

Volume 04, Issue 05, 2024

Publish Date: 09-05-2024

Doi <https://doi.org/10.55640/ijllc-04-05-04>

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND CULTURE

(Open access)

I Saw Ramallah and its Approach to Realistic Colonial Literature

Mohammed Salim Abdulameer

Engineering Technical College / Najaf, Al-Furat Al-Awsat Technical University, Najaf, Iraq.

ABSTRACT

The concept of alienation and exile was very important among the postcolonial enthusiast literary researches. Due to the sporadic nature of the topic, it was estimated that a new area of research exists to be investigated. Due to this interest, this study attempted to discuss the concepts of exile, alienation from homeland and the colonialism in Mourid Barghouti's *I Saw Ramallah* with postcolonial theory. The research attempted to discuss the problem of resistance and personal choices in dealing with the wave of modernization in the colonized countries or regions. It should be mentioned that while this study focused on the ideological clashes caused by colonialism, it was interested to see how a new concept of comparative literature as a discourse tolerance can reveal the meaning of literary works. To do so, this study investigated comparative literature as a form of literary studies against nationalism. In this case, the Mourid Barghouti's *I Saw Ramallah* investigated new ways of reading about the literature of Palestine. On the Other hand, *I Saw Ramallah* showed that the ideology of nationalism was one of the main reasons which cripples the Palestinian literature to offer a more realistic investigation of colonial situation in Palestine which Mourid Barghouti attempted to criticize in the novel.

KEYWORDS: Colonial Literature, exile , alienation.



© The Author(s) 2024. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third-party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (<http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/>) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.

INTRODUCTION

Literary works sometimes can find significance because of the masterpieces and the landmarks of the past. A spectral presence justifies the necessity of finding the roots of human pain. The question of exile, imperialism, and colonialism in Palestine is one of the stories which is so young but so old, where the history and the fate of colonized countries were very different from those of the Middle East but it does not mean that comparing it with another novel is significant. We are living in a time that The Deal of Century can change the whole story of Palestine differently from the other regions dealing with superpowers. The question of comparison finds its significance in this part. This article offers a reading as one of its research questions, but the way that it approaches that question is quite different. Instead, this study introduces another method of comparative literature as puts its theory in another context. We will draw on Auerbach, Said, and Basnett to see how comparative reading can stand against nationalist narrative and produce a discourse of tolerance. So, the research does not offer comparative literature for the sake of comparison but tolerance and openness. This openness is targeted to the national biased thoughts and will lead to a realistic view about colonialism apart from the emotions on religion or the native land. This is not only a new approach, but it is the intention behind the research question itself. If the question is "why did you choose these research questions, the question of comparison finds its significance in this part. Exile is versus belonging and in this chapter, we would have a detailed explanation of belonging as a clarification tool for the theme of exile and alienation. The whole chapter will be focused on the realistic colonialism in the comparative theory of discourse of tolerance. But such an approach needs necessary prerequisites.

Before starting the detailed analysis of *I Saw Ramallah* in the following section, a general review of the history of comparative literature

from Auerbach to Said, who is one of the main critics of *I Saw Ramallah*, does suffice. So, not only comparative study of literature and the theories thereof are not a sign of redundancy, but they are an absolute complement to provide the material of comparative studying of a novel that has the comparison within itself not from a book from another side of the pond. So, the researcher invites you, the dear readers, to bear patiently with the theoretical approach of this research.

A Theoretical Approach to the Comparative Literature

The study of comparative literature contains various fields and it is one of the most important interdisciplinary approaches in humanities. As it is evident in the reference above, paying attention to nationalist views in the literature is outdated and the prominent figures, the new area of study tries to cover the various branches of literary studies. Comparative literature can cover comparative literary history; literature and the languages; world literature, translation, and globalization; colonial and post-colonial works of literature; deconstruction and its legacies; hermeneutics; gender, sexuality, and eroticism; drama, theater, and performance; the history of the discipline; philosophy and religion; psychoanalysis, trauma, and testimony; visual arts and architecture; technology, media, audiovisual culture; sociology, anthropology, and political economy; history and historiography; geography, geology, and ecology (Behdad and Thomas 15).

Foucault's emphasis is on pushing the boundaries to their extremes and from his point of view, the ways that we compare different cultural products must be changed. In this case, it could be realized that the reason by which the national literature is challenged and must not be guaranteed in terms of appropriacy of cultural investigation is its emphasis on categorizing, finding roots, and categorizing traditions and knowledge. From this knowledge gap, Foucault

tries to change the vision of history to redefine the social boundaries, a history that is not unlimited and progressive and is accompanied by the historical development of man. He states it is our present moment “characterized as it is by a hyper - fluidity and interchangeability of information (as is evidenced in this well-intentioned call for papers), a replay of the moment of Foucault’s encounter with Borges’ imaginary artifact” (Foucault, qtd in Chow 21) . However, the data that we analyze in the comparative literature is literary limitless. It is even though we normally try to categorize comparative literature branches. As we go further, the new branches are constantly added to the field and cannot be fixed. The nature of comparative literature is also indicative of such a process as it is to oppose the concepts of race, nationalism, and fixed identity.

Poststructuralist philosophy which was highly influential on the comparative literature's notions on the subject and the configuration thereof. This article believes that God in Pink postcolonial views on identity follows anthropological postmodern views and therefore could be read through this point of view. However, as the main research questions of this thesis are not based on a deep philosophical view, it is intended to review the relation between comparative literature and the poststructuralist theories in general which begins with a critical reading of a text.

The place occupied by Auerbach around 2011, the time of the present chapter, is thus quite thought-provoking. When post-structuralism emerged on the scene during the 1960s to the 1980s, the universalist humanism espoused by Auerbach’s literary vision seemed to have gone out of fashion. Foucault’s attempt to historicize Man, for instance, was simply one instance of an entire intellectual movement, shared by thinkers such as Derrida, Barthes, Lacan, Deleuze, Irigaray, Cixous, and their contemporaries, that sought to radicalize Western thought by overturning the centrality and continuum of an entrenched anthropocentrism. During this period and well into the 1990s, in North American universities at least, comparative literature departments became the home of

“theory,” and comparative literature practitioners adopted a broad and flexible, because cross-national, notion of literary production and reception as opposed to the more restrictive, nationalistic way of studying literature. (Chow 21)

The very concept of humanism is the reason which caused the violence of Eurocentrism and at the same time, the existence of poststructuralist postcolonialism. In general, critical theory decided to stand against putting Man at the center. The ultimate purpose of such theories in comparative literature is to make the discipline as a discourse of tolerance. In the next section, there will be a discussion on comparative literature as a discourse of tolerance according to Edward Said.

Postcolonial Comparative Literature

This article is mainly about the comparative literature in the postcolonial terms and that’s why his section is dedicated to the postcolonial branch of comparative literature. The whole story started by Edward Said’s *Orientalism* in 1978 which was heavily influenced by linguistic studies. Said is considered as an important critic of the branch beside Homi K. Bhabha and also GayatriChakravortySpivak. It should be intriguing to note that Edward Said did not recognize postcolonialism as the stand out point of his studies despite his fame in the field. After Said, Susan Bassnett, among others, recognized Brenheimer's report in which the postcolonial branch of comparative studies was recognized in the year of 1993. French studies played an important role in the promotion of postcolonial criticism. As it is stated earlier, the work of French postmodern philosophers was very influential in the formation of the comparative post-colonialism. In this way, the works of Althusserian Marxism and even those of Lacan and Derrida and Sartre were heavily decontextualized and used again in other contexts which suited the anti-imperialist favors. In the case of Spivak, Murphy knows her as a person who besides Said, transformed the colonial studies by challenging its conjectures. This linguistic and contextual awareness is central to the conception of a revised

comparative literature proposed by Spivak in *Death of a Discipline*, although she (wrongly in my view) denies this critical insight to postcolonial studies, instead promoting Area Studies as the necessary contextual counterbalance to Comparative Literature's close reading. Rarely has Francophone postcolonial criticism sought solely to promote the sometimes-dubious value of reading in the original. For, as the Anglophone postcolonial critic John McLeod has convincingly argued, what postcolonial studies demonstrates is the highly productive nature of Said's conception of traveling theory, "that is the ability of ideas/concepts to move from their original intellectual and cultural contexts and to be adapted for use in often very different contexts indeed; this process may alter the original meaning of the concept but for McLeod (and before him Said) what is more significant is how productive the shift from one context to another can be. (417,418)

The nature of postcolonial studies is very suitable for comparative studies because of comparing at least two spaces and social issues. In fact, by comparing the two spaces, the postcolonial literature studies the legacies of empires and by no means is limited to English studies. In fact, "[t]he field's center of gravity is shifting, so that postcolonial studies is now generally more alert to the different European empires, and their legacies." (McLeod 11). Although the gradual emergence of comparative postcolonial studies is a welcome development, it should be acknowledged that it constitutes only a partial response to Trivedi's admonishment (cited above) that "the postcolonial has ears only for English" (Trivedi 272). What Trivedi had in mind in this statement is the lack of engagement by postcolonial studies with material written in non-European languages, a point that is also central to Spivak's critique of Comparative Literature in *Death of a Discipline*. Promoting the study of material in Dutch, French, and Spanish – yet more European and former colonial languages – at the expense of widely used "indigenous" languages perpetuates the focus on certain types of cultural production only. Trivedi's position acts

as a welcome reminder that we must avoid premature self-congratulation at recent developments in the field. A more comprehensively comparative and interdisciplinary postcolonial field will require yet further evolution and engagement across disciplinary boundaries as I wrote with Charles Forsdick at the outset of our attempts to define the significance of the Francophone postcolonial project.

I Saw Ramallah and the Realistic Colonial Literature

I Saw Ramallah is a response to the issue of intellectual responsibility toward society. Barghouti writes an article in *Autodafe* journal when his novel was published in English and released in America. This article can be considered as the author's introduction to his novel. Barghouti relates the Israeli conflict with the question of language. He states that "the prolonged Israeli occupation has brought sclerosis to our language." (Barghouti 40).

Our poems have been more pulverized than our streets and yet, the majority of us are aware of the fact that we must resist military, simplistic imagery and khaki poems which is not an easy task. But we have to pursue it with painstaking attention and care [...] we, the Palestinian poets, have to struggle not only against all this existential danger and defenselessness but also against the aesthetic vulnerability of our poetry (42).

When he discusses the aesthetic vulnerability, he does not mean to detach the author from reality; on the contrary, this aesthetic vulnerability requires a deep engagement with the material reality in detail. Barghouti remarks on times "when the poetic imagination worked to escape reality; and claims that the poetic imagination now works to confront it" (Barghouti 45). Barghouti's statements are a kind of Baudrillardian creation of reality wherein reality becomes a simulation of it and loses contact with the reality principle. Therefore, the writer can construct his perception of lived experience, a new version of reality, different from the original. And maybe because of its difference, it enters into a

problematic converse and oppositional dialogue with the everyday reality (45).

There is a lot of criticism about the Arabic colonial writers especially those of Palestinians. The criticism targets Palestinians' self-victimization where they try to make the issue of alienation and exile clear and also, exaggerate it. Therefore, the Palestinian text neglects the rules of literature and style because it only talks about the political pressure in an exaggerated text. Edward Said also admits this criticism and says that these types of writing are written to be put in a doctoral dissertation without considering the right style of the novel (Said, *Orientalism* 157). However, Barghouti tries to use this situation and offer an avant-garde type of writing and reject the normal propaganda based Palestinian writings which "reduce the painting into a poster, the lyric into a military anthem, the play into preaching, the novel into a straight ideology, or the poem into slogan" (Barghouti 43)

To avoid such a situation, Barghouti's strategy is to focus on the individual life experience of the Palestinians and avoid some fixed structural system in discussing the issues of exile and alienation in a politically invaded region. The avoidance of tradition is one of the key points that rest in the heart of Barghouti's style because he thinks that he can describe the issue of exile and alienation from the homeland by writing relaxingly without intensifying the unreal tensions.

What can I do with my poetry and my own language here and now, in my part of the world? What happens to a poet in a cataclysmic society, where people live under semi-eternal emergency, and their life is destabilized and exposed to daily horror and endless suffering? (Barghouti 43)

One interesting point about *I Saw Ramallah* is that unlike expectations, it does not care about the urgency of the Palestine issue. The Palestine issue is a historical long-term issue and authors ruin all literary merits by insisting on the urgency of it. Barghouti rejects such attempts and believes that *I Saw Ramallah* takes a universal approach to the human experience of exile and

alienation and it should not be considered as a local or regional concern like many do. Barghouti adds the idea that *I Saw Ramallah* should not be about regional concerns of Israel and Palestine's conflict because it does not suffice the concerns of the nation and also is devoid of literary creation. Maybe this is the quality that makes Edward Said praise the work and considers it as an exception among Palestine's literature. Said praises Barghouti's techniques and believes that *I Saw Ramallah* does not try to generate a multiplicity of exteriority for an interiority which bears the situation within itself. By contrast, the expansion of the interiority can help the writers to see the situation better and see the issues of exile and the harshness of colonialism beyond the region of Palestine. One of the Barghouti's purposes in *I Saw Ramallah* is the reduction of fanaticism as it engages the authors and sickens their writings. "For a fanatic, it is always useful to simplify; for a poet, it is categorically suicidal. The suffering of a nation should not be used as a pretext to justify the mediocre, the clichéd, and thumb-worn, in any form of artistic expression" (Barghouti 43).

Writers may suffer from the anxiety of influence and despite their weaknesses in writing, they applause the high values of their literary products. However, this greatness of Palestinian writers does anything except universalizing human pain and that's why that Barghouti stands against such ideas in *I Saw Ramallah* and tries to universalize the human pain and does not limit it to the sufferings of a nation. "This conception of a writer or artistic relationship to the suffering of a nation differs from the responses I have imagined above in that it directly addresses the need to universalize the crisis, to borrow the terms of Said's exhortation to intellectuals" (Said 32).

It could be realized that Barghouti was worried about the reception of his work as a sentimental work. This impractical sentimentalism about Palestine's conflicts blinds the readers of political literature. Maybe the feelings of Barghouti about *I Saw Ramallah* could be used as a proof for the need to study comparative literature. Barghouti tried to write a novel that treats the issue of Palestine as a non-regional

conflict. A conflict that cannot be played in the hands of those who want to victimize and mourn for everything under the religious or humanitarian pretexts. Therefore, *I Saw Ramallah* focuses on a comparative view and follows a discourse of tolerance which expands the regional conflicts to global ones without sharing their sentimentalism. *I Saw Ramallah*'s discourse of comparative literature avoids the conflicts itself by avoiding the mourning and sharing the collective values of society. So, the pains of Palestinians have shared roots with other military conflicts and is not something exceptional and supernatural. Moreover, *I Saw Ramallah* narrates the question of belonging without mourning because the sentimentalism of mourning reduces the geopolitical chance of tolerance. This tolerance is one of the principles of comparative literature which helps to delimit the novel to place and time. When *I Saw Ramallah* discusses the issue of choice, the choice becomes one of the victims of sentimentalism because of its exaggeration. The sentimentalism dismantles the literary merits of the work and therefore the world cannot understand the real portrait of the people who are trapped in this situation and offers a narration of Palestine's issue based on clichés, not historical facts. This comparative view and relying on the discourse of tolerance in the novel can revitalize the techniques and the formalism of literary works when they are blended with political interpretation.

This comparative project of *I Saw Ramallah* focuses on the political clichés by the use of language. In truth, the comparative view of *I Saw Ramallah* explains the harshness of exile and alienation which relies on the perception of language. For *I Saw Ramallah*, the issue of exile is bounded by linguistical preoccupations which can be found in the narration of the passages. Barghouti assumes that his methodology for drawing on the possibilities and limitations of language can work. His focus on discursive power relations works as well as *I Saw Ramallah*'s views of language as a human product that works in a social context. As of consequence, the language and power relations can create changes and real effects on the social

understanding of the social and political demands of the public.

In his article on *I Saw Ramallah*, Barghouti writes that "Language is the keyword. Language is a shared element between the world of the marketplace and that of poetry" (45) we attempt to "restore to each word its specificity and resist the process of collective vulgarization and to establish new relations among words to create a fresh perception of things" (45). This importance of language is also emphasized in William Gloss's reference to Volosinov's Marxism and the Philosophy of Language as an operation of and within the realm of consciousness" which then becomes a state or process separated, a priori, from social material activity" (38). By contrast "it is at once a distinctive material process – the making of signs – and, in the central quality of its distinctiveness as practical consciousness, it is involved from the beginning in all other human social and material activity" (38).

If the theme of this research is viewed from this perspective, it could be confirmed that Barghouti believes that his novel must be read comparatively. The comparative reading of the novel, whether it be compared with *Things Fall Apart* or not, shows the necessity of a borderless and beyond regional concerns of language function. That's why *I Saw Ramallah* relies on the shared collective values of the human pain, just like what the Jews of America did at the time of its discovery. The sentimentalism, and victimization of the Palestinians, is what *I Saw Ramallah* seriously condemns and repudiates to accept as the proper literary form that we can have.

that rubbish they call the "poetry of the stones" because it 'takes the accessible and the easy from the human condition and so blurs that condition instead of defining it, misrepresents it at the moment of pretending to celebrate it. It is the eternal difference between profundity and shallowness. Between art and political rhetoric" (Barghouti 160)

Barghouti's engagement with the problems of exile and Palestine as a whole is not religious and therefore, significantly material. Because as he believes, the literary work that meets his

standards relies on the personal understanding and the subjectivity of the subjects. It refutes the objectivity of the so-called truth that dominates Palestine's issue because *I Saw Ramallah* tries to avoid objectifying the subjective understanding. "In *I Saw Ramallah*, we read that the Occupation has created generations without a place whose colors, smells, and sounds they can remember; a first place that belongs to them which they can return to in their memories in their cobbled-together exiles [*'iqāmatihā al-mulaffaqa*, lit. 'put-together residencies' (Barghouti 62). The colonizer has created a new generations of us living with fear from everything around them, "The long Occupation has succeeded in changing us from children of Palestine to children of the idea of Palestine. I only started to believe in myself as a poet when I discovered how faded all abstracts and absolutes were when I discovered the accuracy of the concrete detail and the truthfulness of the five senses, and the great gift, in particular, of sight" (63). Then he was surprised when he said, "When I discovered the justice and genius of the language of the camera, which presents its view in an amazing whisper, however noisy, this view was in fact or history. Then I made the effort necessary to get rid of the poem that was an easy accompaniment to the anthem, that is to say, to get rid of the badness of beginnings" (74).

The selected text above shows its relation to Wordsworth's poetry as it tries to emphasize the subjective perception of reality. To do so, the text above does not use the complexities of a postmodern literary text like those of Pynchon or Borges and does not ask its readers to decode a code. As I suggested above, the narration of exile and colonialization in Palestine is not religious and there is not any sense of spirituality when he discusses the harshness of colonialism. So, the poet, using any creator, should not be depended on "the life of things' for personal spiritual gain" (Wordsworth 133) That's why in the text above, we read about the truthfulness of the sense because it could be useful for a collectivity to rely on subjective understanding rather than the propaganda of the media or other dominant narratives of the colonizing

system. When reading of colonial literature comes into consideration, we see that Palestine is considered a holy place and everyone must be careful about it. *I Saw Ramallah* focuses on introducing Palestine as an effect of colonialism, not a romanticized resistance against imperialism. It is the system that *I Saw Ramallah* suggests as a view for present Palestine.

Please bear this idea that nothing is completely ascertained with the idea of language-based exile and the subjective perception. Therefore, the novel does not reject the issue of exile completely. Williams also emphasizes this idea and says the whole of "real life process" can be known independently of language ("what men say") and of its records ("men as narrated") is an "objectivist fantasy," since "the very notion of history would become absurd if we did not look at "men as narrated" (when having died, they are hardly likely to be accessible "in the flesh")" (Williams 60). The problem of representing the colonial condition of Palestine relies on the acceptance of a lack of knowledge. According to Barghouti, those who think they have complete knowledge of Palestine produce bad colonial texts about the politics of Palestine and turns it into an abstraction (Barghouti, 6). Speaking of abstraction, the text could create a sense of false narrative as some realistic and non-sentimental storytelling can be truer to reality than the others. Barghouti, in his ideas on *I Saw Ramallah*, asserts that these bad prose and poetries should not only be avoided but also anyone who wants to follow the historical problems of Palestine and the West Bank of Jordan River or is allowed to visit Palestine must consider them as a probable false narrative. Thus, the purpose of *I Saw Ramallah* is not to be the voice of Palestinian people to make readers pity them and curse the enemies, but an intellectual comparative work which takes distance from the borders of national literature and then, asks its readers to ponder about every nuance of sentimental nationalism which exists in Palestine.

Edward Said also supports Barghouti in his understanding of exile, as he states that Barghouti tries hard to avoid the absolutes and abstractions and despite his love for the concept

of a homeland, he refuses to offer an idealized notion of land and nation which the other Palestinian writers are suffering from (Said 4). If we look at the first chapter in *I Saw Ramallah*, *The Bridge*, in which Barghouti enters Palestine by crossing the Jordan River, we could see what he means by Palestinian aesthetics. The novel starts with the creation of a moment about returning, showing even his physical senses.

It is very hot on the bridge. A drop of sweat slides from my forehead down to the frame of my spectacles, then the lens. A mist envelops what I see, what I expect, what I remember. The view here shimmers with scenes that span a lifetime; a lifetime spent trying to get here. Here I am, crossing the Jordan River. I hear the creak of the wood under my feet. On my left shoulder a small bag. I walk westward in a normal manner – or rather, a manner that appears normal. Behind me the world, ahead of me my world (Barghouti, ISR 1)

What we see in the opening sentences of the novel, is the rejection of Palestinian patriotism, as the novel tries to purge those kinds of narrative from the beginning. His experiences of the first return to Palestine are not that of politics, but just what his senses tell him. He writes about the sweat on his forehead, the wood creak under his feet but these senses will be replaced by the poet's sharp mind thoughtfulness. Such a sensational view gets weakened not because of the heat that he expresses, but because of the mind and thought that overtakes the feelings and emotions. He does not use the literal meaning for the word mist, but he refers to the mediation of surrounding through emotions. Barghouti talks about his belonging and the other places that despite their significance, cannot bear the same feeling for him. That's why he distinguishes these feelings by using "my world" and "the world". This is one of the best ways that he could bring this cognitive understanding to his readers.

The relations between *I Saw Ramallah* and Heidegger's theory of thingliness is also significant. During the whole chapter, from the comparative understanding of Auerbach to Said and then Barghouti's perception of national

literature, I emphasized the subjectivity, the human subject, and the interpretations thereof. Here, Heidegger is another example of why this research does not intend to compare the two novels and is interested in the anti-nationalist aspect of the comparative literature. If we apply Heidegger's ecstatic thingliness to *I Saw Ramallah*, the reason why Barghouti dismantles the pitiful, sentimental Palestinian nationalism for a more subjective approach would be clear because what matters here, is not what a collectivity, for instance, Arab or Muslim world, think, but a subjective interpretation of what the subject has from the information that he gets from the geopolitical case (Heidegger 20).

This system of subjective interpretation and prevention from forming a collective nationalist narrative is continued for the rest of the novel. *The Jordan River Bridge* which remains a significant part of the novel is not used to show a harshness of exile, but it shows how the regional features like a wooden bridge can show the distances between reality and a nation's dreams (Barghouti, ISR 9). Although there are opinions about the Brechtian metaphorical function of the bridge, it could be said that the old wooden bridge that has not been replaced by a new modern bridge is a sign of social function. This finds its significance when we see that Barghouti does not use any human in his descriptions about the geography and the urban space of Palestine. Consequently, by using this description, Barghouti emphasizes the distances between reality and the Palestinian dream as a result of the social and political malfunctioning in the region and "Barghouti's portrayal of the river like a parked car" (Barghouti, ISR 5) "is at once precise in its deliberate, slightly surreal, banality; on the other hand, it is quietly ominous" (Paulin 74). Such imagism in the writing, once again reiterates the social system illnesses in Palestine as both the old bridge and the parked car are the signs of stopped mobility. This stopped mobility is something that signifies the changes which are created by the people living in the West Bank showing a defeat of the social system, and no progress in anything tragic for Barghouti. This tragedy, hence, does not allow him to return to

the past saying defend the nation against the enemies, but he accepts the problems that exist. That's why this imaginary narrative is truer to reality as he stated in his article.

Among other readers and critics of *I Saw Ramallah*, the bridge is a very important part of the setting created in the novel. For example, as Moughrabi writes, the bridge stands for a collective humiliation of the Palestinians and by no means of national pride; however, it also has signified that the Palestinian people do exist and have been persistent in this region. We could view Moughrabi's view in another way that is closer to Barghouti's interpretation of his novel. It could be said that the bridge cannot be considered as a fixed image of the people in the West Bank. But it has resulted from the dependence on the personal interpretation of the writer himself as a human being who experiences different things subjectively. Maybe it is the reason why Barghouti tries to avoid nationalist attributes to his novel as it helps him to be more subjective and flexible. The novel explains this flexibility of interpretation clearly. Fayruz calls it the Bridge of Return. The Jordanians call it the King Hussein Bridge. The Palestinian Authority calls it al-Karama Crossing. The common people and the bus and taxi drivers call it the Allenby Bridge. My mother, and before her my grandmother and my father and my uncle's wife, Umm Talal, call it simply: the Bridge. (Barghouti, ISR 10)

Barghouti expands this signification of meaning in different people to the social understanding of himself. So, he links his crossing the Bridge to his mind and asks "Is this a political moment? Or an emotional one? Or social? A practical moment? A surreal one? A moment of the body? Or of the mind?" (Barghouti, ISR 11).

It should not be considered that these subjective meanings and the game that *I Saw Ramallah* plays with them ignore the existence of severe political control in Palestine. The old bridge does not mean the metaphorical meaning that Israel is the cause of backwardness in Palestine, but it attests to the actual and real control that Israel has on Palestine. That's why when Barghouti crosses the bridge into Palestine and he faces an Israel soldier "wearing a yarmulke ('bi-qubba' at

al-mutadiyyinīn,' lit. 'With a religious hat on') and is forced to remind himself that '[t]his is a real hat and not a literary conceit.'" (Barghouti, ISR 12). So, contrary to the subjective experiences about the bridge, it shows an actual control over Palestine and no one can consider it as a symbol of resistance as it controls all the human passages into Palestine.

Thus, Barghouti's moment of return to Palestine has some aspects. First, his subjective interpretations and narrations from different people give a sense of exile and colonialism concerning the bridge as an old part of his memories. Second, by showing the Israeli domination and actual control, he demands the readers to read the problem of Palestine's colonialization realistically, as the country's dreams have failed and the real control of the country does exist and has the public transportation from an old bridge in its hands. The function of the bridge is necessary as it works as a starting point to develop the realism of colonialism. I call it realism of colonialism because it both encapsulates the exile and colonialism and then helps to expand the realistic view of a country that has nothing to lose anymore. The bad prose, bad poetry that Barghouti detests cannot help evolve the social strength and covers the malfunctions of the region.

Barghouti designed *I Saw Ramallah* as a journey in the homeland's exile. The confrontation of sentimental literary figures and the harsh reality continues in his journey. This reality consists of the city changes in the region as the bushes and the woods are gone and replaced by new human constructions. Such an understanding empowers the exile and alienation as the author cannot remember his childhood. The autobiographical nature of *I Saw Ramallah* clearly shows how the symbolized meanings for human memory can be lost and be replaced by an image denoting the exile and alienation from the homeland.

I used to tell my Egyptian friends at university that Palestine was green and covered with trees and shrubs and wildflowers. What are these hills? Bare and chalky [kālīhawajardā', lit. 'Dull and bare']. Had I been lying to people, then? Or

has Israel changed the route to the bridge and exchanged it for this dull road [al-ṭariq al-kālīḥ] that I do not remember ever seeing in my childhood? Did I paint [halqaddamtu, lit? 'Did I offer'] for strangers an ideal picture of Palestine because I had lost it? I said to myself, when [my son] Tamim comes here he will think I have been describing another country (Barghouti, ISR 28)

The expression of exile environment is not exclusive to Barghouti, because the critique of the pastoral quality of the environment has become a common method among the writers of the region and Barghouti is not an exception (Cleary 89). There is another aspect of this critique, nevertheless, as Barghouti stands apart from the nationalism of Palestine and wants to show that he “realizes how wide the gap is between the real land and the image in which it appears in his, and other’s [sic], poem” (El-Youssef qtd in. Bernard 132). What we see in the novel is a timeline. The evident images in the novel despite showing the appearance of time discuss the reality of Palestine. According to this scenery, the gap between reality and the Palestinian dreams about their country is very large and Barghouti is shocked in the setting because he comes to a self-recognition about the reality of Palestine.

Had I been describing Deir Ghassanah with its surrounding olive groves, and convinced myself I was describing the whole country? Or was I describing Ramallah, the beautiful, lush, summer resort, and thinking that each spot in Palestine was exactly like it? Did I really know a great deal about the Palestinian countryside? (Barghouti, ISR 29)

Smartly enough, Barghouti discusses the political project of exile in the narrative system and it could be said that his sensible writing is truly amazing. The links between the forgotten dreamland and the reality of geographical destruction mean that the Israeli occupation destructs the symbols so that Palestine would not be more than a memory to its inhabitants and there would be no actual monument to signify those memories.

I have always believed that it is in the interests of an occupation, any occupation, that the

homeland should be transformed into the memory of its people into a bouquet of ‘symbols.’ Merely symbols. They will not allow us to develop our village so that it shares features with the city, or to move with our city into a contemporary space. (Barghouti, ISR 69).

Barghouti's understanding of colonialism manifests itself into the urban space. The colonialization, exile, or alienation from the homeland is not limited to a person, but it is a collective problem. The collectivity of Palestine is held back and cannot merge itself into the modernized space of urban architecture. Therefore, this modernized space only can manifest itself into the environment and has nothing to offer more than the trees and rivers. Speaking of environment, some critics think I Saw Ramallah cares about the environment or the who problem of the scenery is because of the environmental damages of colonialism (Shahede 200), which this study does not support too much. The reason is that this research believes Barghouti's description of the environmental problems is a kind of critique for the realist comparative colonialism that was pointed at the beginning of the chapter. Barghouti vanishes nationalism in a secular context and then links the infrastructural issues to his subjective understanding which is far from an Eco critic field of view.

Nevertheless, it is safe to consider a chance for the environment symbolically as the trees can be related to the experience of homeland and exile. In both Arab and Israeli poetry, the trees are used to explain the problem of belonging, roots, and rootlessness (Bardenstein 153). Barghouti as a diasporic writer has relied on these trees extensively. Barghouti's description of Ramallah on his arrival is bounded to the descriptions of nature. “The green fig that covers a third of the hill next to Abu Hazim’s house” (Barghouti, ISR 37). The novel is so careful not to introduce the trees to the nationalist narrative. So, their function is so similar to the bridge, in better words, as a signal. These trees help the reader to make the differences between the fantasy and real crystal clear and see how it is possible to " distinguish

between ideologies and conflicting opinions and political theories on the one hand and this green fig." (Barghouti, ISR 37).

The description of the tree and emphasizing on its linguistic function rather than the actual presence help to see how the novel has mixed the imaginary with its intended materialism. When Barghouti and his friend are riding the car on the hills, his friend stops it and asks Barghouti to check out the view " [a]s though it were on a postcard." (Barghouti, ISR 64). Husam, who Barghouti's friend, asks him to pay attention to something surprising.

Many Palestinian narratives, work with trees as the symbol of collectivity. This collectivity saves a kind of Palestinian life experience. The use of tree can tell the readers about " thriving when it thrives (or being remembered as having thrived) [...] or, in a large number of representations, manifesting the unnatural, disrupted, and disturbed condition of the people-land bond." (Bardenstein 153). The novel's maneuver on the palm tree draws on both Palestine's collectivity and the obstacles they face when it comes to the problem of belonging and house. The palm tree shows the importance and values of loyalty in the face of trouble. The significance of the tree comes from a scene in which a tree has grown out of the house wall. IT seems to be an obstacle but Barghouti tries to show it as a sign of the natural existence of obstacles in Palestine and normalizes the obstacle. This normalization comes from the author's view about the necessity of a realistic view of the problems of Palestine. This view, as it is expected, avoids the emotional, nationalistic narrative of colonialism and exile. Therefore, "plants grow in the stone and live for hundreds of years." (Barghouti, ISR 65). Moreover, growing a palm tree out of the house wall could be related to the backwardness that colonialism created in the region. This abnormal placement of the tree shows that the Palestinian house cannot resist against a tree and thus is a sign of powerlessness and poverty. Besides, it was explained that Barghouti emphasizes on the urban space as the creator of colonialism held it back so we could see the architectural and engineering abnormalities and should accept them as something natural. These

abnormalities, however, speed up the process of decay and the death of dreams which was explained previously. In conclusion, we have a dramatic situation in the novel which is filled by the scenes of decay and fall of the country but instead of confronting the situation, need to accept it as an ongoing event. Barghouti's experience of exile and alienation is not a sadness for him. But a window to see the situation of Palestine realistically as an ongoing process of decay.

The way that Barghouti treats with Palestinian nationalism, is to avoid imagining a unified Palestine with established national signs like their great mosque and the rest. The novel thinks that the idea of a great Palestine as a free nation is based on a vanished past, a destroyed history that has lost its significance instead of a shared future in prosperity like what the Jews imagine in Israel. The theme of exile in *I Saw Ramallah* leads the readers to see the homeland as a cultural product, not an entity that exists independently. Exile had made Barghouti feel the image of the nation in his singularity, not in the collectivity of Palestine (Anderson 4). For *I Saw Ramallah*, the nation exists in the imagination and then is transferred to the next generations. The nation is a continuous product in "the real processes – all of the physical and material, most of them manifestly so which are masked and idealized as "consciousness and its products" but which, when seen without illusions, are themselves necessarily social material activities." (Williams 62). As the idea of nation is the result of human action, all the narrative nationalism, exile, and colonialization of the homeland are also the language-based process.

The theme of exile in the novel is directly related to its comparative aspect. Barghouti explains his ideas of a nation based on the worldliness that alienation from homeland gives to him. Like Auerbach, in the first section of this chapter, living in exile can be a space to develop the worldliness of comparative literature (Said 4). It could be assumed that Said praised *I Saw Ramallah* because Barghouti has written an intellectual work. The intellectuality of a literary work, can find the roots of the circumstances

and explain and challenge them critically to clarify the situation that society is dealing with. So, maybe it is now more clarified to see why Barghouti calls the Palestinian literature filled with bad prose and bad poetry as they are not really in search of the right explanation, not a solution to Palestine's problems.

the individual consciousness is not naturally and easily a mere child of the culture, but a historical and social actor in it. And because of that perspective, which introduces circumstance and distinction where there had only been conformity and belonging, there is distance, or what we might call criticism. (Said 15)

What lacks in *I Saw Ramallah* is the postmodern idea of literary construction in which the literature is the product of the discourse and the reproducer of it at the same time. Some modern inclined commentators like Edward Said and of course Barghouti, believe that the role of literature is not a production of discourse but its representation. So both critics use this representation to stand against a hegemonic and dominant narrative that the bad prose and poetry of Palestine are suffering from. This kind of approach could be used in terms of writing about fiction and reality. The reality which Barghouti insists to represent. Both Said and Barghouti think that Palestinian art must be based on the Palestinian context and have the native quality of the discourse and land because it is the only way in which the final literary product can follow the aim of comparative literature as the discourse of tolerance. Said stands against the media representation of Palestine and it is expected if we read his Orientalism. Instead of media, he focuses on the close reading and the structure and the forms of literary writing claiming that "it is a text's structure or form, exemplified by Kanafani's use of the scene as a means of representing the present." (Said 38)

For Said, as he states in his foreword on *I Saw Ramallah*, the subjective understanding matters and could be directly linked to the idea of exile as he also experienced the exile. For Said, the experience of exile in Palestine is also a collective experience, and thus the way that we explain it can be varied based on various

conditions. That is why for understanding exile better, Said made a trip to Jerusalem to see how that subjective exile experience of Barghouti works. He knows the "whirlwind of sensations and thoughts" that Barghouti recounts in the narrative of his return." (Barghouti, ISR viii). Said knows *I Saw Ramallah* in another sense as it is different from other Palestinian literature and cannot be considered as a nationalist trip to a parental land that has a lot of potentials and has always had the best people on earth. However, *I Saw Ramallah* avoids nationalism seriously and tries to embed exile within every part of society. So, in *I Saw Ramallah*, you do not have to be Palestinian and live in exile to achieve such a discovery, but all of Palestine is exiled from its value and lost its dreams. That's the reason why Said thinks whatever Barghouti writes about exile is acting exile in every line of the novel (Barghouti, ISR xi). The closing part of the novel also proves such claims as to the main character of the novel never returns to an independent Palestine and leave there with the defeat of the enemy or happily ever after. The reason is simple because independent Palestine has never existed and it does not have such existence yet. The realist colonial literature as I wrote about it in the beginning shows itself once more in here. *I Saw Ramallah* does not try to talk about an imaginary Palestine. It is as it is, devoid of the Palestinian dream of independence. This kind of depiction also helped Said to write a foreword which stands against the idealized narrative of past controlled by the regulative ideal.

Barghouti's *I Saw Ramallah* does not try to avoid history, as the novel tries to point to documents about Palestinian displacement and exile from the homeland which was a great harm to Palestinian identity. According to this document, "in addition to the 750,000 Palestinians who became refugees in 1948, 400,000 people were displaced in the war of 1967, and about half of whom were 1948 refugees displaced for a second time." (Pappe 139). When Barghouti discusses such documents, his purpose is to turn *I Saw Ramallah* as a strong tool for historicizing a traumatic experience of exile. Certainly, Barghouti is not alone in using these historical documents and it can be a

popular method among Palestinian literature. Said interestingly points to these issues and points to the effects of the experiences of exile in Palestine. In one of his writings, Said claims that Palestinians are immigrants and hybrid in almost any situation. Therefore, their lives even as a nation will always be accompanied by exile and alienation from homelands in colonialization and aftermaths (Said, *After the Last Sky* 164).

There are differences between Said and Barghouti's interpretations of exile in *I Saw Ramallah*. However, Barghouti detaches the idea of exile from the unconscious experiences and thinks that an exiled person is in an ever-present condition of consciousness. Barghouti uses Said's idea and says "it is like slipping on the first step of a staircase. You tumble down to the end. It is also like the driving wheel breaking off in the hands of the driver. All the movements of the car will be haphazard and directionless." (Barghouti, *ISR* 131). What Barghouti states, is compatible with Said's statements but Barghouti's thought in *I Saw Ramallah* has different aspects when it comes to problems of exile and life experience. Barghouti writes:

But the paradox is that strange cities are then never completely strange. Life dictates that the stranger acclimatize every day. This might be difficult at the beginning, but it becomes less difficult with the passage of days and years. Life does not like the grumbling of the living. (Barghouti, *ISR* 131).

According to the quoted passage above, the experience of exile is a conscious experience and the exiled person does not necessarily always wants to go back home. This alienation from the homeland comes from the idea that the exiled person may not be able to return to the homeland. This self-realization of alienation from the homeland, makes the exiled person to form new relations and cut the ties from the previous homeland or as Barghouti says in *I Saw Ramallah*, "become uprooted forever" (157).

The researchers and colonial critics condemn exile because it is not voluntary action, it is forced. Although the exiled people will adapt themselves to the new land after years or decades by creating new relationships, this

situation is not started by a selection and that is why it is unjust. Moreover, the realistic colonialism of Barghouti is not an acceptance or supporting the Israeli colonialism. He condemns it because exile is a tragedy that can happen repeatedly and the exiled person has the unrecoverable fear of returning to the early moment of exile. This experience is so subjective that the author of *I Saw Ramallah* repudiates to offer a theoretical approach to exile in the theories of memory, trauma, or nostalgia because it is far from depicting the collective experience of Palestinian people realistically.

I Saw Ramallah uses a method to provide the exile experience and keep its rage to colonialization at the same time. The novel emphasizes the Palestinians living in Palestine, not those who are living abroad. Avoidance from diasporic experience helps Barghouti to not privilege the experience of exile and alienation as a guardian angel. On the other hand, he wants to share that looking realistically at the problem of Palestine can help the readers to see all Palestinian writers who lived in Palestine or the diaspora, make the same mistake of homogenization and want everyone to "penetrate to the essence of their material" (Barghouti, *ISR* 160). "Everybody's income here is from the olive and its oil. People who can still work, work in the fields: men and women together as they have always done. But the work of sons or grandsons or husbands in the Gulf is the most important source of income when thousands of Palestinians were thrown out of Kuwait after the Gulf War the economic situation of many families in the village was affected" (Barghouti, *ISR* 57). As it is stated earlier, the fig tree is very important and resembles the poverty and powerlessness of Palestinian people. Therefore, it can be explained how the economy of Palestine is narrow and lost through symbolizing a tree which is very important in general Palestinian literature not only in *I Saw Ramallah*.

I Saw Ramallah's task is to revoke the Palestinian experience of exile realistically and collectively. It could be said that every part of the novel has been coherent to that idea and all

the aesthetics targeted to the purpose to prevent the so-called bad prose and bad poetry in Barghouti's experience. Edward Said also supports the ideas of Barghouti in his foreword to the novel and calls it a "Palestinian experience" (Barghouti, ISR xi). The novel highlights the experience of Palestinian exile and diaspora as a chance to encounter two kinds of native and diasporic exile as both narratives are covered in *I Saw Ramallah*. In fact, "Barghouti draws attention to the immense difficulties that Palestinians face, not simply on the long-deferred day when the scattered peoples of Palestine together in a single place called Palestine" (Bowman 57). This kind of approach is an apart of the intelligence agency that Barghouti is in search of. Searching for a cause to enlighten the issue of Palestine from a realistic perspective and a very well-built comparative approach.

Speaking of a comparative approach, Both Said and Barghouti, on inspiration from Auerbach and the famous *Weltliterature*, do not try to write a novel or criticism which asks to compare the work with another one. Instead, this research uses the term realistic colonial reading as the writer deals with the issue of Palestine realistically and avoids flamboyant ostentatious nationalist narrative which thinks of Palestine as a united and strong country in the future. Barghouti tries to depict what is happening in Palestine and Said is aware of that. However, there is some criticism about the novel which cannot be hidden. In the anxiety of influence, Barghouti also shares that ostentation nationalism tries to avoid that. This is not only limited to Barghouti, but some other critics want to present a heroic narrative of the failures and pains of Palestinians.

The ending of *I Saw Ramallah* is not sentimental, but it is not pessimistic as well. The novel closes itself with the note that shows the exile experience is full of questions. It is not a straight forward replacement of homeland. The alienation remains a question, although it should not be a reiteration of the failed nationalism. Barghouti says "In Amman I will wait for Tamim's permit. I will return here with him. He

will see it. He will see me in it, and we shall ask all the questions after that." (Barghouti, ISR 182).

Throughout the whole research, this study tried to highlight the various aspects of exile and alienation from the homeland because of colonialization and aftermath. The aftermath is important because the postcolonial experience also matters. Despite the harshness and fits of the anger of Achebe in *Things Fall Apart*, Barghouti's experience is calm, not outrageous because he wants to carefully analyze the situation of the Palestinian experience. Barghouti does not offer an emotional solution but asks all readers to think about Palestinian problems and feel the intellectual agency toward the country. *I Saw Ramallah* does not want to lose hope about exile as the expectant note at the end of the novel shows. It draws on memories to show that memory can be challenged seriously by reality and the moment where all humans see the differences between reality and their imaginations will eventually arrive.

CONCLUSION

What is surprising about *I Saw Ramallah* is that despite the despairing portrayal of the condition of exile as something that they will never learn to endure it is a hopeful recounting. Bearing witness to the dislocation of his people and the continued fracture of Palestine at the hands of both its political symbols and the Israeli military interventions Barghouti's memoir is an attempt to reassert dignity and an attempt to make known the peoples sufferings which have been silenced by the din of Zionist and Arab nationalism that would have them suffer in the name of a greater cause.

What removes the loneliness from the experience of loneliness is the way in which Barghouti portrays the isolation and loneliness of the Palestinians as a shared experience. For a people whose experience of being continues to be erased and the political structures that facilitate the erasure seem to have a life of their own: a separation wall that conceives of an isolated state (if that) for the Palestinians reducing negotiated territorial concessions to a

ceasefire line is more a territorial statement than a defensible border and an Israeli populace that seems rather to want to forget the Palestinians than confront the current crisis. The significance of an emotionally shared experience of loneliness as opposed to a stoical endurance is that it can be a transformative force. It is from the individuals recognition of the shared nature of their experience and the discontent with their situation that the Palestinians can hope to move towards meaningful change. Once the reader can understand the loneliness of the individual through the literal and metaphoric spaces of the text they have made a prelude to understanding the significance of the loss of homeland for the Palestinians and the troubling existence in a stateless existence for Palestinian refugees both of which Barghouti describes as a primordial fear that reality will dispossess them of the last thing that they had left of how much longer they can continue to be.

REFERENCES

1. Auerbach, Eric and Edward Said. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.
2. Auerbach, Eric. *Philology and Weltliteratur*. Centennial Review, 1969.
3. Barghouti, Mourid. *I Saw Ramallah*. New York: Random House, 2003.
4. Bassnett, Susan. *Comparative Literature: A Critical Introduction*. New York: Wiley Blackwell, 1993.
5. Behdad, Ali and Dominic Thomas. *A Companion to Comparative Literature*. West Sussex: Blackwell Publishing, 2011. PDF.
6. Bernard, Anna. *Rhetorics of Belonging Nation, Narration, and Israel/Palestine*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2013. PDF.
7. Bloom, Harold. *Chinua Achebe's Things Fall Apart*. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2010. PDF.
8. Bowman, Glenn. "Tales of the Lost Land: Palestinian Identity and the Formation of National Consciousness." *New Formations* (1988): 13-52.
9. Chow, Rey. "A Discipline of Tolerance." Behdad, Ali and Dominic Thomas. A
10. Companion to comparative Literature. West Sussex: Blackwell Publishing, 2011. 15-28. PDF.
11. —. "I Insist on the Christian Dimension": On Forgiveness... and the Outside of the Human." *Differences a Journal of Feminist Studies* (2009): 224-249.
12. Cleary, Joe. *Literature, Partition and the Nation State: Culture and Conflict in Ireland, Israel and Palestine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
13. Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. United Kingdom: Pluto Press, 2008.
14. Glazer, Steven A. "Review." *Middle East Journal* (2001): 688-690. PDF.
15. Greenblatt, Stephen. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature 8th Edition*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2005. PDF.
16. Heidegger, Martin. *Poetry, Language, Thought*. New York: Perennial Library, 1975.
17. Horvath, Ronald J. "A Definition of Colonialism." *Current Anthropology* (1972): 45-57. PDF.
18. Innes, CL. *Critical Perspective on Chinua Achebe*. London: Heinemann, 1979. PDF.
19. Jaggi, Maya. *Alifeinwriting: Mourid Barghouti*. 13, Dec, 2008. <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2008/dec/13/mourid-barghouti>.
20. Jefferess, David. "Opposition and the (Im)Possibility of Liberation." Jefferess, David. *Postcolonial Resistance: Culture, Liberation, and Transformation*. University of Toronto Press, 2008. 57-94. PDF.
21. Kant, Immanuel. http://www.columbia.edu/acis/ets/CCREAD/et_scc/kant.html. n.d.
22. Lane, Richard L. *The Postcolonial Novel*. Polity Press, 2006.
23. Latour, Bruno. *We Have Never Been Modern*. Cambridge: Harvard, 1993.
24. McLeod, John. *The Routledge Companion to Postcolonial Studies*. London: Routledge, 2007.
25. Murphy, David. "How French Studies Became Transnational; Or Postcolonialism as

39. Comparatism." Behdad, Ali and Dominic Thomas. A Companion to
40. Comparative Literature. West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell, 2011. 408-421.
41. Nietzsche, Friedrich. The Birth of Tragedy. New York: Dover Publications, 1995.
42. PDF.
43. Said, Edward. After the Last Sky. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.
44. —. Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest
45. of the World. New York: Vintage Books, 1996.
46. —. Culture and Imperialism. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.
47. Said, Edward. "Introduction to the Fiftieth - Anniversary Edition . In E. Auerbach .
48. Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature." Auerbach,
49. Eric. Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature. London:
50. Princeton University Press, 1997. ix - xxxii.
51. —. Orientalism. New York: Vintage, 1978.
52. Seeman, Melvin. "On The Meaning of Alienation." American Sociological Review,
53. 24(6) (1959): 783-791. PDF.
54. Seidel, Michael. "INTRODUCTION: Postexilic Eminence." Seidel, Michael. Exile
55. and the Narrative Imagination. Yale University Press, 1986. 1-16. PDF.
56. Selden, Raman, Peter Widdowson and Peter Brooker. A Reader's Guide to
57. Contemporary Literary Theory. Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited, 2005.
58. Shahede, Raja. London: Profile, 2002.
59. —. Palestinian Walks: Notes on a Vanishing Landscape. London: Profile, 2007.
60. Williams, Raymond. Marxism and Literature. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
61. Wolfreys, Julian. Modern European Criticism and Theory. Edinburgh: Edinburgh
62. University Press Ltd, 2006. PDF.