

Philosophy and Progress

Volumes LXXV-LXXVI, January-June, July-December, 2024

ISSN 1607-2278 (Print), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3329/pp.v74i1.82460>

KARL MARX UNDER THE CHARGE OF ORIENTALISM: A REFLECTION AFTER EDWARD SAID

Tahmina Yesmin Shova*

Abstract

In this paper, I examine Said's critique of Marx concerning the discourse of Orientalism. Said's critique has raised profound debate among advocates of both Marx and Said, particularly on the question of whether Marx can be classified as an *Orientalist*—someone who reinforces the *Orient* status of the non-Western people in the global South. I will analyse the merits of Said's allegation by examining the contrasting perspectives of Marxist and Saidian advocates. Ultimately, in the final assessment, I argue that we cannot completely deny Said's critique of Marx. In fact, Marx's Orientalist position in projecting the economic situation in Asia during European colonialism is explicit.

Keywords: Said, Orientalism, Marx, Capitalism, South Asia, Colonialism.

* Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy, University of Dhaka.
Email: tahminayshova@du.ac.bd

1. Introduction

The philosophies of Karl Marx and Edward Said pose a predominant position in postcolonial scholarship, given that these approaches are committed to challenge the long-valued European insights in representing the non-Western world and human lives opposite to reality (Althusser, 1970; Brennan, 2001). More broadly, these approaches are accredited for raising fundamental objections toward the Eurocentric ideological stance of the West. In this respect, although Marx and Said markedly fostered insightful ideas in postcolonial thought, their inherited ideological differences are extensive and raise intense disagreement among their advocators. While Marx embraces a materialistic principle for interpreting the universal nature of social change and movement, an idealistic principle, quite the opposite manner, Said has endorsed examining the ideological divisions between the Orient and the Occident. This binary position between Marx and Said, however, entails one of the central concepts of postcolonial discourse: how postcolonialist intellectuals have outlined the Western treatment of the people of non-West in relation to European colonialism and imperialism.

In *Orientalism* (1978), Said identifies those 19th and 20th centuries European and non-European intellectuals as Orientalists who seek to objectify the status of the Orient in the case of non-Western people. Within this framework, Said locates such an understanding in Marx, when he explicitly justifies the necessity of British colonial intervention in the context of Asia, and thereby recognises Marx as an Orientalist. Said's account, however, in a remarkable way, encompasses several significant ideas from Marxism, for which many contemporary scholars find both an affirmative continuity and antagonistic relationship

between Orientalism and Marxism (Gandhi, 1998). Marx's influence over Said, in fact, is apparent in his dealings, as Amel (2021) and Howe (2007) identify, since Said consistently opted to denounce Marx's thoughts more in his verbal than in his written scholarly contributions. This illuminates a clear point of tension in Said's work about the Orientalist position he ascribes to Marx. Still, Said has been persistent in his claim that Marxism essentially has *epistemological* inadequacies and fails to realise the actual colonial truth of the West from an Eastern perspective. It therefore becomes a matter of debate whether Said's notion of Orientalism poses any real challenges to Marxism.

As a result, three distinguished, as well as contrasting, philosophical cohorts developed in this debate: (i) the adherents of Marx such as Aijaz Ahmed (1992), Kevin B. Anderson (2010), Mahadi Amel (2021), who thoroughly reject Said's orientalist criticisms of Marx; (ii) the Saidian advocates like Gayatri C Spivak (1994, 2013), and Homi K Bhabha (1992, 1994), who find Marx's view objectionable in relation to European colonialism; and (iii) the group of scholars who prefer to be addressed as both Saidian and Marxist, aiming to synthesise the positive aspects of both approaches. In this paper, I will first outline Marx's conception of Asia, including his later revisions, and explore how Said criticises these perspectives. I will then focus on the responses Said receives from contemporary interpreters of both Marx and Said. While I do not intend to provide a thorough discussion of the perspectives within these three groups, I will selectively engage with the views of specific thinkers. Given the contrasting analyses, I will finally argue that, despite the amendments to his understanding of Asia, Marx cannot fully escape the charge of Orientalism.

Before delving straight into Said's critique of Marx, it is important to first understand what Said (1978) means by "Orientalism" and what is implied when someone is addressed as an "Orientalist". Allow me to explain this in the following section.

2. What is meant by "Orientalist"?

In *Orientalism*, Said (1978) identifies those scholars as *Orientalists* who contribute (viciously or productively) to creating a false and enigmatic image of the Orient (non-Western people) and maintain the false information to support the cultural dominance of the Occident (the West). In this respect, Said investigates the writings of British-French-American Orientalists from the 19th to the late 20th centuries, including those of Silvestre de Sacy, Ernest Renan, Conrad's Marlow, Lamartine, T. E. Lawrence, and Gertrude Bell, to show the necessary connection between knowledge and power, as well as their connections to material contexts or "worldly affairs" (1978, p. 27). Such an idea of correlation between knowledge and the power of Said is seemingly based on two key assumptions: (i) Texts or literature and arts are fundamentally tied with their authors' own social perspectives and cultural values. And (ii) consequently, it would be mistaken to believe that authors are the producers of pure knowledge who are unaffected by their specific cultural and political realities. Instead, intellectuals play a crucial academic and political role in fostering European hegemony with the reference to some fictitious and false historical facts about the Orient or *Others* (Said, 1978, pp. 5-6). From these assumptions, Said (1978) draws his central claim that the Orient and the Occident share a "relationship of power, of domination, of varying degrees of a complex hegemony" (p. 5).

An Anglo-American long-preceding definition of a *text*, which Said utterly opposes, is that it transmits objective and pure knowledge generated by authors out of their most impartial perspectives exclusively for the sake of knowledge. It indicates that literary and artistic works (particularly humanities) serve primarily as sources of *pleasure* rather than politics (Said, 2021). To refute this ideological distinction between pure knowledge and political knowledge, Said (1978, pp. 11-10) alternatively advances the relativist argument, that is, there is no such thing calls pure or abstract knowledge that sits beyond any material relations. Texts, according to Said, reflect history and they do have “worldly” affairs (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia, 2001, p. 16). It is essentially a written expression of authors’ thoughts, ideas, and perceptions that, in the end, interpret their identities shaped by a particular political and cultural context, which cannot be imagined separated from the texts themselves. In Said’s (1978, p. 10) words:

No one has ever devised a method for detaching the scholar from the circumstances of life, from the fact of his involvement (conscious or unconscious) with a class, a set of beliefs, a social position, or from the mere activity of being a member of a society. These continue to bear on what he does professionally [...]. For there is such a thing as knowledge that is less, rather than more, partial than the individual [...] who produces it. Yet this knowledge is not therefore automatically nonpolitical.

Knowledge or texts are, therefore, the most significant kind of media that not only conveys the specific history, tradition, culture, and political ideologies of a given community but also preserves the narrative and transmits it on to the next generations through the process of *repetition* and *representation*, Said (2021, p. 32) claims.

Building on this framework, Said (1978, p. 11) claims that knowledge resulting from intellectuals' experiences and understandings is never independent of their surroundings. If this assertion is to some degree true, then the accurate integrity of any established writings may only be discovered by a careful analysis of the settings or history of how it was presented. To explain this, Said states two crucial aspects of a text: its *strategic location* and *strategic formation* (Said, 2021, p. 30). While a text's *representational* quality, which defines an author's specific cultural and political perspectives, is its core characteristic, its *formation* appears when an author writes a book based on her own experiences and searches for references in other writings. Thus, the book itself draws a marked connection between historical cultural ideologies, other writers' works, audiences, institutions, and the subject matter at hand.

Texts that are created in a specific time and place must therefore be evaluated not only in light of the contexts that they are placed in or how intellectuals interpret those contexts, but also given how they are impacting the prevailing political, cultural, and ideological structures of the society. To put it another way, the extent to which a literary work is successful in disclosing the potential and constraints of the societal political and cultural systems determines the relevance of the knowledge it contains (Gandhi, 2019, p. 68). As Said (1978, p. 11) puts it:

I doubt that it is controversial [...] to say that an Englishman in India or Egypt in the later nineteenth century took an interest in those countries that were never far from their status in his mind as British colonies. To say this may seem quite different from saying that all academic knowledge about India and Egypt is somehow tinged and impressed with, violated

by, the gross political fact—and yet that is what I am saying in this study of Orientalism.

The concept of *Orientalist* thus becomes clearer in light of the distinguished definitions Said provides to clarify what he exactly means by Orientalism. Said offers three definitions of Orientalism to illuminate a general perspective of who can be identified as an “Orientalist”. The first definition suggests that “Orientalism”, in its broadest definition, refers to any literary works that aim to represent the culture and way of life of the Orient in the Western mind, since it is a “distribution of geopolitical awareness into aesthetic, scholarly, economic, social, logical, historical, and philological texts, [...] about what ‘we’ do and what ‘they’ cannot do” (Said, 1978, p. 12). By the second definition, Said states that “Orientalism is a style of thought founded upon an ontological and epistemological distinction formed between ‘the Orient’ and (most of the time) ‘the Occident’” (Said, 2021, p. 21). The third definition of Orientalism, nevertheless, shows the genuine Saidian challenge to European and American imperialism by arguing that it represents an unreal or allegoric cultural interpretation of the East by the West constructed through literary and cultural means. That is, Orientalism

can be discussed and analysed as the corporate institution for dealing with the Orient—dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it: in short, Orientalism is a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient. (Said, 2021, p. 21)

Based on these normative grounds, Said concludes that the notion of Orientalism is inherently a European and American

intellectuals' creation fabricated by their stereotyped beliefs, false imagination, and retrofitted facts designed at an unceasing cultural and political power of the former. Orientalism explained in Orientalist writings only reveals a "man-made history" (the idea Said receives from Vico) of the Orient, not any "inert fact", and so as the division of Orient and Occident (Said, 2006, p. 122). This line of thought narrates, quite in a *static* and *fixed* way, the Occident as the owner of a logically and culturally sophisticated civilisation, whereas the Orient's culture is inferior, illogical, weak, and feminine. (Said, 2021, pp. 34-35). Thus, although Orientalist scholars attempt to explain their neutral representation of the cultural characteristics of the Orient, in reality, they describe the Orient in the form of those predetermined beliefs that they had already conceptualised without any justification.

Given the above discussion about the *Orientalist*, let us focus precisely on why Said addresses Marx as an Orientalist, how Marx views the non-Western society pertinent to English colonialism, and what Said perceives as objectionable in Marxist thought.

3. Said's View of the Marxist Conception of Asia

In *Orientalism* (1978), Said identifies three particular contributions of Marx, analysing his ideological position regarding the intervention of British colonialism in non-Western society. These include: *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (1937) (originally published in 1852), *The British Rule in India* (1853a), and *The Further Results of British Rule in India* (1853b). While the first two writings of Marx attempt to divulge the realities of economic exploitation and class struggle

particularly in France, and the modes of production in Asian societies, such as India and China, the third writing reflects some crucial modifications to his understanding of the social system of Asia. In analysing these literary works, Said comes to uncover two different versions of Marx: (i) Marx as an Orientalist; and (ii) Marx as an exception to the rule of Western Orientalism. I shall *refer* to each as: the Early Marx (who has justified British colonialism in Asia) and the Later Marx (who seeks to alter his interpretation of Asiatic mode of production). Let's focus on the first approach of on what ideological ground the earlier Marx constituted his conception of the East.

3.1. The Early Marx

Marx, in his earlier scholarship (especially his works between the 1850s and 1860s), appears to be rigid in his idea about the universality of dialectical materialistic principles to discover the ultimate causes of social change and revolution as the most appropriate road to realise socialism. Unlike Friedrich Hegel's (1777) (originally published in 1807) notion of dialectical idealism, which primarily explains an intimate connection of all worldly objects to an abstract idea proceeding in a triad manner (e.g., B evolves from A and forms C), Marx prefers to limit the dialectical system to a materialistic interpretation of social structure and its changes, referencing to its historical realities instead (Marx, 1906, 1970). In *Communist Manifesto* (1970, pp. 32-33) (originally published in 1848), Marx, along with Engels, identify the character of the modern economy, which is called the *base*, as crucially grounded in the capitalistic mode of production and all other *superstructures* of the society such as politics, culture, and even law are essentially shaped and defined

by the *base* system. This idea of Marx mainly derives from his historical material principle. As Marx and Engels (1970, p. 13) put it:

[I]n every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently the whole history of mankind [...] has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes.

This solitary embodiment of capitalistic principles in the production structure eventually creates two sharp-acting classes in the society: “Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat” (Marx and Engels, 1970, p. 31). Here, (i) the bourgeois denotes that group, that owns the entire surplus value or capital, and (ii) the proletariat represents the group, who are thoroughly being exploited by this institutional set-up of the bourgeois. The bourgeois class as the ruler group acts here controlling the production materials out of their possession of capital, whereas the proletariat class runs the production through the means of their labour, which by nature is transactional (Marx and Engels, 1970, pp. 34-36). This entire growing relationship of exploitation and domination between these two core classes in terms of their level of ownership of capital, for Marx, broadly known as the process of modern capitalism, in which economic power is the exclusive parameter of distinguishing every other thing set in the society. Marx and Engels (1970, p. 36) explain:

The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian, nations into civilisation. [...] It compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois mode of production; it compels them to introduce what it calls civilisation into their midst, i.e., to become bourgeois themselves. In one word, it creates a world after its own image.

This line of thought, what Anderson (2010, p. 10) calls a “unilinear” model, led Marx to propose two of his strong presumptions about the historicism of social change, and what he obstinately implies in explaining the economic system of Asia, that are:

- The first presumption is that the modern concept of class divisions and class conflicts by no means are the products of capitalism. Marx’s rationale for this claim is strongly lying on the presumptions that the actual development of the society is involved in its economic system and the rigorous categories of class divisions and struggles. This kind of social system mostly appears in modern Western society, primarily resulting from its prevailing capitalist economic structures nonetheless generating the highest level of class contradictions, compared to any other previous social systems in history. And, consequently, proceeding from class conflicts to power conflicts, as Marx anticipates, the proletariat class is ultimately bound to fall into the form of revolution to pursue socialism (Marx and Engels, 1970, pp. 44-46). It is therefore believed by Marx that capitalism is a necessary condition for socialism and that socialism is desired by all the proletariat or marginalised class. As Marx (1970, p. 44) states:

Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie to-day, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class. The

other classes decay and finally disappear in the face of modern industry; the proletariat is its special and essential product.

-The second presumption is, by highlighting the Western capitalistic mode of production as a necessary condition for pursuing socialism, Marx (1973) arguably classifies all societies either as *capitalistic* or, precapitalistic or non-capitalistic. Given this, Marx contends that the realisation of socialism is not obtainable in a pre-capitalist or non-capitalist society, since it requires some necessary class relations and contradictions which is only possible in a capitalistic economic system. By this second presumption entailed from the first presumption, Marx alternatively acknowledges the functional superiority of Western capitalism by essentially imposing it on other social systems under the consideration of the possibility of socialism.

This ideological position of Marx, for many postcolonialists including Said, noticeably reveals his understanding that social change mainly facilitates the qualitative superiority of the Western society in the guise of capitalism and invokes its inevitability for any other society outside of this Western modernity.

3.1.1. The Early Marx's View of the Asiatic Mode of Production

Under the economy-based classification of Western society, in *The British Rule in India* (1853a), *Capital* (1906) (originally published in 1867), and *Grundrisse* (1973) (originally published in 1939), Marx classifies the social structure of pre-colonial India as *precapitalistic*, particularly reflecting on some of its inherent traditional aspects. Marx (1853a, p. 128) argues that the economy of India was primarily central to its agricultural and handicrafts productions, and there were significantly no signs of actual

private landed property since both land and laws were crucially preserved and governed by the state itself. A vast number of people living isolated in the rural area were hardly connected to the metropolitan city. These entire circumstances of India's *semicivilized* people fundamentally revealed their ownership of a "static" and "stagnatory" economy (Marx, 1853a, p. 132), which systematically not only bounded in "reproducing itself" with no further development but "resistant to capitalist development" as well (Murthy 2012, p. 210). This is what promotes, according to Marx (1853a), "the solid foundation of Oriental despotism" for the country itself (p. 132). As Marx (1953a, p. 132) notes:

[W]e must not forget that these idyllic village-communities, inoffensive though they may appear, had always been the solid foundation of Oriental despotism, that they restrained the human mind within the smallest possible compass, making it the unresisting tool of superstition, enslaving it beneath traditional rules, depriving it of all grandeur and historical energies. [...] We must not forget that this undignified, stagnatory, and vegetative life, that this passive sort of existence evoked on the other part, in contradistinction, wild, aimless, unbounded forces of destruction and rendered murder itself a religious rite in Hindostan.

Therefore, for Marx, a country like India which possesses a vast populace is highly required of a booster economic development that neither was possible for its primitive production system nor its government. Marx thus arguably reveals the scenario of Asiatic society in such a way as if it is not the West but the people of Asia themselves who are the real reason for their own Orientalist label.

Two obvious assumptions, I reckon, can notably be drawn from this earlier Marxist view of Asia. These are:

(i) The mode of production of India categorically expounds nothing but a precapitalistic tradition which is in a real sense out of modernity;

And (ii), what is the most important to bring a real change in it and allow the Orient to move on to the path to freedom, which is certainly not possible to achieve by their own traditional orientation, is the inclusion of the Western capitalistic mode of production.

This transformation, as Marx (1953c, pp. 148-55) perceives, was so inevitable for India that it would be justified even if it occurred through a forcible intervention by a third party, namely British imperialism. The contentious intervention of the British colonisers, particularly of their economic interests, is thus justified by Marx in the case of Asia by considering its ultimate outcome for the benefit of its own people. As Marx (1853b, p. 332) writes in *The Future Results of British Rule in India*:

England has to fulfil a double mission in India: one destructive, the other regenerating – the annihilation of old Asiatic society, and the laying of the material foundations of Western society in Asia.

Interestingly, in this way, both European imperialists and Marx are expressing the parallel strategic interest that they intend to do something best for the people of the non-West, which is also morally desired by them.

3.1.2. Said's Responses to the Early Marx's Thought

Marx's depiction of Asian social structure has been perceived by many postcolonialist scholars, like Said, as a straight intention to demonstrate how the non-Western civilisation is structurally different and ideologically inferior from the advanced West.

Said (1978) argues that such a Marxist interpretation of Asia as “fundamentally lifeless” is something different from reality (p. 154). Instead, the Marxist view of capitalism is nothing but a part of his Orientalist mechanism in which Marx recognises British colonialism as a precondition for the real social revolution of Asian society. As Said (1978, pp. 325) explains:

[T]he Western market economy and its consumer orientation have produced [...] a class of educated people whose intellectual formation is directed to satisfying market needs. [...] Its role has been prescribed and set for it as a “modernizing” one, which means that it gives legitimacy and authority to ideas about modernization, progress, and culture that it receives from the United States for the most part. Impressive evidence for this is found in the social sciences and, surprisingly enough, among radical intellectuals whose Marxism is taken wholesale from Marx’s own homogenizing view of the Third World.

Said (1978, p. 155) further maintains that

Marx is no exception. The collective Orient was easier for him to use in illustration of a theory than existential human identities. For between Orient and Occident, as if in a self-fulfilling proclamation, only the vast anonymous collectivity mattered, or existed. No other type of exchange, severely constrained though it may have been, was at hand.

Taking the specific quotation from Marx’s *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, that is: “They cannot represent themselves; they must be represented” (1937, p. 62), Said (1978, p. 21) further argues that this is no less than presenting the paradoxical position between Western imperialism and Orientalism that Orientalist scholars often justify through their

literary contributions, and Marx is, in fact, one of them. It is indeed a common shared Western attitude regarding the non-Western people which is usually occluded by a paternalistic and patronising political character that Marx thought was necessary for the ultimate economic liberation of the people of the East. As Said (1978, p. 21) believes,

The exteriority of the representation is always governed by some version of the truism that if the Orient could represent itself, it would; since it cannot, the representation does the job, for the West, and *faute de mieux*, for the poor Orient, as Marx wrote in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*.

Said's point here again seems to count as one of the principal reasons for which he thoroughly criticised European art and humanistic literature of the entire 19th to 20th centuries, that is, they all sublimely and unconditionally assume Western superiority, which is also evident in Marx's theoretical commitments (Gandhi, 1998). There is, therefore, no way to ignore the fact, Said (1978) claims, that Marx's discourse shares a deep relation with the Orientalist discourse.

However, this specific assessment of Marxist thought by Said receives strong counter-responses from Marxian interpreters (Howe, 2007; Sing and Younes, 2013; Amel, 2021). These advocates argue that the specific quote (mentioned above) from *The Eighteenth of Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* does not highlight the Orient people, but rather it underscores Marx's concern for the French peasant class who were suffering in the regime of Louis Napoleon de Bonaparte (Marx, 1937, p. 62). This particular work of Marx primarily narrates the social nature and consequences of the 1848 revolution in France, which ultimately led Louis Napoleon to seize power over France in

1851, focusing on the relationship between class politics and the state. It becomes more clear from the following statement where Marx (1937, p. 67) seeks to represent the perspective of the peasant's class:

Bonaparte would like to appear as the patriarchal benefactor of all classes. But he cannot give to one class without taking from another. [...] He would like to steal the whole of France in order to be able to make a present of her to France or, rather, in order to be able to buy France anew with French money, for as the chief of the Society of 10 December he must needs buy what ought to belong to him.

Thus, a specific quote from Marx, that is - "They cannot represent themselves; they must be represented" (1937, p. 62) mainly highlights the ideological foundation of the anti-democratic and bureaucratic nature of Napoleon's state for treating the marginalised class, rather than stating that the inferior class have to be represented by the West, and Marx was doing so as one of them (Marx, 1937, pp. 62-63). Thus, for Marxist advocates, Said has misunderstood Marx by relating his statement to a wrong situation.

So, the idea derives from the above debate between Said and Marxist advocates is that while Said seeks to trace the common Western ideological stance of Marx in terms of the East, the advocates of Marx are likely to engage in locating Said's misunderstanding of Marx instead.

3.1.3. Contemporary Interpreters' Views of Early Marx

Some contemporary interpreters of Marx, in a distinct sense, acknowledged the Orientalist or Eurocentric ideology in Marxist thought that exactly Said tried to pin down (Krader,

1975; Vitkin, 1982; Anderson, 2010; Linder, 2021). In *Marx at the Margins: On Nationalism, Ethnicity, and Non-Western Societies*, which is a collection of contemporaneous illuminations of Marxist's understanding of the non-Western civilisation in terms of ethnicity and colonialism, Kevin B. Anderson (2010) argues that Marx's *unilinear* conception of capitalism over the non-Western societies does resemble his Eurocentric ideologies and superiority of the West. As Anderson (2010, p. 10) asserts:

Marx and Engels's praise for Western colonialism's conquests in Asia in the *Manifesto* can be seen as part of their overall sketch of the achievements of capitalism in Western Europe and North America [...]. However, while they revisit these capitalist achievements inside Western Europe and North America [...], they do not do so with regard to Western colonialism in Asia. This suggests that at this time, Marx held to an implicitly unilinear model of development, according to which non-Western societies would, as they were swept into the world capitalist system, soon develop similar contradictions to those of the already industrializing countries.

When theorising Marx's obsession with the universality of his historical materialism doctrine, Anderson (2010, pp. 12-16) claims that Marx explicitly states that the capitalistic mode of production is a necessary condition to any kind of society for ultimately realising socialism, no matter whether the capitalistic system growing from the inside of the society or being imposed from the outside. In other words, socialism as an ultimate means to freedom is in no way possible for any society without experiencing the requisite class contradictions that only capitalism can bring on.

In a similar vein, in *The Asiatic Mode of Production: Sources, Development and Critique in the Writings of Karl*

Marx, Krader (1975), one of the American anthropologists, seeks to outline Marx's vision of the East by analysing a good number of his published and unpublished original works (including notes). Krader distinguishes two noteworthy different attitudes of Marx in the non-Western society – (i) East as an Oriental society; and (ii) East as of different mode of production. Concerning the first view, Krader (1975, p. 118) argues that Marx's speaking of Oriental society involves not only economic concerns but all other vital political and cultural issues which made the Orientalist study controversial. Concerning the second view, Krader (1975, pp. 120-25) contends that in addressing the people of Asia as *semi-civilized* and its mode of production as *precapitalistic*, Marx reveals his clear disposition to show the structural differences between the West and the East mainly in terms of European cultural standards.¹ Building on these ideas, Krader (1975) contends that Marx has essentially felt the absence of the Western model of capitalism in Asia and defined its necessary transformations conditioning the inevitable inclusion of the Western model of the market economy. This cultural bias of Marx is also acknowledged by himself stating that his assumptions about non-Western's social systems were largely inferred from the European point of View (see, *Grundrisse*, 1973, pp. 495-96). Drawing on Krader's perspective, Mikhail Vitkin (1982) thus states that Marx's view of the East reflects his Western understanding, that is, "his [Marx] belonging to European culture leaves its decisive imprint on this approach to

¹ For the details of these two perspectives, see, Krader, L. (1975). "Marx on the Asiatic Mode of Production" (Chapter III), in *The Asiatic Mode of Production: Sources, Development and Critique in the Writings of Karl Marx*, pp. 118-89.

non-European problems” (p. 67),

But, quite in an intense manner, in *Hegemonic Orientalism and Historical Materialism*, Kolja Linder (2021) reveals the literary sources from where Marx mainly formed his vision of Asia. According to Linder (2021, pp. 518-20), it is evident in the writings of Marx that he was under the influence of Francois Bernier (1916), a French doctor and physician who articulated his observations of India in a travelogue after spending more than a decade there. Like a typical European Orientalist, Bernier, as Linder remarks, differentiates the West as “diligent, rational, enlightened, and dynamic” from India “as a state of laziness, superstitions, despotism, and stagnation” (Linder 2021, p. 519). Marx’s most of the ideas about India largely derive from this literary thought, as is seen in Marx’s writing to Engels in 1853d (pp. 333-34):

Bernier rightly sees all the manifestations of the East – he mentions Turkey, Persia and Hindustan – as having a common basis, namely the *absence of private landed property*. This is the real *clef*, even to the eastern heaven.

Linder (2021) thus argues that “Marx had much more in common with Orientalist discourses than Marxists are generally willing to admit” (p. 520).

It is so far clear from the above discussion that early Marx’ preliminary perspective of Asia explicitly includes a Eurocentrism on the basis of which he articulates the Orientalist character of Asian people and their mode of production. Marx perhaps soon realised that his perception of Asia was somewhat overwhelmed by Western views rather than reality, and thereby altered his view. So, it just would not be justified to draw any bold

line upon the Orientalist charges of Marx without examining his modified visions on the East articulated in *The Further Results of British Rule in India*, for which many of his interpreters, who could not ignore the Eurocentric characteristics of Marxist thought, ultimately found him worthy of non-Orientalist designation. However, conversely, Said has been consistent in his earlier position. I will now proceed to examine the second interpretation of Marx.

It is not only the whole West's ideology in general being questioned by Said but the whole intellectual community who made remarkable efforts fostering the idea through their nationalistic contributions in literary works in their distinct ways, wherein Said found the earlier Marx as an inevitable part of it.

4. The Later Marx

After immediately publishing *The British Rule in India* (1853a), Marx, in *The Future Results of British Rule in India* (1853b), interestingly discovers the truth that his previous idea of private landed property in India was formed on wrong observation, that is— the property only acquired by the state and the monarchs. Instead, there was the existence of other individual ownerships from the rural communities. Contrariwise to Bernier's observation, Marx (1853b, p. 221) then proclaims that:

The Indians will not reap the fruits of the new elements of society scattered among them by the British bourgeoisie, till in Great Britain itself the now ruling classes shall have been supplanted by the industrial proletariat, or till the Hindus themselves shall have grown strong enough to throw off the English yoke altogether.

This is because, as Said (1978) also remarks, Marx started to realise the sufferings of the Orient and shifted from an Orientalist version of the East to discover the real nature of the Asiatic mode of production. As Marx (1853b, p. 222) notes:

The devastating effects of English industry, when contemplated with regard to India, a country as vast as Europe, [...] are palpable and confounding. But we must not forget that they are only the organic results of the whole system of production as it is now constituted. That production rests on the supreme rule of capital. The centralization of capital is essential to the existence of capital as an independent power.

4.1. Said's Responses to the Later Marx

Said however seems not so convinced to discharge Marx from the charge of Orientalist upon his later perspectival alternations. Rather, Said (1978, p. 153) considers this change of Marx best as an exception to the rule. Hence, the idea of exception of the rule applies to someone in the sense that if similar circumstances were to be found, she would serve to affirm the sovereignty of nationalist thought rather than negate it. In terms of this second ground of explanation, there are two types of intellectuals Said recognises in the category of *exception*, although it does not release them from the charge of Orientalists: (i) Massignons², and (ii) intellectuals like Marx (1978, p. 153).

The first group consists of those intellectuals who individually seek to realise the spiritual difference between the West and the East through their intuition. However, for Said (1978), it is rather a “misleading appearance” of such intellectuals (p. 267). Said

² For details, see Said, E., “Modern Anglo-French Orientalism in Full-est Flower” (Chapter 3). In *Orientalism* (1978). pp. 255-83.

(1978, p. 267) instead explains the Massignons' contributions to the knowledge production in the following way:

Massignon's considerable literary gifts sometimes give his scholarly work an appearance of capricious, overly cosmopolitan, and often private speculation. This appearance is misleading, and in fact is rarely adequate as a description of his writing. [...] Everywhere his attempt is to include as much of the context of a text or problem as possible, to animate it, to surprise his reader.

With regards to the second group, an exception is counted on Marx because of his sensitive feelings for the Orient and for acknowledging their sufferings caused by British colonialism. According to Said (1978, pp. 153-55), Marx's sympathetic view of Asia in relation to English colonialism originated out of his emotions or heart, that is - how the people of the Orient suffer humanistic and structuralist destructions because of such coercive colonial invasions. In Said's (1978, p. 154) words:

These are Romantic and even messianic: as human material the Orient is less important than as an element in a Romantic redemptive project. Marx's economic analyses are perfectly fitted thus to a standard Orientalist undertaking, even though Marx's humanity, his sympathy for the misery of people, are clearly engaged. Yet in the end it is the Romantic Orientalist vision that wins out, as Marx's theoretical socio-economic views become submerged in this classically standard image.

Building on the concept of exception, Said (1978, pp. 154-55) further contends that even if both categories of intellectuals could be considered exceptional individuals in terms of their self-realisation, they ultimately returned to their nationalist thought governed by reason. As Said (1978, p. 154) notes: although Marx

was well aware of the human depredation introduced into this system by English colonial interference, rapacity, and outright cruelty, again

he [Marx] returned with increasing conviction to the idea that even in destroying Asia, Britain was making possible there a real social revolution. [...] Marx's economic analysis is perfectly fitted thus to a standard Orientalist undertaking, even though Marx's humanity, and his sympathy for the misery of people, are clearly engaged. The idea of regenerating a fundamentally lifeless Asia is a piece of pure Romantic Orientalism, of course, but coming from the same writer who could not easily forget the human sufferings involved, the statement is puzzling.

Therefore, Said (1978, p. 271) claims that Marx is an Orientalist, since,

no scholar, not even a Massignon, can resist the pressures on him of his nation or the scholarly tradition in which he works. [...] that in one direction his ideas about the Orient remained thoroughly traditional and Orientalist, their personality and remarkable eccentricity notwithstanding.

4.2. Marxist interpreters' Responses to Said

There is, in fact, a common concern among the Marxist interpreters regarding Said's inadequate understanding of Marx, that is, Said's Orientalist or Eurocentric assessment of Marx shares far less connection to the neutral intensity of Marxist doctrine (Ahmed, 1992; Howe, 2007; Sing and Younes, 2013; Amel, 2021). Assessment as such rather substantiates some particular statements of Marx, considering few social systems of the non-West region. This criticism of Said, I contend, is made by

these critics because of two reasons. First, Said never discloses his radical position against Marx in any of his writings and discusses him very briefly in *Orientalism* instead, which is why, critics consider Said's assessment of Marx as 'brief, allusive, ambivalent' (Howe, 2007, p. 50). Said's rigorous criticisms of Marx perhaps largely appear in the interviews, where he relentlessly speaks of the contradictions of Marxist thought. As Said (1992b) states, "Marxism, in so far as it is an orthodoxy, an ontology, even an epistemology, strikes me as extraordinarily insufficient" (p. 259). By this insufficiency Said, in fact, places a duality in Marx—academic and political—which endorses the interpretation of the US's academic Marxism as lacking political relevance, on the one hand, and identifies the political Marxism of the Arab world as dogmatic and pro-Sovietism³, on the other hand (Said, 1992b, pp. 259-61).

Second, Said refers to a very minimal number of texts of Marx in *Orientalism* and the uses of such precise resources hardly grant Said the adequacy of holding a charge like Eurocentric or Orientalist for Marx. Stephen Howe (2007, p. 51) argues that Said's understandings of Marx are hardly grounded on classical or traditional Marxist thought of political economy and historical materialism, but rather on many contemporary Marxist theorists and historians such as Adorno, Gramsci, Lukacs, Fanon, Williams, who has explained Marx in their distinct ways. As Howe (2007) states, "There is no substantial discussion of or reference to Marx's (or Engels's) own major writings anywhere in Said's. Nor is there [...] to Marxist theories of imperialism" (p. 52). Said's observation of Marx is thus better to be referred to as "Western

³ For details about this perspective of Said, see, Sing & Younes (2013). The Specters of Marx in Edward Said's *Orientalism*.

Marxism” which mostly reflects a European intellectual tradition and Anglo-American academic model (Howe, 2007, p. 52).

I think, this kind of theoretical position of Said, as outlined above by Marxist interpreters, indeed advances the curiosity of whether Said’s Orientalist critique of Marx is missing the corresponding point between classical Marxism, that is, a materialistic and revolutionary approach substantially framed on the long social, economic, and historical realities, and Asian modes of production, then exactly on what sort of Marxist thought Said’s criticisms are relying on.

Forwarding a solid disagreement with Said, the ideological transformation of Marxist thought has been referred to by Anderson (2010) as a ‘multilinear model’ (pp. 154-55)⁴. According to this approach, it is not only the capitalistic system that owns a unique way to pursue socialism, but other social systems that traditionally originated in Asia inherit significant potentialities to the way to socialism which simply cannot be ignored. Having drifted away from the universal sense of Western capitalism, Marx hence tried to reconcile the progressive economic and social characteristics of India and China permeate to socialism. As Anderson (2010, p. 238) notes:

Asian societies had developed along a different pathway than that of the successive modes of production he [Marx] had delineated for Western Europe—ancient Greco-Roman, feudal, and capitalist. Moreover, he compared and contrasted

⁴ For the details, see Anderson, B. Kevin (2010). “From the Grun-
drisse to Capital: Multilinear Themes” (Chapter Five), in *Marx at the
Margin: On Nationalism, Ethnicity, and Non-Western Societies*, pp.
154-95.

the communal property relations, as well as the broader communal social production, of early Roman society to those of contemporary India. While he had seen the Indian village's communal social forms as a prop of despotism in 1853, he now stressed that these forms could be either democratic or despotic.

This later Marx, for Anderson, has truly realised the categorical differences in social systems of Asia and, therefore, rejected the solitary idea of socialism through the contradictions of capitalism; an awareness that could happen only because of the distinguished modes of production originated in India and other similar Asian societies. In Anderson's (2010, p. 237) words:

Marx to have created a multilinear and non-reductionist theory of history, to have analyzed the complexities and differences of non-Western societies, and to have refused to bind himself to a single model of development or revolution.

Anderson argues that Marx hence has revealed himself "as a humanist for whom socialism provides the moral framework from which to evaluate the potential of various social systems" (cited in Murthy 2012, p. 211) and by this principle "when Marx rejected a stage theory of history, he also gave up the idea that socialism must develop out of the contradictions of capitalism" (cited in Murthy 2012, p. 213). Anderson's assessment thus implies that the revolutionary Marx he attempts to figure out perhaps is not the one "who grafts an already existing theory onto history, but one who creatively combines rigorous social theory and meticulous empirical research to promote revolutionary political action" (cited in Murthy 2012, p. 211). and thereby denies Said's Orientalist endorsement of Marx.

Anderson (2010, pp. 17-20) thus asserts that Said has correctly identified some real Orientalist characteristics of Marx for imposing his Western expectation over the non-West, but at a final assessment, he is not. This is because Said's criticisms of Marx were precisely grounded in his early works when Marxism was carrying out its universal revolutionary apparatus in postcolonialism. For holding such specific kinds of writings of Marx, Anderson claims that Said's criticisms are based on partial knowledge of Marx. Therefore, despite the fact that Said has rightfully reacted to Marx for his previous unilinear thought of expecting all kinds of societies to have the capitalistic mode of production at any cost in order to achieve socialism, he is left to consider the later modifications Marx endorses at the end realising the value of other social systems as the one exists in Asia.

Apart from other Marxist interpreters, I however assert that Mahdi Amel's view is categorically different and quite intransigent. While at some point Marxist interpreters like Anderson admit the Orientalist content in Marxist thought, Amel thoroughly rejects such allegations by asserting it as entirely a conceptual abstraction and ideological misinterpretation of Said. In the article *Is the Heart for the East and Reason for the West?* Amel (2021) endeavours to answer criticisms of Said in this respect explicating his sole purpose of deconstructing the logic of Orientalism as outlined by Said. Amel thus proceeds on the way to this through: (i) the explanation of differentiating the logical principles between Said and Marx as a justification of why Saidian idealistic logic categorically fails to understand the materialistic logic of Marx. And (ii) rebutting the delineation between heart and reason that is endorsed in Said's theory originates from a similar logical spirit. Hence, the former ground

of explanation, for Amel, necessarily entails the second one. Allow me to explain these in detail in the following section.

4.3. Error in the Logic of Orientalism in Amel's View

According to Amel (2021, pp. 484-85), the general principle of Western nationalist thought Said has endorsed in *Orientalism* is mainly based on the “logic of identification” or “logical formalism”; an idealistic approach that identifies and governs the ‘empiricist and positivist’ thoughts by its prevailing rule. For Amel, the logic of the identity of opposites entails that disagreements are to be acceptable in the sense of exception to the rule which resides irrationally outside of the subject matter. This logic of *Orientalism* seems to Amel, on the one hand, enforcing the action that “one can deduce that all Western thought is, in its relation to the East, Orientalist thought, by merely viewing the East from West” (2021, p. 483), and, on the other hand, inappropriate for the assessment of Marxism. This is particularly because, Marxist theory is primarily constructed on materialistic contradictions deeply linked to its historical process, whereas “the logic of the identity of opposites” (Amel, 2021, p. 484) explains contradictions based on a hegemonic rule which “does not allow for materialistic contradiction, nor is it capable of grasping its reason (Amel, 2021, p. 485). For this logic, *denial* is the best means to deal with any materialistic contradictory ideas based on an ‘either... or...’ formula (Amel, 2021, p. 485). Thus, the formal logic, hence, runs on “human feelings”, shares no fundamental relationship with the materialistic logic of contradictions and there is no way of settling down the antagonistic relation between them (Amel, 2021, p. 485). Because of these logical differences, for Amel, a formalistic or

empiricist logic like that of Said falls into a dilemma whenever it tries to shape materialistic theory like Marxism, which is principally different to it.

Amel (2021, p. 483) further maintains that Said's text typically follows the general principle established on an idealistic logic: "The prevailing thought in a nation is the national thought that governs all individuals". This "thought structure of nation" resulted in the uneven relationship between East and West that the identification of the East as Oriental does not reflect the actual East, but entirely an imagination constructed and governed by the Orientalists themselves (Amel, 2021, p. 483). However, Amel (2021, p. 499) criticises Said's kind of "abstract conception" stating that Orientalism enhances a hegemonic view of social representation which necessitates the thorough involvement of all the scholarly contributions without having any consideration of any exception or difference: "no scholar in the West can escape this relation, even if he is not an Orientalist" (p. 483). This is the ideology of the general nationalist thought structure, which for Said originated only in the West, solely governed Said to believe Marx was an Orientalist and this conclusion will remain till the end no matter how much Marx was concerned with the Orient.

Moreover, the heart-reason duality of Said for clarifying his concept of exception, Amel argues, on the one hand, reflects two sides of the same coin and implies no real difference in his principal ideological standpoint, and nothing more than an intentional exertion of creating unreal contradictions in the actual Marx's theoretical spirit, on the other hand. This is precisely because, Said's inclusion of exceptional intellectuals and returning them to the Orientalist position illuminates his principal preference for the idealistic logic of Western nationalist thought, which is tailored

by his strong belief that an individual exception is incapable of bringing any crucial change in the prevailing nationalist thought and will somehow dissolve in such vast major sense. For this reason, Amel maintains, an exception is not an appreciation to the individual intellectuals here, but to restore the general principle of Said's theory to produce this result:

[A]ll changes in thought assimilate to its pre-established structure and preserve it. Therefore, this change is not actual change, but the form through which this thought structure renews and, in consequence, eternalizes itself. (Amel, 2021, p. 489)

Additionally, by this dual thought mechanism Said tries to make Marx fall into the theoretical dilemma, that is:

It is as if Marx were caught in a struggle between reason and the heart. It is as though the heart were for the East and reason for the West, so that the heart speaks and reason falls silent, then Orientalist thought is defeated. But as soon as reason speaks through Marx's espousal of historical necessity, Orientalist thought prevails. (Amel, 2021, p. 487)

This again perhaps is the general principle of Said that speaks of its eternity imposing that "every scientific or rational appraisal of the East were bound by the necessity of succumbing to Orientalist logic as the logic of Western thought" (Amel, 2021, p. 487).

Amel thus finally concludes that this way of proceeding to understand the ideological spirit of Marxism would not be successful because of its logical errors:

The solution sought by this thought in order to resolve the crisis remains an impossible one; it relies on the abolishing of

contradiction. Yet the contradiction cannot be abolished, since it is material. (Amel, 2021, p. 486)

The key idea derived from the aforesaid Marxist interpreters' views is that Said's understanding of Marxist thought or readings is not centred on his objective analysis of historical materialism in which Eastern societies are also a significant part of the strand, but rather on a predetermined nationalist thought structure. Said's view of the West could be reasonable if he could have identified his idea of Western nationalist thought as reflecting mainly the thought structure of its bourgeois class rather than generalising all Westerners as Orientalists or all Easterners as marginalised. And that is why, Said fails to obtain the spirit of revolution as the path to liberation that Marx proposed for every single marginalised individual of both East and West standing against the Western bourgeois class. Said's logic follows here a deductive pattern from which assessment of a kind of rational theory is bound to have an Orientalist designation, even an exception would follow the same consequence.

Given the above multi-dimensional discussions, I argue, that what offers Marxist's theory here, in accord to his proponents, an anti-colonial entitlement is duly his rightful identification of the fact that Western society is fundamentally elevated on a system of exploitation and domination, and his meticulous criticisms against the legitimacy of a Western bourgeois class ruling over the vast proletariat class. Showing equally the way out of breaking the long-growing unjust societal structure thus granted this theory of Marx a form of resistance, broadly a postcolonial mark.

5. Concluding Assessment

Given all the foregoing, it is apparent that both Marx and Said have envisioned the world as unjustly divided between groups and seriously posed questions about the legacy of European rule. However, while Marx emphasises social *structure* elucidating the class relation to economic principles as an existing fact of every contemporary society, Said stresses social *representation* defining the world's dividing line between the Orient and the Occident in terms of Western interpretation of race, gender, culture, and politics. Although a substantial motivational difference in these discourses is apparent, I argue that Said's special attention to Marx is undeniable. The possible reasons for this attention could involve Said's seriousness in investigating whether Marxism deserves a genuine place in the postcolonial study since many of his adherents strongly consider this approach as the breaking ground of postcolonialism for significantly figuring out the Western bourgeois' unjust domination over the marginalised class and the way to get rid of it (Chia, 2008). Additionally, at later times (since the 1980s), Marxism calls for to receive different explanations from different scholars including the postcolonialists and specialists of cultural and subaltern studies when the failure of socialism becomes evident and intellectuals look to construe the doctrine of capitalism from different dimensions which include:

[T]he shift from a Fordist to a neoliberal mode of capitalism, which instigated a crisis in and the eventual fall of the Soviet bloc, the emergence of market capitalism in China, a dynamic increase in the growth rates of various non-European nation-states, and a global defeat of leftist politics. (Murthy, 2012, p. 209)

Principally, Marxism, which fosters a different vision of the materialistic structure of social change and comprises some obvious transformations and consequences, is best known to its proponents and commentators as an anti-colonial and revolutionary political approach of the late 20th century (Chia, 2008). This theory is extensively recognised for its historical materialism that explains the ruler and ruled class relation under the broader concept of economic imperialism and social revolution. However, I contend that the over possessiveness of Marx in material relations reveals his less interest in ideas and more in matters, for which he was enthusiastic to limit the dialectical process of revolution to the historical events of society, particularly in the European context. What Said has opposed here with Marx is his universal division between the base (economics) and superstructure (politics, culture), and to see the entire non-West division as a subject of identical structure. Said instead has tried to link between structure and superstructure to explicit their ultimate relation to a particular Western ambition and emphasises that it is the idea that matters most in historical events—the idea that gives birth to ideologies like colonialism and imperialism. Marx's doctrine significantly thereby lacks the distinct cultural and political realities of the societies, as Said contends, lying outside the European border; the realities which demonstrate how the political ideology governs the entire social system including subjects like economics, culture, and education.

In Saidian Orientalist charge of Marx, interpreters of Marxist thought demonstrate two different trends here. One group of intellectuals find quite a similar ideological spirit in Said and Marx, that is, they both endorse an anti-colonial paradigm, while

another group of scholars refuse any kind of possibility of viewing one theory through the other one. Following this category, this could arguably be said that if Said's dual understanding, as Amel identifies, illuminates a clear dilemma of his thought about Marx, then this dilemma is not only possessed by Said himself but also by many Marxist interpreters like Anderson. In a similar sense, the point of the argument made by interpreters like Anderson, that an overall understanding of Marx exonerates him from Orientalist accusations, is in no way sufficient to negate the Eurocentric charges of Marx.

The question at the centre is not whether Marx has realised the particular value of the Asian mode of production, but rather what has thoroughly been imposed over the non-West in the name of Western superiority. Appreciating the value of other modes of production does not guarantee that Marx's preference for a capitalistic economy disappeared or that it is not required anymore. To the fact, Marx is well aware that no society is unaware of the capitalistic realities, as British imperialism in the East obliterates every possible doubt of it, and socialism could be desirable to all as the ultimate consequence of capitalism. This is certainly because even after reapproaching his view to the non-Western mode of production, Marx never left his ultimate purpose of necessitating capitalism, that is, how to make socialism possible for any society. If this makes sense, that Marx's socialism itself is a Western concept and that this is what Western capitalistic societies are required to look for, then there is no point in arguing whether Marx gives a different kind of consideration to any particular production system of Asiatic nations or not. Thus, I argue whether it is unilinear or multilinear, Said's Orientalist accusation of Marx stands on both grounds.

This is equally ignored by the contemporary interpreters of Marx that although Marx's initial ideological sketch of the Asian mode of production is explicitly based on his universal model of social change, it is also significantly grounded on some literary facts, rightfully identified by Linder (2021) and Anderson (2010), which undeniably exemplifies Marx's Orientalist character as Said remarks. Under both of these notions, Marx goes on to define the idea of imperialism as accepting European superiority and universalises the idea based on the assumption that a society must be conceived under imperial rule if its economic system is running after the capitalistic norm. The European literary works seem to impact Marx so intensely that even in reapproaching Asia Marx never includes studies like culture, racism, and gender which are inevitably crucial to understanding the realities of colonialism in Eastern society. Linder (2021) justifiably identifies this dearth in Marxism arguing that both Marx and his strong interpreters, like Amel, have undermined the role of other social issues such as racism and gender in strengthening European essentialism, as they failed to realise: "racializing discourses and practices that are an important feature of Orientalism are not equivalent to class representations and praxis" (p. 518). Thus, Amel's efforts of confining Orientalism only to the Western bourgeois thought just only devalued its hegemonic appeal. We completely cannot ignore the truth that this kind of Western theory of justice neither expressed any concern for the role of race and gender issues nor the cultural facts, which theorists like Said found more crucial than that of economic tension.

If we are convinced enough by Said's criticisms against Marxism, it would then be meaningful to say that the capitalistic system is one of the mechanisms to persist group conflict so

that being stuck in their national conflicts non-Western people would never be able to come out of their imposed cultural identity. Perhaps, does the negation of Marxist justifications indicate that Marxist theory has no place in the non-Western society in relation to English colonialism? Like Said's theory, we also entirely cannot overlook the postcolonial urges of Marxism either, that it utterly discloses critical responses to social inequality and injustice that severely deprived a majority number of people by another group in the name of freedom and equality. As a result, I hence would like to endorse the economic concern in addition to Linder's (2021) cultural concern. His idea of economic imperialism entails one of the important realities of postcolonial society, that is, colonialism is extensively grounded on both of the ambitions political and economic rule of the Westerners. Thus, while Marxism seriously ignores the philosophical trends of racism, gender, and culture, to which the all-inclusive European and US intellectual body sincerely are devoted and which drives a scientific ground for the new interpretation of humanism in 19th and 20th centuries, Said also fails to relate the role of economic interests that Marx advances to European colonial realities. This is admissible that economic acquisition and modification were one of the crucial purposes of the British invasion of Asian countries. Understanding colonialism, therefore, only from an economic perspective or only from Orientalist literature essentially reflects incomplete knowledge of the marginalised Orient.

Bibliography

- Ahmad, A. (1992). In theory: Classes, nations, literatures. Oxford University Press.
- Amel, M. (2021). Is the heart for the East and reason for the West? On Marx in Edward Said's Orientalism. *Critical Times*, 4(3), 481–500.
- Anderson, K. B. (2010). Marx at the margin: On nationalism, ethnicity, and non-Western societies. University of Chicago Press.
- Ashcroft, B., & Ahluwalia, P. (2001). Edward Said (2nd ed.). Taylor & Francis Group.
- Bernier, F. (1916). Travels in the Mogul Empire A.D. 1656–1668 (A. Constable, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1671)
- Bhabha, H. K. (1992). Postcolonial criticism. In S. Greenblatt & G. Gunn (Eds.), *Redrawing the boundaries: The transformation of English and American literary studies* (pp. 437–465). Modern Language Association.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
- Chia, P. (2008). The sun never sets on 'Marx'? (Marx) colonizing postcolonial theory (Said/Spivak/Bhabha)? *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 30(4), 481–488.
- Gandhi, L. (1998). *Postcolonial theory: A critical introduction*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1977). *The phenomenology of spirit* (A. V. Miller, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1807)
- Howe, S. (2007). Edward Said and Marxism: Anxieties of influence. *Cultural Critique*, (67), 50–87.
- Krader, L. (1975). *The Asiatic mode of production: Sources, development and critique in the writings of Karl Marx* (Vol. 1). VAN GORCUM & COMP. B.V. - ASSEN.

- Linder, K. (2021). Hegemonic Orientalism and historical materialism: Karl Marx, Edward Said, and Mahdi Amel. *Critical Times*, 4(3), 517–529.
- Marx, K. (1906). *Capital: A critique of political economy*. The Modern Library. (Original work published 1867)
- Marx, K. (1937). *The eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*. Progress Publishers. (Original work published 1852)
- Marx, K. (1970). *A contribution to the critique of political economy* (S. W. Ryazanskaya, Trans.; M. Dobb, Ed.). International Publishers.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1970). *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (S. Moore, Trans.). Foreign Languages Press. (Original work published 1848)
- Marx, K. (1973). *Grundrisse: Introduction to the critique of political economy* (M. Nicolaus, Trans.). Vintage. (Original work published 1939)
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1853a). The British rule in India. In *Collected works (1853–54)* (Vol. 12, pp. 125–133). Lawrence & Wishart; International Publishers.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1853b). The future results of British rule in India. In *Collected works (1853–54)* (Vol. 12, pp. 217–222). Lawrence & Wishart; International Publishers.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1853c). The East India Company – Its history and results. In *Collected works (1853–54)* (Vol. 12, pp. 148–156). Lawrence & Wishart; International Publishers.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1853d). Marx to Engels in Manchester. In *Collected works (1852–55)* (Vol. 39, pp. 330–335). Lawrence & Wishart. (2010). Electric Book.
- Murthy, V. (2012). Reviewed work: Marx at the margin: On nationalism, ethnicity, and non-Western societies by Kevin B. Anderson. *Journal of World History*, 23(1), 209–214. University of Hawai'i Press.

- Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Vintage Books.
- Said, E. W. (1992b). Interview. In M. Sprinker (Ed.), *Edward Said: A critical reader* (pp. 221–264). Blackwell.
- Said, E. W. (2006). Introduction to *Orientalism*. In J. Morra & M. Smith (Eds.), *Visual culture: Critical concepts in media and cultural studies*. Routledge.
- Said, E. W. (2021). *From Orientalism*. In P. Mongia (Ed.), *Contemporary postcolonial theory: A reader*. Routledge.
- Sing, M., & Younes, M. (2013). The Specters of Marx in Edward Said's *Orientalism*. *Welt des Islams*, 53(2), 149–191.
- Spivak, G. C. (1994). Can the subaltern speak? In P. Williams & L. Chrisman (Eds.), *Colonial discourse and post-colonial theory: A reader* (pp. 67–111). Columbia University Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (2013). General strike. *Rethinking Marxism*, 26(1), 9–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08935696.2014.857839>
- Vitkin, M. (1982). Marx between West and East: Reflections on L. Krader's *The Asiatic Mode of Production and The Ethnological Notebooks of Karl Marx*. *Studies in Soviet Thought*, 23(1), 63–74.