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Edward Said was the quintessential intellectual of the last quarter of the twentieth century. Commonly celebrated as the founding figure of postcolonialism, his critical oeuvre spans varied terrain. The very strength of his critique lies in these diverse tributaries of thought. Crossing borders and boundaries incessantly, Said’s intellectual project celebrates the culture of resistance while opposing doctrinaire rhetoric. The paper tries to journey along the multifarious “margins” of discourses that crop up in Said. “In-between” spaces have to be investigated for their radical potential, while daring to “transgress” has its own dangers. Said unmasks the unholy nexus between knowledge and power in the mapping of the “Orient” that abetted the colonial enterprise. His contrapuntal readings of literary texts reveal the ubiquitous presence of imperial empire. Consequently, voices from the margins spur counter narratives and “writing back” in the postcolonial condition. Intellectuals in exile tend to be “marginal” and this location helps in looking at the two or even three sides of an issue. Questions of identity, selfhood, nationality, politics, memory, history, representation, geography, homeland, anxieties of influence are dealt with in the paper. The intertwining of the personal and the political occurs in Said. “Memory” is the only hope for resuscitating a “lost world” and battling the accompanying sense of “loss” and “despair” infused in both individuals and communities alike. The paper tries to address how “border crossing” and the “coalescing of margins” create an interdisciplinary breadth in Said, which resist categorization. The “centre/margin” binary is problematized by acknowledging the presence of “many voices,” “polyphony” being a favourite concept of Said. Music gave to him metaphors for human emancipation, while “transgression” was vital. His acknowledgement and assimilation of fellow critics is also mentioned. Beyond enunciating insider-outsider distinctions, Said tried to cultivate knowledge as a bridge between different interests and locations.
The feeling of being on the edge of something could be the signature of the complicated times we inhabit. Fringes of experiences, speculations, memories and histories—call it by any other name; limits, edges, borders, frontiers or margins of all kinds—are thresholds waiting to be crossed, spaces rife with the seductive aura of transgression. As the twilight which invades both night and day, margins infiltrate the centre and the core expands to the periphery. Fred Dallmayr points out that “margins of political discourse . . . designate those border-zones or crossroads where attentiveness and creative initiative intersect and where the stakes of meaning and non-meaning, order and disorder have to be continually renegotiated” (ix). Jacques Derrida in The Truth in Painting illuminates that, when we look at a painting we take the frame to be part of the wall, yet when we look at the wall the frame is taken to be part of the painting, the parergon is neither work (ergon) nor outside the work (hors d’oeuvre), neither inside or outside, neither above nor below, it disconcerts any opposition but does not remain indeterminate and it gives rise to the work (61). Voices from the margins will demand to be heard and will demand that the nuances they offer be taken into account. Spaces on margins have to be occupied to reclaim lived spaces as localization of radical openness and possibility. Margins are “both sites of resistance and sites of repression” (hooks 151) and are seen as “an intervention.”

A message from that space in the margin that is a site of creativity and power, that inclusive space where we recover ourselves, where we move in solidarity to erase the category colonizer/colonized. Marginality as site of resistance. Enter that space. Let us meet there. Enter that space. We greet you as liberators. (hooks 152)

This paper attempts to explore how Edward Said negotiated with “margins” of varied forms in his critical output. It looks into the “art/act of crossing” borders along textual, political and cultural margins.

Edward Said was a “border intellectual” par excellence. The broadness of Said’s approach to literature and his other great love, classical music, eludes easy categorization. Said’s influence, however, was far from being confined to the worlds of academic and scholarly discourse. He distinguished himself as an opera critic, pianist, television celebrity, politician, media expert, popular essayist and public lecturer. His interests ranged from intellectual history to current affairs, from philosophical to journalistic discourse. Said thrived on creative, often strategically, selective eclecticism. Abdirahman Hussein notes that
Said often conjoints in the same sentence or paragraph . . . epistemological with ethical concerns, materialist constructions with speculative leaps, or existentialist self-definitions with broad socio-political matters, given this lack of respect for traditional boundaries between genres, modes of enquiry, and areas of intellectual combat, what grid or criterion does one use and to what specific interpretive end? (Edward Said 2)

The “in-between zone” was vital to Said not only in its geographical and political designations but also in its subtler cultural, historical, epistemological and ontological connotations. It is not an indication of ambiguity, neutrality or passivity but an active field of engagement deployed as an instrument of ideology critique. His multi-vectored methodology is thus an empowering one. Said’s life was one always “between worlds,” criss-crossing boundaries, constantly incurring the risk of falling off one side or the other side of the limit while undoing, redoing, modifying this limit. His “voyage in” invited danger and reputation as “professor of terror”!

Said was a “cultural amphibian,” who exulted in the role of the “humanist gadfly,” challenging experts in their carefully guarded territories (Marrouchi, Edward Said 24). He reiterated the Adornian stance that “for a man who no longer has a homeland, writing becomes a place to live” (Reflections 568). In the final paragraph of Culture and Imperialism, Said remarks, “No one today is purely one thing” (407), and for him, concepts of unitary, essentialized or monolithic identities, not least in the form of racist or xenophobic nationalisms, were the root cause of much suffering and oppression. Coalescing of margins and interpenetration of discourses was vital to Said. Patrick Williams points out that

For him—rather than the ideological constructs offered by discourses or institutions like Orientalism emphasizing cultural difference and hierarchy, or the reactive and reductive politics of identity which results in embattled, often bitter, separatism—humanity is formed in and by the complexities of “Overlapping Territories, Intertwined Histories,” as one of the section titles of Culture and Imperialism has it. Again, the purpose is not to indulge an easy celebration of hybridity or syncretism (precisely the kind of contemporary theorizing Said was most uncomfortable with), but to point to the necessary and difficult task of both accounting for and analyzing the forms of such overlapping and intertwining, as well as assessing their impact. This process, both historically informed and contemporarily relevant, embodies the best of Said. (170)

Identity and its constructedness was a continuous concern of Said. His own life exemplified that identities are fractured, multiple and paradoxical. Said called himself “a Palestinian going to school in Egypt, with
an English first name, an American passport, and no certain identity at all” (Reflections 557). His professional career found him in an unenviable position of speaking for two diametrically opposed constituencies, one Western, the other Arab. Golda Meir’s scathing denial, “there are no Palestinians,” in 1969, propelled him to articulate the Palestinian history of loss and dispossession (Reflections 563). Said explains that his identity was that of a “minority within minority.” His parents were Protestants in Palestine. Most of the Christians in the Middle East, who were a minority within an essentially Muslim society, were Greek Orthodox. Missionaries who came to Palestine, Lebanon, Jordan and Syria in 1850’s, failed to convert the Muslims or Jews and ended up converting other Christians. His father’s family had thus turned Anglican and mother’s Baptist (Viswanathan 234). Being an Arab Christian had its own toll; while singing hymns like “Onward Christian Soldiers” he found himself at once both aggressor and aggressed against (Reflections 558). Strangely, despite his extremely anti-religious politics, he was glorified and branded as the defender of Islam. Furthering the crisis of identity was the condition of exile. Said comments:

In a secular and contingent world, homes are always provisional. Borders and barriers which enclose us within the safety of familiar territory, can also become prisons, and are often defended beyond reason or necessity. Exiles cross borders, break barriers of thought and experience. (Said, Reflections 185)

He found parallels between his life and that of Joseph Conrad, sharing the fate of the wanderer with the loss of home and language. The exilic loss of Palestine was a cruel punishment. The tantalizing hope of return sometimes makes life more miserable, as life cannot be started afresh leaving behind severed ties. An intellectual in exile would be characterized by restlessness and movement, being constantly unsettled (Said, Representations 39). Seismic shocks to jolt people out of their complacency have to be sent. The intellectual in exile should be a consciousness that cannot be regimented in a totally administered society (Representations 41). Exile would thus mean being “marginal,” unable to follow prescribed paths. It is the world “responsive to the traveler rather than to the potentate, to the provisional and risky rather than to the habitual, to innovation and experiment rather than the authoritatively given status quo” (Representations 47).

This positioning helped Said to show not only the obligatory two sides to every question but also the often overlooked third dimension as well (Marrouchi, Edward Said 2). He took the quest of “writing back” forward beyond nationalism and postcolonial statehood, crossing bounda-
ries to interpret the world and text based on “counterpoint,” where “many voices” were “producing history.” The struggle for Palestine, to Said, was not to create a nation which would give another airline to the world, but to transform Palestinians into a people who fight for justice. He could thus turn against Arafat and his retinue who opted for easy and unjust settlement in the Oslo agreement (Marrouchi, Edward Said 10). Refusing to don the cloak of neutrality, Said has shown how theory can be effective in countering explosive struggles of cultural hegemony.

Said’s project on the “Orient” gave voice to “margins” in diverse ways. While unmasking the unholy nexus between power and knowledge, he illustrated how “margins” are created and controlled by imperial “centres.”

The second part of Chapter One of Orientalism is entitled: “Imaginative Geography and its Representations: Orientalizing the Oriental.” Said argues that Orientalism relies heavily on the production of geographical knowledge in the imperial centre. Any representation of the “Orient” is necessarily spatial. Beyond the techniques of mapping that underplayed the imperial project, it is the cultural politics of space and place that he is primarily concerned with uncovering. Said points out that the upsurge in Orientalist study coincided with the period of unparalleled European expansion: from 1815 to 1914. Central to the emergence of the discourse is the imaginative existence of something called “the orient,” which comes into being within what Said describes as an “imaginative geography.” Derek Gregory points that “in Orientalism Said treats these imaginative geographies as so many triangulations of power, knowledge and geography, and the conceptual architecture of his account is derived from the spatial analytics of Michel Foucault” (311–12). One can find the resonances of Foucauldian ideas on discourse, discursive formations, power/knowledge and representation in Said. Drawing on the discontinuous, genealogical historiography of Michel Foucault, Said views the entire corpus of writing on the “Orient” as a “discourse.” Furthermore, he appropriates Foucauldian notions, of power and knowledge, and disciplining for analyzing the discourse of Orientalism. Foucault conceives discipline as a mode of modern punitive power, which establishes its control over the body and makes it docile and useful. And no power relation is possible without the corresponding fields of knowledge, according to him. Said probably takes this as a signal point and demonstrates how Oriental subjects are constituted by power/knowledge relations. For Said (as well as Foucault), discourse was the means through which power constructed and objectified the human subject of knowledge. This Foucauldian idea of “knowledge as power” can be found throughout Said’s critique of Orientalism. It was Foucault who offered Said a means of describing the relationship between knowledge and power over the “Orient.”
In *Culture and Imperialism* he repeatedly points towards the struggle over geography, over territory, over space, and over place, amply evident in the Palestinian struggle. Edward Said refashioned spatial sensibilities not only in “geographic” terms but in a broader epistemological sense. Committed to transgressing established borders, Said envisaged “new topographies,” where watertight compartments of cultures, professions, realms of experience, become inevitably hybrid and interpenetrating. In-between zones and marginal interstices which carry the burden of culture are thus created. “Third Space,” deployed by Homi Bhabha, is an image of such hybrid in-betweenness, to undermine essentialist representations of identity. It is created when the colonial demand cannot be fully translated from its original place of articulation to another place, but instead splits to give something else (Bhabha 211).

While interrogating textual margins, especially those in the novel, Said problematizes the centre/margin binary by playing off voices from the peripheries against those that occupy centrestage. The novel is of crucial importance to Said’s analysis of imperial culture because, in his view:

> Without empire . . . there is no European novel as we know it, and indeed if we study the impulses giving rise to it, we shall see the far from accidental convergence between the patterns of narrative authority constitutive of the novel on the one hand, and, on the other, a complex ideological configuration underlying the tendency to imperialism. (*Culture* 82)

The novel—as a cultural artefact of bourgeois society—and imperialism are unthinkable without each other. The continuity of British imperial policy throughout the nineteenth century is accompanied actively by the novel’s depiction of Britain as an imperial centre. The novel’s function furthermore, is not to ask questions about this idea, but to keep the empire more or less in place (*Culture* 88). It becomes imperative to reinterpret the western cultural archive as if fractured geographically by the activated imperial divide.

The chief methodological proposal of Said is “contrapuntal reading.” This is a form of “reading back” from the perspective of the colonized, to show how the submerged but crucial presence of the empire emerges in canonical texts. An awareness of both “metropolitan history” and “other histories” is needed while reading. The idea for contrapuntal reading came from Said’s admiration for the Canadian virtuoso pianist Glenn Gould, a person who exemplified contrapuntal performance in his ability to elaborate intricately a particular musical theme (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia 192). Contrapuntal reading is a technique of theme and variation by which a counterpoint is established between the imperial narrative and the post-
colonial perspective, a “counter-narrative” that keeps penetrating beneath the surface of individual texts to elaborate the ubiquitous presence of imperialism in canonical culture. As Said points out,

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

Contrapuntal reading takes both (or all) dimensions of this polyphony into account, rather than the dominant one, in order to discover what a univocal reading might conceal about the political worldliness of the canonical text. Said’s masterful readings of Mansfield Park, Aida, Kim, Camus and Yeats testify to this counterpoint and “writing back.” R. Radhakrishnan aptly comments that Culture and Imperialism is a work situated “virtually on the border between several discourses, several issues and agendas” (Robbins et al. 15) while Mary Louise Pratt detects “achronology” as an important principle prescribed by this method of Said (Robbins et al. 3). She elaborates that Said reads the past through the present, reading “retrospectively and heterophonically.” Pratt describes:

It calls upon us, for example, not to “respect the integrity” of the English nineteenth century at the expense of understanding it more fully. It implies, for instance, including twentieth century texts of decolonization or anti-imperialist thought or revisionist history on the syllabus and in argument, to create the counterpoint to the otherwise unrelenting . . . intolerably alienating—imperial/ethnocentric vision. The argument is less ethical than intellectual: you’ll understand the nineteenth century better that way. (Robbins et al. 3)

Edward Said travelled through methodologies. Dividing his critical agency into disparate areas—the activist and the theorist—without any dialogue between the two would result in ghettoizing and depoliticizing Said’s work. It would aggravate existing schisms between political and professional engagements, associating solidarity with politics and opportunism with professional ventures (Robbins et al. 16). Said tried cultivating knowledge as a bridge between different interests and locations. Beyond enunciating insider-outsider distinctions, his was the task of building cognitive and ethico-political bridges. He traversed through divided histories and spaces by means of a universalist imagination, acknowledging overlaps. R. Radhakrishnan further comments that Said’s work of mediation, translation and representation is:
... a border task that is neither all metropolitan nor all peripheral. It is in this spirit of initiating dialogue across an asymmetrical divide that Said perhaps privileges the metropolitan location. His reading of Ranajit Guha, C.L.R. James, George Antonius and Alatas in a metropolitan context is a way of peripheralizing the center and not an act of capitulation to the metropolitan center... Said is profoundly involved in the task of articulating coalitions between differences within the First World and the Third World as difference. In other words, when postcoloniality moves to the center, the center itself is not and cannot be the same anymore. Business as usual in the center cannot be continued anymore in the same old way. (Robbins et al 17)

Rescuing the politics of his homeland from the margins of public imagination, revitalizing its cause by taking recourse to “memory” as a strategic tool, and the ensuing poetics of space was cardinal to Said’s endeavour. Said’s interesting juxtaposition, “I’m the last Jewish intellectual... The only true follower of Adorno. Let me put it this way: I’m a Jewish-Palestinian” (qtd. in Viswanathan 458), proclaims the collapse of structures of oppositional differences without, however, erasing difference itself (Hochberg 47–48). What Said points out is the inseparability of the Jew and the Arab, their histories and memories. Said challenges all “national memories” which are built on a process of exclusion and forgetting each other; the erasure by the massive colonial enterprise of Zionism for example. Healing is to be sought through memory, “re-membering.” It is in the recreation of collective memories, in a historical continuity, “as part of a shared political, ethical and psychological sphere,” that both Jews and Arabs, Israelis and Palestinians can have a tranquil future (Hochberg 48). The main obstacle to a peaceful agreement between these two “unequal communities of suffering” is their mutual indifference to each other’s suffering. The land is lost “national patrimony” to one, and “Biblical fiat and diasporic affiliation” to the other. Both consider themselves as “victims of violence” (Hochberg 50).

Memory is a social, political and historical enterprise. Memory for the modern world is both for historians as well as ordinary citizens and institutions very much something to be used, misused, and exploited, rather than something that sits inertly there for each person to possess and contain. Said says:

Memory and its representations touch very significantly upon questions of identity, of nationalism, of power and authority. Far from being a neutral exercise in facts and basic truths, the study of history, which of course is the underpinning of memory, both in school and university, is to some considerable extent a nationalist effort premised on the need...
to construct a desirable loyalty to and insider’s understanding of one’s
country, tradition, and faith. (“Invention” 178)

The title of Said’s memoir *Out of Place* states the theme of this in-
timate and honest work. It tells the frustrating story of a lifelong search
for identification. Though sparked by the diagnosis of chronic leukemia,
the writing of the book also stemmed out of having “no sense of roots.”
The chaotic nature of the time and place into which he was born and the
neurotic nature of the household in which he was raised, were respon-
sible for this plight. He was born as a “mandate child” in 1935, Talbieh,
Jerusalem, which was cut adrift by the shattering of the Ottoman Empire
and absorbed into the British Empire at the end of World War I (Da-
vidson 166). In 1948, the family fled to Egypt following the creation of
Israel, losing its property and assets in Palestine. This left an indelible
mark on the young Said. The sense of disconnectedness and loss, “being
not quite right and out of place” (*Out of Place* 295) dominated the rest
of his life.

Francoise Lionnet opines that postcolonial autobiography carries the
conviction “that writing matters and that narrative has the power to trans-
form the reader” (qtd. in Luca 126). Memoir is a form of witnessing to
historical events. Personal histories are created and individual accounts
of public events are recorded. It shapes materials of the past by memory
and imagination for present needs. Said’s memoir documents the politics
of identity formation and self representation. It tells the story to keep it
alive, to fight oblivion. In fact Said had earlier told the “story” of Palestine
in a variety of ways, in *The Question of Palestine* (1979), *Covering Islam*
for the “lost world.” In fact a single Palestinian narrative is impossible to
imagine; parallel histories of the communities in the occupied territories,
documenting their experiences have to be coalesced to do justice to this
“story telling.” *Out of Place* documents how events like “World War II,
loss of Palestine and establishment of Israel, end of the Egyptian monar-
chy, the Nasser years, the 1967 war, the emergence of Palestinian move-
ment, the Lebanese Civil War and the Oslo peace process” (xiii) and places
like “Jerusalem, Cairo, Lebanon, the United States” (xiv) were crucial in
the making of Said. The three places in which Said grew up no longer ex-
ist—Palestine, Lebanon (before the civil war) and colonial monarchical
Egypt—and theirs is a “story worthy of rescue” (*Reflections* 568).

A deliberate creation of archives, museums, memoirs and celebration
of anniversaries, eulogies are all needed to keep traces of memory alive
as they are no longer “real environments of memory.” Ioana Luca applies French historian Pierre Nora’s concept of *lieux de mémoire* to *Out of Place* and detects in it “sites of memory” where “memory crystallizes and secrets itself,” which functions as traces of such ‘environments of memory’ in a society cut off from its past and even original location” (137). The intertwining of personal memory and national identity is achieved in the book. Palestine remains only in “traces of memory” and as Nora says “no longer quite life, not yet death, like shells on the shore when the sea of living memory has receded” (qtd. in Luca 138). *Out of Place* recreates a “site of memory” where Palestine turns “from a trope to a full fledged topos” (Luca 140). The memoir acted as therapy and healing to Said during his leukemia days and also undertook the task of “commemoration” of times and places threatened with forgetting. His autobiography goes beyond traditional boundaries of the genre and resists fixity and inhabits a “third space of continuous becoming, the space of the Deleuzian ‘AND’” (Luca 140), opening up “in-between spaces where new forms of art, experience, and political action emerge” (Luca 141).

Said’s investigation of cultural margins in the realm of music, while furthering his passion for annihilating disciplinary fiefdoms, intend to show that, however private the experience of music may seem, it never escapes social context and functions. His *Musical Elaborations* mixes theoretical speculations in both musicology and literary theory with autobiography. Foucault and Adorno mingle with Brahms and Wagner. Music criticism, sometimes technical and sometimes impressionistic, joins with literary criticism, and both intertwine with narrative and remembrance. Said notes that writings on music are governed by the assumption that classical music develops according to its own internal and formal logic, independently of social history, has been relatively untouched by recent developments in literary and cultural theory (*Musical* xiii). His goal is to treat music as a cultural field and to see (or hear) music as always implicated in social distinction and roles, in questions of national and regional identity. For Said, both Foucault and Adorno are guilty of a totalizing theory that does little to contest the totalizing society it confronts. “No social system,” Said writes, “no historical vision, no theoretical totalization, no matter how powerful, can exhaust all the alternatives or practices that exist within its domain. There is always the possibility to transgress” (*Musical* 55). Even Wagner’s *Die Meistersinger*, epitome of a musical, elaborating a social order, contains its own transgression.

Read and heard for the bristling, tremendously energetic power of *alternatives* to its own affirmative proclamations about the greatness of German art and culture, *Die Meistersinger* cannot really be reduced to the
nationalist ideology of its final strophes stress. It has set forth too much in the way of contrapuntal action, character, invention. *(Musical* 61)

Like Glenn Gould, Edward Said is able to think radically and for himself. He does not approach the pieces of music through the preconceptions and musical clichés of his time. This led him to reject almost all nineteenth century piano music after Beethoven, to view Wagner with distrust, and to admit to his personal canon only a fraction of the output of Mozart. Said argues for his aesthetic from a number of positions, but it is best understood as the aesthetic of a dedicated and passionate polyphonist. Mustapha Marrouchi comments that polyphony is a special illness of Said’s inner ear, an almost pathological specialization in the way of his thinking and perhaps even a condition of Said’s psyche. This passionate commitment to musical polyphony places him at odds with the culture of the concert hall and classical music (Marrouchi, “Variation” 102).

*Parallels and Paradoxes: Explorations in Music and Society* contains freewheeling and often exhilarating dialogues—which grew out of the acclaimed Carnegie Hall Talks—an exchange between Daniel Barenboim, internationally renowned conductor and pianist and Edward W. Said. Barenboim is an Argentinian-Israeli while Said Palestinian-American. These dialogues range across music, literature and society, opening up many fields of inquiry: the importance of a sense of place; music as a defiance of silence; the legacies of artists from Mozart and Beethoven to Dickens and Adorno; Wagner’s anti-Semitism; and the need for “artistic solutions” to the predicament of the Middle East—something they both witnessed when they brought young Arab and Israeli musicians together, in the West-Eastern Divan orchestra, founded in 1999. This “crossing over” was not easy, but rewarding:

In doing so they managed to overcome daunting human and bureaucratic barriers, enabling gifted young musicians from both sides of a widening political divide to benefit from master classes taught by some of the most accomplished performers and musicians of their era, and to meet and learn from one another in ways that would otherwise have been unthinkable. (Barenboim 91)

“Counterpoint” was a musical practice and personal guide to Said “to relate divergent musical and cultural backgrounds, and as a metaphor for humanistic emancipation” (Groot 221). “Polyphony” in music allows no domination of one voice over others and if it does occur, it would be temporary, shifting the role of prominence from one voice to the other. In a metaphoric sense “polyphony” is a “totality of equal social relationships”
(Groot 223). To Said, “amateurism” helped in making connections across lines and barriers. He also points out that “the basic humanistic mission today, whether in music, literature, or any of the arts or the humanities, has to do with the preservation of difference without, at the same time sinking into the desire to dominate” (Barenboim and Said 154). Dissidence is allowed in polyphony, especially in the case of Bach. This could be helpful in volatile social situations, as Said’s humanistic ideal allows “room for dissent, for alternative views . . . to advance human . . . liberty” (Barenboim and Said 181).

Edward Said’s trajectory crosses several intellectual boundaries and margins. His impressive and substantial oeuvre “never suffered from a Bloomian anxiety of influence” (Bayoumi 46). Said names freely the critics from whom he borrows ideas and concepts. He then assimilates and uses them in his own fashion. Abdirahman Hussein argues that Said “borrowed valuable insights from revisionist Marxist thinkers—his reflections on history, hegemonic culture, identitarian thinking, critical consciousness, and the late style are permeated by Lukacsian, Adornian, Gramscian, and Williamsian ideas” (“New” 102). Said admires Lukács, because “theory for him was what consciousness produced, not as an avoidance of reality but as a revolutionary will completely committed to worldliness and change” (World 234). Said owes allegiance to Georg Lukács and his groundbreaking understanding of the reification of consciousness, a constant reminder that the force of identity (as a concept, form, psychic state, mode of thinking) must be battled and resisted at all costs (Gourgoris 64). Adorno’s influence on Said not only shaped his writings on music but also his views of criticism and critique. Adorno (and Said) was deeply interested in the idea of “late style,” of how final works of a great artist (especially Beethoven) exist not as a summation of one’s own oeuvre but in fact in a position of alienation from one’s audience. Said finds much common ground with Adorno’s writing on exile. “It is part of morality not to be at home in one’s home” writes Adorno in Minima Moralia: Reflections from Damaged Life (qtd. in Representations 42), a thought that no one believed more strongly than Edward Said. Gramsci’s concept of hegemony provided Said a way of explaining how the influence of certain ideas about the “Orient” prevailed over others. While using Gramsci’s distinction between civil society and political society in Orientalism, Said takes culture, which is located in civil society, as the chief instrument for inducing consent and therefore hegemony. Said learns from Raymond Williams the basic principle that resistance to empire in a way requires the mapping or invention of new space and geography. He points out that in the concluding chapters of The Country and the City, Williams sketches “the new geography of high imperialism and decolonization” focusing on “the relationships between
peripheries and metropolitan centre” (*Reflections* 467). Williams’ examination of structures of feeling, communities of knowledge, emergent or alternative cultures and patterns of geographical thought tremendously influenced Said.

Bruce Robbins illuminates that Edward Said gave authority to a secular internationalism founded on an ambiguous border crossing, “neither simply an exile (which privileges the place of origin) nor simply an immigration (which privileges the destination), but both an exile and an immigration at once” (“Secularism” 34). Orthodox rigidities melt down as Said’s critical enterprise interrogates “margins.” The interdisciplinary breadth of Said’s corpus may be proposed as antidote to banal “micro specializations” that become stumbling blocks in the path of solidarist positions, which are threatened by solipsistic, nihilistic and pessimistic stances. Rediscovering the societal roots of experience at the margins, via Edward Said, could help dismantle impervious walls of exclusion and open up spaces for all those who have been long shut out of the boulevards of dignity.
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