

II

Thoughts on ‘Exile’

The ‘unhoused’ and the ‘housed’: In that opposition is writ large the tale of the principal narratives that have informed the life and work of Said. The largest collection of his essays appeared under the title ‘Reflections on Exile’,21 and it can be argued that the entire tapestry of Said’s writings is woven around multiple ideas of exile. The Marxist critic, Aijaz Ahmad, alleged that post-colonial intellectuals such as Said, quite oblivious of their own positions of immense privilege, had fetishised the intellectual in exile.22 Ahmad viewed post-colonial theory as the hardi- work of scholars who conveniently over- looked considerations of class and even made themselves out to be ‘refugee’ int erlectuals. But Ahmad is scarcely the first critic to have pounced upon the fact that exile is a knotty subject. The poet Ovid, banished from Rome by Augustus in 8AD, famously declared, “Exilium mors est” (‘Exile is death’). Most likely any urbanite removed to a garrison town, rendered utterly bereft of the company of poets, aesthetes, and women, would have felt the same. Victor Hugo, by contrast, found exile rejuvenating. In 15 years of exile on the island of Guernsey, Hugo penned some of his most famous works. He may well have said, ‘exilium vita est’. So what is the space of exile occupied by Said? Did he have the comfort of embracing either position openly, or did he live somewhere in the space between banishment and belonging? What forms of banishment were akin to belonging, and what forms of belonging could Said only pity? Said had a rather nomadic upbringing, one of many reasons why throughout his life he refused to be satisfied by any simple and nurturing conception of ‘home’. He has often related how his life was a series of displacements and he felt himself to belong, if at all he belonged, between cultures. Though Said was born in Jerusalem in 1935, his parents shuttled between Egypt and Palestine. His childhood sum- mers were spent in Lebanon. In the pre- dominantly Muslim Levant, where the Christians largely belonged to the Greek Orthodox Church, Said’s father – who had acquired American citizenship – was a Baptist. Asked to say something on his memoir, Out of Place, Said described the title as meaning “not being able to go back. It’s really a strong feeling I have. I would describe my life as a series of departures and returns. But the departure is always anxious. The return always uncertain. Precarious.”23 One can speculate that Said must have found it apposite, alarmingly apposite, that his family home in Jerusalem had been taken over by a fundamentalist Christian organisation based in South Africa.24 Not only did Said view Israel as an apartheid state, but he understood that fundamentalists gravitate towards each other just as rogues find rogues. Why should Christian fundamentalists not have found Israel hospitable, if not to their ambitions, at least to their idioms of totalitarianism? The house of humanism, Said saw for himself, had been built over by religious fundamentalists. Yet, however much Said might have wanted to reclaim the house where he had been born, he remained uncertain about wanting to be “completely at home”. “I suppose it’s sour grapes”, Said told an interlocutor in 1996, “that I now think it’s maybe not worth the effort to find out” what it means to be at home.25

Said saw modern western culture as fundamentally a creation of exiles. One might be tempted to think that the experience of his own people, whom he described as largely “dispersed exiles”, led Said to this conclusion. The ironies, Said would have been the first to recognise, were compounded in that the Palestinians had been rendered into exiles by another people of exile. Israel’s “War of Indepen- dence”, Said has reminded us, “was a catastrophe for Palestinians: two-thirds were driven out of their homes and country, many were killed, all their property was seized, and to all intents and purposes they ceased to exist as a people”.26 Pit exiles against exiles, and out comes a nation state. And nation states, as we know, are notoriously protective of boundaries, incorrigibly hostile to the nomadic modes of life. However much this may be the modern condition, and notwithstanding the fond- ness of a literary scholar for irony, Said had much more in mind in thinking of the inextricably exilic foundations of moder- nity. “In the United States,” Said wrote in his 1984 essay, ‘Reflections on Exile’, “academic, intellectual and aesthetic thought is what it is today because of refugees from fascism, communism, and
other regimes given to the oppression and expulsion of dissidents”. 27 Nearly all the figures that Said held in esteem – CLR James and Joseph Conrad, Erich Auerbach and Theodor Adorno, Mahmoud Darwish and Faiz Ahmad Faiz – were émigrés and intellectual refugees, as were those, such as TS Eliot, with whose aesthetic and political views Said was in acute disagreement but whose centrality to the culture of the modern west was beyond question.

Throughout his life, Said retained a prolific interest in intellectuals and writers who had trafficked across borders, cutting across territorial and cultural boundaries. He was greatly moved by the idea of the noble life of the labouring intellectual in exile – an exile in which the labour was rendered more difficult, more poignant, marked by the “sense of dissonance engendered by estrangement, distance, dispersion, years of lostness and disorientation”, and thus requiring “an almost excessive deliberation, effort, expenditure of intellectual energy at restoration, reitera- tion, and affirmation that are undercut by doubt and irony.” 28 If Auerbach and Adorno remained for Said towering examples of the discerning intellect, 29 one has to ask how far Said thought that their experience of exile had furnished them with insights not ordinarily available to others. Joseph Conrad, a Polish émigré to Britain who scarcely knew a word of English before he was 20 and went on to become one of the greatest novelists in the English language, was the subject of Said’s doctoral dissertation, and he appears frequently in Said’s writings as the supreme example of the exilic consciousness. 30 Though Said remained unceasingly critical of Conrad’s inability to see the non-west except through western eyes, and scathingly characterised him as possessed of “gringo eyes” that would not allow him to fathom “other histories, other aspirations”, 31 he never begrudged Conrad his literary genius, and, much more to the point for us, was quite certain that Conrad’s writings bore the mark of the “sensitive émigré’s obsession with his own fate” and his ceaseless struggles to be securely moored in his new surroundings. 32 The exile not only sees himself as terrorised into action, is in truth the one who does not give up. Furthermore, thinking is not the spiritual reproduction of that which exists. As long as thinking is not interrupted, it has a firm grasp upon possibility. Its insatiable quality, the resistance against petty satiety, rejects the foolish wisdom of resignation. 35 The exilic mind, Said is here arguing, refuses to habituate itself to academic pieties, to accepted readings of texts, to the satisfactions of power, and to the comforts of surrender to some transcendental force. Elsewhere calling to mind Adorno’s Minima Moralia (Reflections from a Mutilated Life), Said says that “language is jargon, objects are for sale. To refuse this stage of affairs is the exile’s intellectual mission”. 36 To be alert, vigilant, critical, contrarian – to be all this is to be always in exile. Only the exile has that awareness which comes with contrapuntal understanding. One might add parenthetically that if the intellectual engaged in criticism is always in exile, one can also understand why Said had little sympathy for those who, abjuring the more difficult and enduring task of subjecting the classics to sustained inquiry and oppositional readings, launched into the ‘canon wars’ and found their salvation in ‘identity politics’, the recovery of lost histories, and other puerile exercises. 37

‘Late Style’

I have remarked that Said remained, to the end of his life, a staunch secularist. Late in his life, as he grappled more intensely with his illness, Said became interested in what he has called ‘late style’. Many people in his position would have turned to the comforts of religion. Somewhere the late and irascible Nirad Chaudhuri, who lived to a ripe 101 years, doubtless drawing much sustenance from his chosen vocation as gaddly, has remarked that scratch the skin of an atheist in India and he turns out to be a believer. The Indian Marxist, on his deathbed, invariably reveals himself a Hindu. (Being a Bengali, Chaudhuri was in the know.) Said denied himself this outcome: if men and women make their own history, he was not about to call upon his Maker. Said’s integrity, intellectual liveliness, and passion drove him, at this juncture, to a fuller exploration of some of the ideas which had crossed his mind over the years and were now fertilising into a new set of reflections on music, the subject of exile, and the relationship of style and exile to death. The arguments of his posthumously published essay, ‘Thoughts on Late Style’, are too complex to be taken up here in full, but...
even in passing form a fitting conclusion to this essay as they do to Said’s own life. It is Adorno, once again, who had suggested, apropos the works – the last five piano sonatas, the Ninth Symphony, the last six string quartets, among others – belonging to Beethoven’s third and last period, that ‘late style’ might constitute a form of multiple estrangement. Beethoven abandoned all interest in ensuring some commensurability between his music and the social order; indeed, Adorno has argued, he displayed indifference to the question of continuities in his own work. It is characteristic of ‘late style’ that the artist, in Said’s language, “achieves a contradictory, alienated relationship” with the social ethos of the time. The “late works” of the artist “are a form of exile from his milieu.” Said departed this life “on the last day, stating that Said had flung the stone at an Israeli guardhouse, which was in any case half a mile away.”

Notes

1 “Orientalism was a book”, wrote Chatterjee many years after its publication, “which talked of things I felt I had known all along but had never found the language to formulate with clarity. Like many great books, it seemed to say for the first time what one had always wanted to say.” See Partha Chatterjee, “Own Words”, in Edward Said: A Critical Reader, ed. Michael Sprinker (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), p 194.


5 Ibid, p 320.

6 Ibid, p 388.


8 In an interview given in 1993, Said revealed that he had been “turned off by Martin Luther King, who revealed himself to be a tremendous Zionist...” In a previous interview given to the well known journal Social Text in 1988, King is mentioned alongside Reinhold Niebuhr and Roger Baldwin as a “powerful advocate of the Jewish state”. See Said, Power, Politics and Culture, pp 209, 327.

9 There is no mention of King’s alleged Zionism in any of these well known biographies: Stephen Oates, Let the Trumpet Sound: The Life of Martin Luther King, Jr (New York: Mentor Books, 1982); King: A Critical Biography (New York: Praeger, 1970); and Taylor Branch, Parting the Waters: America in the King Years 1954-63 (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1988).

10 Cited by Oates, Let the Trumpet Sound, p 456.

11 The New York Times ran a correction the following day, stating that Said had flung the stone at an Israeli guardhouse, which was in any case half a mile away.


14 For one moving and nuanced account of Said’s warm admiration for Barenboim, see Tania Tamari Nasir, ‘No ordinary concert’, Al-Ahram Weekly Online (September 4-10, 2003), online at http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2003/654/feature.htm.
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16 On the subject of ‘popular music’, Said remarked, in an interview published in 1992, that he did not “obviously” accept “all the hideously limited and silly remarks made about it by Adorno,” while conceding that it did not speak to him in the same way as it did to his interviewer or to his children. “I’m very conservative that way”, Said admitted. Said’s response to the arresting suggestion that the tradition of western classical music was an “unproblematic refuge of greatness” for him is an uncharacteristic silence, followed by an assertion about the “persistence” of the western classical tradition. See Power, Politics, and Culture, p 145. I know of only one essay, and a relatively uninteresting one at that, by Said on lowbrow culture – in this case, on the Tarzan movies of Johnny Weissmuller. See “Jungle Calling”, in Edward W Said, Reflections on Exile and Other Essays (Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 2000), pp 327-36.


19 Ibid, p 390.