

Exploring Power Dynamics: Orientalism, Culture and Imperialism

Rehan Baloch

Edward Said was born in 1935 and grew up in Cairo. He was an Arab Palestinian Christian. He was lonely and studious. That is why; he ended up reading many novels and listened to music from various podcasts and programs. Said's '**memoir out of place**' which was published in 1999, proves that Said was some sort of troublemaker and he was taken out from Victoria College in 1951 and sent to Manusccharets. The climate of America suited Edward and he began to get interested in music and started playing piano. He wanted to study music and secure a career in it; however, he changed his mind and started his career in Literature. He did his PhD on Joseph Conrad and started teaching Comparative Literature at Columbia University in America. In 1967, Arab-Israeli war broke out and Said's career was deeply impacted by the war. Said began to have doubts on his paradox identity because he was born a Palestinian and then moved to America where his professional career was also built. The war of 1967 grew thick on Said and the fact that he is a Palestinian from childhood which was suppressed in his unconscious began to show itself in the writings of Said. This is best reflected in his book on Palestine, **After the Last Sky**, in which he says:

Identity- who we are, where we come from, what we are, is difficult to maintain in exile- we are the 'other', an opposite, a flaw in the geometry of resettlement, an exodus. Silent and discretion veil the hurt, slow the body searches, sooth the sting of loss.

Said realized, the discourse of the west, a paradoxical identity and the role of text in a culture, was the colonization of Palestine. His works show literary theory cannot be separated by the political realities of that time. Said is deeply concerned by the political reality of the Palestine, about the identity of Palestinian in general and his own in particular, and the role of text locating it in a structure of the world. Throughout his texts, Said can be seen very much concerned about his identity as a Palestinian and the Palestinian culture. However, rather than finding the roots of his identity and culture, Said doesn't reinvent his identity, he, in fact, says culture and identity are continuous and growing processes. In a talk, he clearly mentioned that he cannot leave New York but it is his place now. In 1983, he published his essays on **'The world, the text and the critic'** which tells us about the role of the critic and the underlying principle of theory and its place at a given time. In fact, Said celebrates exile both in terms of what had been left behind and what is actual here and now. Said was always in a double perspective about things he saw. The greatest writers he observes are those who are not biased and who look at things in a double perspective, such as Jonathan Swift's Eric Aucerbach

Mimesis, Gulliver's Travels and Drapier's letters. Said believed in what Mathew Arnold says, ' **The great men of culture are those who have had a passion for diffusing, for making prevail, for carrying them one end of society to another, the best of knowledge, the best of their time. Thus, the power of culture is potentially nothing less than the power of the state.**' So, he works to identify what culture is and what its role is in controlling a nation. He concludes that the best culture that is carried is through text. His essay '**Speaking Truth to Power**' is about the ability of resistance lying in writing back to imperialism, to speak truth to injustice. He emphasizes that holding onto bias and viewing things in extremes is a misguided approach. Instead, he encourages individuals, particularly intellectuals, to remain impartial and seek the truth in order to make the right choices for meaningful change. This led Said to stay calm, unbiased and choose what he thought was seen from a double perspective.

The Wordiness of the text

Ferdinand de Saussure introduced foundational ideas for what became known as structuralist theory in his posthumously published work, "Course in General Linguistics," in 1916. This theory holds that every text possesses structure and cannot be eliminated; for instance, structure of English grammar can determine definition of a sentence. Saussure exemplifies this with historical linguistics: for instance, how the sentence analysis is expressed by considering formal properties – such

as subject and predicate. Another prognosis of Saussure's concept is signifier and signified distinction. He argues that words originate from signs and these are; the phonic signifier and the mental signified. His formula can be summarized as: sign = signifier + signified. The signifier is the acoustical image transmitted from one brain to another and the signified is the mental picture in the brain. Post-structuralist Jacques Derrida rightly criticizing this theory claims that language is incapable of conveying stable information. He uses examples, such as the phrase "Time flies like an arrow," to demonstrate how shifting roles (e.g., making "time" the verb and "flies" the object) can alter meaning entirely. What is important here is that for Derrida, one signifier could call up many signified, which renders the use of language problematic. He carries on Saussure's formula and adds that sign = signifier + signified + other signified, stating that there can be no center or structure of text, as meaning changes. In contrast, French structuralist Roland Barthes views the text through two axes: the syntagmatic axis which is the linear distribution of words within a sentence and; the paradigmatic axis which is the totality of the substitutions possible in the given distribution. Nonetheless, a dominant encoding of a work is what Edward Said had to offer on his response to Barthes by asserting that it wipes out the cultural texture of any work. His basic premise is that a text authored in a given period and place possesses the character of the culture of its creation. If an attempt is not made to understand the cultural context of

creating a text, the meaning of the text vanishes into thin air; the motives into view.

The Worldliness of the critic

Said is worried about critics who get locked in to such specialization which, as he defines it, is **a cult of professional expertise**. He argues that this specialization marginalizes intellectuals' engagement with pressing political issues in contemporary society. Although they are elites, he thinks their practice has to be rooted in the secular world, and hence a call for secular criticism. According to Said, secular criticism presupposes two grand tasks one of which is to determine the critic's worldliness.

There are various possibilities of how critics address literary theory. Some try to see it as a mode of reflection or play it as an exciting compilation of ideas and still others employ it as a sharp critique. There is another and more active approach, which also considers criticism as a way to practice change, observe today's experiences, commitments, and suffering. In this regard, therefore, Said feels that through outing pretenders, pointing out falsehoods and doing the work of change, then the intellectuals are able to achieve these results. For example, when analyzing Orientalist discourse in relation to imperialism, Said raises a connection between him and the analyzed text to the contemporary Palestinian conflict. This knowledge of text and relationships among text, reader, and the critic fits perfectly in his worldly experience.

Said is critical of the imposition of English literature in colonized regions, which perpetuates dominant narratives about European elites. He asserts that criticism must consider the contexts of colonized peoples; otherwise, it serves merely to uphold European perspectives. He states, **“The history of thought, to say nothing of political movements, is extravagantly illustrative of how the dictum, solidarity before criticism, means the end of criticism.”** He emphasizes that **‘even in the very midst of a battle in which one is unmistakably on one side against another, there should be criticism, because there must be critical consciousness if there are to be issues, problems, values, even lives to be fought for’.**

Moreover, when he uses the word **‘amateur’** he refers to the intellectuals and critics who have no specialization. When asked about this choice of word he said that it means a love for meaning and an involved interest without professional constraints. Those critics who fail to address modern issues of political or social relevance may contribute to hegemonic discourses associated with the economy and the world power. Said contends that a critic must be more than an amateur devoid of critical insight, as **“criticism treats the work of art as a starting point for new creation,”** as Oscar Wilde notes.

In his essay **“Speak Truth to Power”** from *Representations of the Intellectual* (1994), Said offers a pathway for critics. He continues his work on the basis of the Bhabha’s concept of

the power of resistance as the ability of the author to 'write back' to imperialism and to tell 'truth' to injustice. He asserts that human beings construct their truths, yet the so-called objective truth of white superiority is built upon the violent subjugation of African and Asian peoples. Telling the truth implies considering possibilities, making proper decisions, and fighting for effective improvements.

In simpler terms, Said demands that intellectuals should not be extreme, that is to perceive one side as all good and the other as all evil; the method the intellectual should employ is **"the double perspective."** It is a utilitarian view, which according to his experience of exile, does not isolate problems and gives one account of the past and the present. Some of the intellectuals who hold this point of view include Salman Rushdie and Ngugi wa Thiong'o and the Pakistani Scholar Iqbal Ahmed.

Introduction to Orientalism

Orientalist discourse, when analyzed with the help of the Foucauldian terminology, can be identified as both a discourse and a practice of power/knowledge. Before we go any further into the discussion of the present work, we must have a clear understanding of the terms "Orient" and "Occident". 'The "Orient" is a collective term normally used to represent areas outside Europe, especially the Far East

and the Middle East, while the “Occident” depicts western culture specifically Europe and America. The Orient is always in the opposite pole, it is the ‘Other’ being constructed by the Occident.

For Said, Orientalism is primarily a question of representation. He assumes that the Orient has no existence outside the texts created by the West; rather, these texts construct the Orient. When someone reads Orientalist texts, one is not simply looking for what is behind them, but trying to decode how the West writes about the Orient and makes it talk in support ‘of the West’. The central question in Said’s scheme is that of whether representation is really possible because every representation is inevitably shaped by the cultural, linguistic and moral conditions of the representer. As such he argues that representation comes with many other factors than just what he says is ‘truth’, that is representation itself.

Said references Voltaire, who suggested that the complexities of human existence can only be understood through texts. This shows how the Western scholarship can acknowledge great deal of the Orient and at once mute it. Different scholars and intellectuals of the western origin wrote the text about the ‘Other’ a subject with an intention to de-subjectify and dehumanize it. Thus, Orientalism turns into a pathologized Europe by scholars who consider themselves to be smarter and therefore better than the Orientals. According to Said, the task for this discourse is to

analyze it with the intention to unmask the lie and fight for justice.

Nonetheless, numerous scholars disagree with Said's theory. For example, Bernard Lewis and Dennis Porter criticize his methodological approach. According to Lewis, Said's framework is unsound, and its methodology is seriously questionable, thus posing serious questions about such expertise that Said professes to have regarding Arab culture, Islam, and their histories. Thus, Porter criticizes Said for asserting the existence of a 'real' Orient beyond Orientalism by the very same token that the latter denies the possibility of any objective knowledge. He claims that Said misunderstands Foucault and applies Gramsci's concept of hegemony without explaining how one might come from the other.

Aijaz Ahmed, in his book *Theory: Class, Nations, and Literatures* (1992), notes that both Said and Foucault adopt a Nietzschean stance, which claims that there is no true representation, only misrepresentation. Ahmed asks about how the voice of colonized people contributes to the discourse, and whether authors like Ngugi wa Thiong'o and Salman Rushdie use a Western canon to discuss marginality—a question that remains unanswered. James Clifford also raises criticism to Said attributing that Said himself joins the Orientalism by using concepts from the anthropological human sciences of the West. He raises

pertinent questions to do with how people build their culture and place of origin.

It must be said that Said acknowledged some of these concerns in the 'Afterword' to the fourth edition of *Orientalism* (1995) and expanded on these matters in *Culture and Imperialism*. It is, however, necessary to understand that though his work stimulated substantial criticism, his assumptions concerning the West's understanding of the Orient remains authoritative after a century. This is still one of the fundamental postulates of Orientalism and one should not disregard it.

Defining culture as imperialism and its role

William Blake once wrote that empire follows art and science, remove or degrade them, the empire is no more. Said, similarly, assures that the control of the imperialist in political, economical, and institutional operations is nothing and not possible without the control of the culture that maintains them. Foucault shows that the struggle for domination can be systematic and hidden. There is an unceasing struggle between classes, nations, and states in order to dominate the other; however, what makes this struggle a battle of tooth-and-claw is because the struggle of values is involved. However, culture has always been used by the colonizers as an excuse for tool of development.

For instance, John Stuart Mill says that they are in India because India needs them for the purpose of civilizing them, i.e. **'Because India requires us, that these are territories and peoples who beseech domination from us and that...without the English India would fall into ruin'**. It is a notion that intends to justify their colonization and control of the colonized people. In addition, the occupier shows the world that it is their duty to civilize those people **'lost in barbarism'**. Furthermore, different scholars and writers of Europe tried to justify their colonization in their texts. Such as Joseph Conrad who not only supports imperialism but also justifies their act of domination by claiming that the nation that wants dominance from other nations is always welcoming, else the domination would not have been possible. In other words, power and opportunity to take over territory, itself, gives you right to dominate. Besides, what is important is the fact that within the metropolis, the imperial ideology and rhetoric remains unquestioned by the social reformist movements, such as the liberal movement, feminist movement, working class movements, etc. **'They are all imperialist by and large'**.

Culture is always associated with a nation or a state; this differentiates 'us' from 'them' with the degree of some xenophobia. Therefore, imperial culture is the most dangerous weapon used to dominate the 'other'. It indicts the imperial hegemony. Said refers to Raymond William who regards that English literature is mainly about England. This

idea directly contradicts the conception of Said's worldliness of the text **that literature itself makes constant references to itself as participating in Europe's overseas expansion**, what William calls '**structure of feeling**' that supports the practice of the empire. Neither culture nor imperialism is inert, nor so are the connections between them as historical experiences dynamic and complex.

Said is very much concerned about novel and its relation with the empire. Novel is produced in order to support the empire more or less. Without the empire, he says, 'there is no European novel as we know it'. The novels involve a complex set of ideologies that support the authority of the empire. However, it is not novel or culture in the broader sense that caused imperialism but novel as a cultural artifact of bourgeois society, and imperialism are unthinkable without each other. Said calls this 'structure of attitude and reference'. In other words, the structure connecting the novels to each other has no existence outside the novels. Such is the novel of Camus's stranger. Camus's work is read in a way as if Algeria did not exist. The fact that Meursault (protagonist in the novel) kills an Arab- as unnamed presence-is incidental. The French occupation started in 1830 and continued during Camus's life. His writing is 'an element in France's methodically constructed political geography of Algeria', says Said.

Moreover, Said suggests **contrapuntal reading** that is reading back from the perspective of the colonized in order to look

how imperial mission and agenda is submerged in the texts. This strategy of reading is a technique that is to counter imperial discourse that goes beneath the text in order to reveal the intention of the text. Said's own contrapuntal process involves the importance of geography. This process assures the readers to rethink the geography and it is his basis of worldliness of the text as well. Colonialism and imperialism are not abstractions for Said, **'they are specific experiences and forms of life that have an almost unbearable concreteness'**. Such is the case with European traveler and merchant who visited different parts of the world and wrote about them for the empire. Imperialism and its associated culture create different ideologies about the territory in order to contain it in her control. In addition, Said also has a contrapuntal reading of Austen's *Mansfield Park*, Verdi's *Aida*, and Kipling's *Kim* in which he reveals the hidden context and purpose of the texts in his book.

Said's Resistance Theory

Scholars and critics believe that Said has no resistance theory. In fact, Said had problem with Foucauldian method who he says has distributed power in every level of the society and leaves no room for resistance. Foucault dealt with the question of how and why power is used rather than trying to change power relations. Anyhow, Said's resistance theory is two-folded; to know the orient outside orientalism, and then to write back against the discourses of the orientalism in order to represent the marginalized people.

The most influential people in this resistance is the intellectual; he uncovers the discourses of imperialism and then tries to bring a positive change in society by presenting the present, present that exists and is the reality of the colonized people. In other words, Saidian resistance theory rests upon intellectuals who exercise their critical consciousness, not simply to reject imperial discourse but to intervene critically '**within the intrinsic conditions on which knowledge is made possible**'.

Furthermore, the process of contrapuntal reading is the other name of this resistance theory. Using this process, the critic and the colonized people get to know the political discourses of the empire which creates for them an avenue, an avenue where resistance is rejection. However, postcolonial analysis reveals that this resistance is not only far from rejecting the discourses produced, but the binary relationship between the colonized and colonizer makes it impossible for the people to mobilize. Therefore, successful resistances have taken hold of the dominant discourse that had been produced by the colonizer and have created difference between these discourses and the reality experiences of the people that are located in their culture.

An example of this is, writers and intellectuals enter the domain of the dominant idea that might be the colonialist language or its literary forms and transform it using literature that not only reflects their cultural reality but also uncovers the hegemonic force. Said is deeply inflicted with this notion

of resistance which no doubt creates his secular world for the intellectuals. Secularism, according to him, is not the rejection of specialization but also uncovering the theological ideas of nationalism which is a way out for good change. The dense fabric of secular life, says Said, is what **'can't be herded under the rubric of national identity or can't be made entirely to respond to this phony idea of a paranoid frontier separating "us" from "them" — which is a repetition of the old sort of orientalist model'**. The politics of secular interpretations is avoiding what Fanon calls **'Pitfalls of national consciousness'**. **'Rhetoric of blame'** is such a pitfall that ceases potential change for the society.

Said in his resistance theory is in contradiction with Foucault and cites Fanon for better clarity in his resistance theory. Under the Foucauldian terms, Said says, it is impossible to resist. Yet the colonized people must resist, he must be anti-imperialistic and must recreate himself as post-colonial and this recreation was contextualized in Fanon's influence on him. Fanon says, **'It is through the effort to recapture the self and to scrutinize the self; it is through the lasting tension of their freedom that men will be able to create the ideal conditions of existence for a human world'**. Said says,

I do not think that the anti-imperialist challenge represented by Fanon and Césaire or others like them has by any means been met: neither have we taken them seriously as models or representations of human effort in the contemporary world. In fact Fanon and Césaire...jab directly

at the question of identity and of identitarian thought, that secret sharer of present anthropological reflection on 'otherness' and 'difference'. What Fanon and Césaire required of their own partisans, even during the heat of struggle, was to abandon fixed ideas of settled identity and culturally authorized definition. Become different, they said, in order that your fate as colonized peoples can be different.

Therefore, Fanon doesn't present a radicalized notion of culture; his purpose is clearly visible in *The Wretched of Earth* where his emphasis is on a national culture and that focuses on a decolonized culture, a culture that brings consciousness and conscious activity for liberating one. Said says, for Fanon it was not only necessary to create identity and recreation in the process of decolonization but also go beyond and create social consciousness. Without social consciousness, the liberated men will be again dominated by some other after the imperialist is gone. Hence, it will be replacement of one dominant idea by the other. In addition, Said also cites Fanon's violence for which he says that Fanon wanted to rest his arguments on tactical armed struggle because he wished **'to bind the European as well as the native together in a new non-adversarial community of awareness and anti-imperialism'**. Finally, Said rejects Foucault's method which creates no alternative for resistance and moves away from problems of society as social wholes and cites Fanon's work because his work systematically treats the colonial and metropolitan societies together. To sum up, Saidian

resistance lays its ability in the ‘**voyage in**’ in order to write back to imperialism

Balochistan under the lens of Orientalism

The history of Balochistan is a complex and complicated history of Baloch people. Various kinds of literature have been produced about the Baloch people in order to create confusion and division among the people. One of the main reason behind these confusing and complicated texts is the work of those who were from a different land and had different purposes to produce the texts. Sadly, without any anthropological and geological research, the Baloch people, particularly the writers accepted those texts and forwarded them through their produced literature.

The concept of Orientalism is already familiar with this context, which was advanced by Edward W Said; Orientalism pertains to distorted representations of Baloch peoples and their societal circumstances generated by authors from the Western world and written in support of Western imperialism. Although the texts appear to present a uni-dimensional outlook about the colonial encounter, a closer analysis of the texts unveil such problematic tendencies as can be unearthed and traced when the contrapuntal analysis is undertaken focussing both on the colonial/European and the Baloch narrative.

It is to be noted that the British Empire which consisted of modern day Britain, later sent agents like Pottinger to Balochistan in the year of 1810 as a part of information gathering for their colonialism. These agents sought to portray Balochistan accordingly. These colonial agents sought to paint Balochistan and the Baloch people in a bad light. This record has been done by Dr Farooq Baloch through counter narratives. For instance, they describe Brahvi speaking people as savages and at the same time they are kind hosts. Pottinger paid much attention to the Kalat fortifications describing them in a manner that would help British military in the effort of colonization. Furthermore, there were the intentional changes of the names and identities by British writers, for example, the changing name of Khan Baloch to Khan Brahvi; The British writers intended to create division between the Balochi and Brahvi speakers. Luckily, today's Baloch youth are more aware about their past and history which has come under notice due to scholars like Dr. Farooq Baloch.

Many of the texts written by social scientists that came to light strived to essentially cement fissures amongst the Baloch people. For example, Longworth Dames, who worked on Balochi literature, had colonial Briton bias which he reflected when he served to give Baloch tribalism a wrong depiction. A bribed colonial personality of that time was Sir Robert Groves who worked in the Mastung and Quetta

Treaties, and facilitated in transferring the regional territories from Kalat's jurisdiction to Britain. Through using a strategy of 'divide and rule,' Groves aimed at disturbing the Baloch unification.

British colonial policies aimed to dehumanize the Baloch by reducing their identity to mere statistics and trends. The ongoing consequences of these strategies still affect Baloch society today, perpetuating issues like the corruption of the tribal system, which was exacerbated by British favoritism toward certain Sardars. This led to what Frantz Fanon describes as a "disease"—an aspiration among some Baloch to align with Western ideals.

In 1948, Pakistan occupied Balochistan, although the Baloch people have always bravely opposed occupation if necessary, giving their lives for the battle. However, they failed to develop proper strategies and resources to safeguard Kalat State from the armed invasion of Pakistani Army. Pakistan started implementing the British policies from day one, to strengthen the gaps created through colonialism. It led to further fragmentation, as some areas were merged with neighboring provinces. For instance, most of the Baloch people who are residing in Dera Ghazi Khan and other areas are affected by these tactics. The state has tried its best to isolate these people from the Baloch identity and contribute to the fragmentation that threatens the political and social integration of the Baloch people.

Also, the state has used religion as a tool to narrow down the Baloch people into religious groups such as Zikri, Sunni, and Shia culturally, which violates the Baloch tradition. This manipulation is well seen in acts of violence against individuals like Rauf Baloch where apartheid like violence is inflicted under the guise of religious fascism while not respecting and/or recognizing Baloch traditions.

Thus, one is able to find all the signs of colonization in the modern indigenous people such as poor educational system, poor health, especially presented by melancholy young people and drug addiction. These problems are connected to colonial histories, and unless the Baloch regain power and detoxify their culture and selves, they will remain as such. Solving these problems means identifying discourses on these topics, and interacting with the Baloch culture and languages, as well as making the reader see more about what makes 'us' different from 'them.'

Writers in Politics

"Literature is the most subtle weapon for controlling people because it works through influencing emotions, the imagination, and the consciousness of a people", says Ngugi Wa Thiango. In 20th century, there was (and still is in 21st century) a debate, a debate whether literature and politics are intertwined, interdependent, and connected with each other. In other words, whether literature is used as a weapon for propaganda against discourses surrounding the ground

politics, propaganda in a sense unused by West but to propagate the issues and movements of one's peoples, or unlike what Ngugi and other writers believe that will be discussed later in this writing. According to Ngugi, there are two categories of writers, one who are fatalistic that end up believing in fate and the other who are radical that go for transformation and change. In the middle of the both, there is one category that are on neither side and who believe in Western discourse of humanitarianism. So, his intellectual is a writer using whose literature shapes the politics or vice versa. He sees no difference between a writer and a politician since both trade in words. Furthermore, Said's intellectual that has already been discussed is the writer who writes back to imperialism and speaks truth to injustice/power. She/he uncovers the hidden agenda of what has been said about the native man, gets out from the cult of specialization and looks at the issues and problems of the society in a double perspective. Said's intellectual is, for instance, Ngugi who not only writes back to the oppressor but also shapes the politics of the ground.

Moreover, literature is produced by an intellectual/writer whose writings or words reflect the reality of the people, and that reality cannot be divorced of the movements and issues happening in the society. To use Shakespeare's words, literature is '**a mirror unto nature**', a reflection of society. If the literature that is outside of where it is getting produced, it carries no meaning. Such is the case with Fanon's

intellectual who goes from one transition to the other. Fanon stressed the responsibility of intellectuals and writers in a statement made at the Second Congress of Black Artisans and Writers in Rome in 1959, to forge national consciousness in their work as a part of the struggle for independence. In his essay '**National Culture**' published in his book *The Wretched of Earth*, he shows that national consciousness and national culture are inseparable and anti-colonial resistance cannot succeed without them. His intellectual passes through three stages. First, he tries to identify himself with the colonizer, i.e. his lifestyle, ideas, and writings get into a parallelism with the master. He calls this stage '**unqualified assimilation**' (p. 179, *Wretched of Earth*), because the intellectual excels the language of the colonizer and tries to sit on the table at which his master is served but still fails to do so. Second, the intellectual realizes that no matter how much he serves the master, he will still remain one of those who sit beneath the master and does not align with him; therefore, he ceases identifying himself with the oppressor. Fanon calls this literature '**just-before-the-battle**'. At this stage, the intellectual begins to reflect the past of the people. But, as Fanon says '**You will never make colonialism blush for shame by spreading out little-known cultural treasures under its eyes**' (pp. 178-80). Therefore, this leads to the final phase that Fanon calls '**fighting phase**' (p. 179) at which the intellectual gets connected with his own people and starts mobilization for the movement. In other words, he gets directly involved in the people's struggle against colonialism.

National literature at the time of war against colonialism, says Fanon, is only combative literature. Else, literature that is non-combative and speaks of false-humanism is serving the oppression of the oppressor. Consequently, there is a movie named 'Party' produced in 1984. It is a Hindi-language film and is directed by Govind Nihalani. The cast of the film are Vijaya Mehta, Manohar Singh, Om Puri, Naseeruddin Shah and Rohini Hattangadi. It is based on the play 'Party (1976)' by Mahesh Elkunchwar. The conversation in the part between the actors is an interesting and needs some attention. It is as follows.

Om Puri: *Amrit's poetry is not just poetry. It is a weapon.*

Manohar

Joshi: *For me, it is just a poem*

Om Puri: *In my opinion, any art creation; poem, drama, novel, or even a film through which if you are able to concur with public opinion, it is a weapon in social or political struggle.*

Manohar Joshi: *But, why are you insisting about it every time?*

Om Puri: *This is not insisting, but truth. Art can never be separated from politics. If you observe carefully, government of every country is using art and media to establish its rule. We have to use art and media as a weapon. Even then if we are not able to achieve our set*

goals, then we have to make weapons as our medium.

Manhar Joshi: *In your opinion, motive of art is to become a weapon of politics. Isn't there any independent entity for art?*

Om Puri: *If the artist is not politically committed, his art is irrelevant. What do you say doctor (Amirsh Puri)?*

Amirsh Puri: *An artist's belief in any political ideology or becoming a member of any political party is his personal decision or choice. I do not believe it is a precondition for the*

relevance of art. But, one thing is clear. Good art and literature particularly in the 20th

century is born under some form of protest. Whether the protest was political, social

or philosophical, it is not very easy to analyze it. But, in the artist's mind, the power of

revolt and protest was very strong. Let it be any political system, it is the prime duty of

all artists to protest against injustice and oppression.

Om Puri: *By the way, doctor, don't you feel to make an artist's protest into a widespread*

rebellion, he needs a political organization's support?

Amrish Puri: *I don't think so. In an historic moment, when many artists join together, they articulate a special sensibility, a special consciousness, it will develop into a*

movement of its own which will reach in the common man's heart and soul.....

The issues of the topic are supported by the cinematic dialogue of the movie "Party" which proclaims that the art – poetry, drama, novels, films– is a weapon in social and political battles. It is very apparent from the dialogue, which discusses the idea that politics cannot be separated from art, and that artists have to be politically motivated for their art.

It is very difficult or perhaps impossible to separate literature from politics and vice versa. In simple words, if the literature does not reflect the reality of one's society, it will be senseless to people. People will have issues understanding the art. An art, poetry, novel, drama or a film contains emotions, emotions that are connected to one's life. In fact, the purpose of the art is to touch those emotions without which nothing remains. Therefore, Said speaks about cultural location of a text, without which, he says, the text is meaningless. That cultural location is one's own land and his history, one's lifestyle in a society, one's language and traditions and values, one's movements and issues and

problems of the society, subtracting which the identity of 'man' would be lost. So, literature reminds one's identity and his location in his land with respect to world.

Finally, I do not want to bind Baloch writer in some definition of intellectual given by writers from West. But, I also cannot ignore the fact that literature and works produced by some Baloch writers is combative, that rests on Baloch culture and his society. In a world characterized by the amalgamation of diverse native cultures, universality emerges from representing and preserving these cultural identities. In conclusion, the intricate relationship between literature and politics is a perpetual source of discourse and contemplation. Ngugi, Said, and Fanon offer perspectives on the role of intellectuals and writers in shaping societal narratives and political landscapes and using whose writings (of course, there are others whose thought-provoking ideas cannot be ignored) there is gap between local cultures that can be studied for better understanding the relationship between politics and literature and the role of later influencing the former or vice versa.

References:

Said, Edward. Orientalism. Vintage Books, 1979.

Said, Edward. Culture and Imperialism. Vintage Books, 1994.

Bill Ashcroft and Pal Ahluwalia (3rd Ed.). (2008). Routledge Critical Thinkers: Edward Said.

Nihalani, Govid. (1984).Party. The National Film Development Cooperation.

Frantz, Fanon. The Wretched of Earth. Grove Press, 1961.

Baloch, Farooq. Balochistan aur Bartanvi Morkhein. Balochi Academy, 2018.

Thiango, Ngugi. Decolonising the Mind. James Curry Ltd, 1986.

Thiango, Ngugi. (Revised Edition) Writer in Politics. Heineman, 1997.