

Yedi bölümden oluşan eserde sırasıyla şu konular ele alınmaktadır: depolitizasyon söylemi olarak tolerans, iktidar söylemi olarak tolerans, tamamlayıcı unsur olarak tolerans, yönetim zihniyeti olarak tolerans, bir müze nesnesi olarak tolerans, toleransın özneleri ve medenî söylem olarak tolerans. Kitabın temasıyla uyumlu ve kullanışlı bir “Dizin”e de sahip olan bu çalışmanın, hangi alanda uzmanlaşmış olursa olsun, demokrasilerde çokkültürlülük, demokratik çoğulculuk ve tolerans üzerine düşünenlerin okuması ve üzerinde düşünmesi gereken bir kitap olduğunu söyleyebiliriz.

Democracy and Education’ın yazarı John Dewey, yaklaşık yüzyıl önce, o dönemde “gelişmiş milletler” olarak adlandırılan devletlerin, en mükemmel demokratik devlet yönetimi anlayışına ulaşmış oldukları düşüncesine kapıldıklarını; oysa demokratik sistemin sanıldığı gibi ulaşıldıktan sonra sâbit hale gelen ve durağanlaşan bir yönetim biçimi olmadığını, aksine demokrasinin anlam ve kapsamının sürekli olarak yeniden keşfedilmeye, daima yenilenmeye, yeniden yapılanmaya ve yapılandırılmaya ihtiyaç duyan bir süreç olduğunu ısrarla vurgulamıştı. Öyle anlaşılıyor ki Brown’ın liberal demokrasilerde müphem kalan noktalar konusunda dikkat çektiği meselelerle birlikte, dünyanın hangi coğrafyasında olursa olsun, demokrasilerin kendi demokrasi anlayışlarını yeniden keşfetme ve yenileme konusunda yapacakları oldukça önemli ev ödevleri bulunmaktadır.

Seyfi Kenan

Edward Said: Continuing the Conversation

Edited by: Homi Bhabha and W.J.T. Mitchell

Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005. 171 pp.

Due to the fact that there is constant interaction with the Other(s), discourses of modernity cannot afford not to resolve the critical issues raised by otherness and differences. Paradoxically however, these discourses, derived from a strong Western rationalist and universalistic posture, reduce the “ethical space” for the Other to represent itself independently of Western universalism, in its own cultural specificity and its own history. In fact, the history of what can be called “the modernity debate” reveals that though the need to know the Other is, and has always been, strongly emphasized, the dominant mode in which such knowledge is realized has been the accumulation of

diverse “empirical” knowledge of other peoples, other nations, other regions and other cultures, with a taken-for-granted assumption that more knowledge automatically ensures and produces a better understanding of the Other. The reason for this is that what was at stake was, and still is, not only considering the Other in order to discover cultural similarities and differences (so that other cultures become included within the dominant scientific discourse, i.e., the reproduction of Western universalism) but also maintaining the privileged role of the Western self as a rational, Cartesian modern cogito in order to define the course of historical development as progress.

Given this dualistic (the self/the Other) cultural framework, a practical question would be to what extent is an attempt to describe the life of other peoples as “an objective and empirical account” conducive to the recognition of the Other as a different (independent) presence. An answer to this question requires a two moves, the deconstruction and the re-construction of modernity in such a way that not only is a substantial critical reading of the discourses of modernity, whether rationalist, positivist or critical, from the lenses of the Other provided, but also our understanding of modernity becomes enlarged, reconstructed and modified. It is here that the significance of Edward Said lies. On the one hand, Said’s work on “Orientalism” has provided what can be called in this context a “paradigm-constitutive” framework on which the postcolonial interrogation of Western modernity can be built. On the other hand, Said’s work on the “Palestinian Question” has concretized the critique of Orientalism, both methodologically and politically. In both realms, Said has focused on the problem of representation in that he has offered in an epistemologically convincing and politically effective way a critical account of Orientalism and its power-knowledge based operation, which creates a set of binary dichotomies that lead to the hegemonic position and status of one discourse/position over the other. In so doing, and as can also be seen in Said’s other works in the field of literary criticism, Said constantly employed and initiated a “critical strategy of cutting against the grain, questioning received ideas (including his own), and treating the critical encounter, not as a matter of system or position, but of dialogic transformation” (Mitchell, p.3). This is where the significance of Said’s work has emerged and unfolded, finally creating its legacy, a paradigm-constitutive quality.

We lost Edward Said in the fall of 2003. Yet today we are still with him, listening to him, reading his works, learning from him, and realizing that the legacy of Said continues. In our risky, insecure globalizing world, a world in turmoil, as we are confronted by security risks, economic uncertainties, moral

dilemmas and significant problems of poverty, exclusion and climate change, we turn to Said and learn and relearn from his critical strategy of cutting against the grain with the intention of altering the existing power-domination relations. In this context, as Bhabha correctly puts it, “Adagio” requires “Continuing the Conversation” with Edward Said (pp.7-16). The book, *Edward Said: Continuing The Conversation*, is a collection of excellent essays on Edward Said, each of which focuses on one or two dimensions of his work, yet together they in fact continue the conversation with Edward Said. In addition to the editors, Homi Bhabha and W.J.T. Mitchell, the book involves well-known scholars, (I will not list the names here, as all of them are well-known in their on fields) who are good friends of Said and have produced excellent and essential quality essays on him. This makes the book not only extremely valuable, but also one that does justice to the legacy of Edward Said.

Let me focus on Said’s paradigm-constitutive work on Orientalism, which has also been discussed by a number of scholars in their continuing conversation with Said. In critically analysing and theorizing Orientalism, Said’s intention is to provide a contrapuntal reading of Western discourses on the Orient in such a way as to demonstrate that the distinction drawn between the Occident and the Orient forms a historically specific discourse of power/knowledge. Said is concerned with delineating how this discourse works in three inter-related locations. Orientalism refers to (i) the “practice of teaching” about the Orient, (ii) “a style of thought” based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between the Orient and the Occident, and (iii) a “corporate institution” for dealing with the Orient. While (iii) indicates the historical specificity of Orientalism, that is, the interconnection between Orientalism and European colonial expansion from the eighteenth century onward, (i) and (ii) reveal the power/knowledge basis of Orientalism: the way in which Orientalism made it possible for European culture to “manage, even produce, the Orient, politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically and imaginatively during the post-Enlightenment period.

Here the crucial question is that of representation. Following Antonio Gramsci (with respect to his conception of hegemony, which Said articulates as “a cultural leadership”) and Michel Foucault (with respect to his notion of ‘power/knowledge’, which Said uses to present Orientalism as a discourse on the basis of which the Orient was constructed as a fixed identity with a timeless essentialism), Said suggests that the distinction between the Occident and the Orient, which has been made *at the levels of ontology and epistemology*, manifests itself in the systematic objectification and discursive construction of

the Orient not only as an object of study, but also as a subject that is “integral” to Western hegemony. Thus, the Orient functions as an integral element of the very constitution and definition of the West, as being its contrasting image. “The Orient is an integral part of European material civilization and culture... Orientalism expresses and represents that part culturally and even ideologically as a mode of discourse with supporting institutions, scholarship, imaginary doctrines, even colonial bureaucracies and colonial style.” Thus, Said states that Orientalism was, and is, “a kind of Western projection onto and a will to govern over the Orient.” In order to understand the functioning of “this governing”, it is important to distinguish analytically the levels of *the problematic* and *the thematic* at which the Orientalist discourse operates. At the level of the problematic, the Orientalist discourse works through the identification of the Orient as an object of study, the Orient as the Other, in fact, the essential Other of the West.

On the other hand, at the level of the thematic, the Orientalist discourse works with a typological understanding of history as a transition from *Gemeinschaft* to *Gesellschaft*, in which, even though each pole is assumed to have its unfolding essence, one pole is privileged as being able to transfix the non-West as the Other. Therefore, at the level of the thematic, which constitutes an epistemological and ethical system that establishes relations between elements, what is at stake is the study of the Other through a set of binary but at the same time essentialized dichotomies, such as the West and the Rest, the self and the other, the Occident and the Orient.

Said extrapolates three important conclusions from the working of Orientalism at both levels: At the level of the problematic, the Orientalist discourse produces an image of the Orient with a timeless essentialism. The Orient is thus represented in timeless and essentialist terms. Said argues that in this context the problematic in Orientalism puts the Orient into a “closed system in which objects are what they are because they are what they are, for once, for ontological reasons that *no empirical matter can either dislodge or alter.*” Hence, the Orient becomes a manifestation and embodiment of an essence, an Orientness, that is fixed and frozen in history and which has no ability to alter its timeless unfolding essence. In other words, the Orientalist discourse does not seek to represent its object in its historicity, but rather “the essence of a way of life”, either as modern or non-modern.

At the level of the thematic, the essentialist mode of representation of the Orient is deployed in an epistemological and ethical system that is constructed on the basis of an epistemological and ontological distinction between the Oc-

cident and the Orient. Thus, Orientalist descriptions and accounts are, as Said puts it, “produced by means of the juxtaposition of two opposed, essentialist entities, the Occident and the Orient... [e]ach is understood in reified, essentialist terms, and each is defined by its difference from the other element of the opposed pair.” It is significant that this epistemological distinction, produced by an Orientalist subject studying its object, the Orient, functions to justify what has already been produced at the level of the problematic, a timeless conception of the non-Western Other. Hence, what is regarded at the level of the problematic as being an essentialist passive subject becomes “the object of study” at the level of the thematic, and the knowledge of this is derived from its difference from the already privileged element, the Occident.

The working of Orientalist discourse, both at the levels of the problematic and the thematic, constitutes *the precondition* not only of the image of the Other, but also the very constitution of the modern self as a privileged point of entry into history. Said argues that as an integral element of Western modernity, the Orient is the precondition for the justification of the modern self as a sovereign rational subject. The signification of the Orient as being passive, irrational, closed to alterity, in turn, justifies the superiority of Western reason and knowledge. The historical specificity of Orientalism, that is, the globalization of Western modernity through colonial practices, along with its power/knowledge basis, for Said, marks the relationship between culture and empire, the connections between cultural forms, the intertwined histories of “the West and the Rest”, and the overlapping territories on a world scale.

Having briefly outlined the basic premises of Said’s genealogical study of Orientalism, it is possible to understand why it can be considered to be a “paradigm-constitutive” for the deconstruction of “universalizing historicism”, as well as for the restructuring of post-Oriental historiography. Said’s work makes a significant contribution in three fundamental ways: first, it shows that Eurocentrism is the precondition of the Orientalist image of the Other. In this sense, Said provides a conception of the Other as a discursive construct, which enables us to break radically with the appropriation of the Other as either an empirical/cultural being or a being in itself. Secondly, the working of the Orientalist discourse, both at the levels of the problematic and the thematic, indicates that culture is not a totality of shared values and meaning, but a practice, a signifying practice through which meaning is socially constructed. That the Orient is constructed as an integral element of the Occident is indicative of how culture works as a signifying practice. To conceptualize culture in this way leads to unearthing what the notion of cultural diversity hides – the

hegemony of the modern self, which in turn makes it possible to consider cultural differences in relational terms. Thirdly, and as a logical consequence of the first and the second points, Said's work provides a radical critique of the typological and essentialist understanding of history in which the defining characteristics of Western modernity constitute the primary point of reference for the analysis of international relations in general and other cultures in particular. Said's critique of what we called "the Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft problematic" as Eurocentric applies equally to both the classical sociological discourses of modernity as developed by Marx, Weber, and Durkheim, and the theories of development articulated by modernization, dependency, and world-system theories, as well as to international relations theory.

In his Introduction to *EDWARD SAID: Continuing The Conversation*, Mitchell tells us about his trip with Edward Said to the West Bank and Israel. One day during this trip, Mitchell, Said, and the late Ibrahim Abu-Lughod, went swimming in the Mediterranean after visiting Palestinian villages and neighbourhoods. Mitchell says: "Edward, always a powerful swimmer, quickly left us behind in the shallows and swam far out into the sea until his head was just a dot, appearing and disappearing in the swells. He has swum out too far for us to follow now. But the ebb and flow of his conversation continues and will continue in the criticism, the politics, the culture, and the evolution of human thought to come" (p.6). I had never met, or been introduced to, Edward Said, but I have listened to him three times, and read all of his writings on Orientalism, Culture and Imperialism, and the Palestinian question. My conversation with him continues, and he still makes a significant contribution to my work, my politics and my thought. For all of us who have been fortunate and honoured enough to listen to him, read him, and learn from, his legacy continues, and will continue.

E. Fuat Keyman

Çatışmanın Dinamikleri - Din ve Felsefe Uzlaşmazlığı Üzerine

Fehrullah Terkan

Ankara: Elis, 2007. 261 sayfa.

İslam Felsefesinin en temel problemlerinden biri olan din-felsefe ilişkisini inceleyen bu çalışma üç bölümden oluşmaktadır. Bölümlerin ilkinde "felsefeden dine bakış", Fârâbî, İbn Sînâ ve İbn Rüşd gibi düşünürlerin görüş-