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We live in a post-colonial reality. It is a fact of history. A past that determines the present, a present that determines the future. It is not the colonization of land that this project seeks to inquire about, but the colonization of knowledge, for what we know determines who we are. This thesis studies the relationship between the construction of the colonial self and the colonial reality from which it derives consciousness. It is an epistemological examination of a form of knowledge that presupposes the inferiority of the colonial being. This colonization of knowledge is the foundation of Western Humanism that has transformed the hegemonic culture of neo-colonialism. The underdevelopment of the peoples of the post-colonial state is owed to a mechanism of exploitation that originates in the making of the neo-colonial culture. This thesis contributes to the decolonial discourse that strives to decolonize the consciousness - a New Human, a Reconstruction of Knowledge.
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Introduction

The Pakistani Question and Decolonial Paradigm

*One fact that is paramount in my eyes is this: we, men of color, at this precise moment in our historical evolution, have come to grasp, in our consciousness, the full breadth of our singularity and are ready to assume on all levels and in all areas the responsibilities that flow from this coming to consciousness.* - Aimé Césaire, *Letter to Maurice Lopez* (1956)

This study examines the postcolonial state, Pakistan, and its postcolonial subject to confront and contest the problem of neo-colonialism in language, class, and race relations. It is an epistemological inquiry into the colonial forms of knowledge integrated into the post-colonial state that make the hegemonic culture and, consequently, determine the system of social relations. It provides a critical account of the decolonial paradigm, which refutes the neo-imperial form of knowledge production that reproduces the power structures imposed upon marginalized cultures. This decolonial paradigm is an intellectual foundation, a material framework for the emergence of a revolutionary humanism that endeavors to dismantle the dominant culture that naturalizes the system of social relations by forming a counter-culture that is an amalgam of the subaltern. The Pakistani Question is a conceptualization within the framework of the decolonial paradigm. It aims to symphonize the prospect of a liberation struggle for the people of Pakistan with the revolutionary humanism of the decolonial framework. Hence, we begin by asking: What is the Pakistani Question? The Pakistani Question is, at its core, a question of identity. It refers to the nexus of ideas constituting the collective space from which individuals derive political consciousness. In other words, the ideas that shape our material reality and, in turn, how we interact with it are endowed upon us by a system of social relations that is not a project of liberation but a mechanism of oppression. The Pakistani Question is not only a question of Pakistan but, in
consequential terms, of the post-colonial state whose existence is fundamentally rooted in a colonial framework. And since the contemporary world is a post-colonial reality, it is through delving into the dynamic of the post-colonial state that one can begin to understand beyond the dichotomies in which the world is perceived: Developed and Developing, North and South, First World and Third World.

The Pakistani Question is epistemological, meaning it is an inquiry into the theory of knowledge formation whereby knowledge refers to the methodology through which concepts are naturalized in the fabric of society. It examines how knowledge is produced, who produces it, and its relation to political consciousness within a post-colonial reality. It critically investigates the dominant framework of knowledge as a form of neo-colonialism that colonizes the consciousness and qualifies the development of the post-colonial society. Pakistan is the subject of interrogation as it is an appropriate case of a neo-colonial framework of knowledge formation, which has, over the generations, reproduced itself. The persistence of this phenomenon implies an interconnected relation of power that reorganizes and acclimatizes with the fluctuating political realities. The Pakistani Question examines this theory of knowledge formation that colonizes the consciousness. It is a question of the post-colonial reality of neo-colonialism in Pakistan. It posits the intersectionality of the racial dimension with the class conflict. It interrogates the neo-colonial framework that produces the socio-economic hierarchy and maintains the power of the ruling elite. But the Pakistan Question is more than a question. It is a theoretical undertaking that provides a historical critique of the emergence of the neo-colonial status and conceptualizes revolutionary education, rooted in the decolonial paradigm, as a project of liberation and transformation of the system of social relations.
This epistemological inquiry into consciousness and knowledge formation contributes to the decolonial paradigm, a liberation project that refutes the dominance of Western forms of knowledge and endeavors to critique the relationship between Western modernity and colonialism by examining indigenous cultures and perspectives. It is a critical framework that aims to challenge the legacy of colonialism and how it has shaped the post-colonial culture and society. In other words, the decolonial paradigm investigates the imposition of power structures upon marginalized societies and contextualizes the inter-temporal underdevelopment of the post-colonial state. It calls for a radical dismantling of the current epistemologies, be it the presentation of the English Language as a symbol of civilization that is a prospect of socio-economic mobility or the radicalization of religion as an ideological weapon to maintain the hegemonic culture and the inhibition of intellectual development of the masses. It searches for a new form of humanism that morphs the collective into the making of a revolutionary political consciousness that liberates the subaltern classes from the colonial framework and its forms of knowledge that reproduce a system of oppression.

The thesis has been structured into three chapters: Chapter 1 is an inquiry into Classical Marxism as the philosophy of praxis and its influence on the project of African liberation. It first examines the concept of alienation and provides a racial dimension by engaging in a comparative analysis of the worker and the native. Second, it introduces the concept of the superstructure and historical materialism to understand society's evolution. In other words, a critical account of the abovementioned concepts sets the foundation for a theory of the colonization of consciousness. Chapter 1 concludes with a decolonial critique of classical Marxism and examines the prospect of a new form of humanism within the philosophy of praxis that forms the foundation of political consciousness. Chapter 2 furthers the analysis by providing a critical account of the formation of
consciousness and ideology and how the two phenomena are interrelated. Secondly, it puts forward a theory of colonization of consciousness rooted in a sociogenic analysis borrowing from the work of Sylvia Wynter and Frantz Fanon. It critiques the geography of reason and the universality of man’s consciousness as defined by European Humanism. It further contextualizes the project of linguistic assimilation as a mechanism for the reinforcement of the colonial framework whereby the native in the colony is transformed into the savage. Thirdly, Chapter 2 goes beyond the colonial epistemology and utilizes the case study of Pakistan to analyze the transformation of consciousness in the decolonial period under which the post-colonial state existed. The final Chapter 3 examines the prospect of decolonizing the consciousness and grounds the investigation into the search for a revolutionary humanism that requires the de-anglofication of knowledge and the empowerment of marginalized cultures as the medium to shift the power structures. It interrogates the Gramscian concept of counter-culture through which the Collective Man - the space that drives the individual consciousness - can be transmuted into a decolonial consciousness through the changes in the system of social relations. Lastly, Chapter 3 analyzes the Negritude Movement and how it provides insight into the Pakistani Question.

The theoretical framework of this thesis relies on a combination of methodologies that improves the substance of the concepts under investigation. Since the purpose of the thesis was to provide a refutation of the Western epistemologies, the Decolonial hermeneutic, a critical methodology, allowed for a literary critique of the decolonial texts that contribute towards highlighting the historical impact of colonial and aim to subvert the knowledge systems that reproduce mechanism of oppression in the post-colonial state. This, combined with a discursive analysis approach that relies on linguistic styles and rhetorical devices, permitted the examination of how knowledge is produced within a discourse. So far as this thesis presents a theoretical
investigation of the epistemologies of the decolonial paradigm, there are limitations to the
discourse that has been analyzed. Though the thesis mentions the intersectionality of race, class,
and religion, it does not provide a theory that encompasses how these multi-dimensional concepts
interact to produce the collective space. The thesis analysis is limited to the qualitative devices and
is part of a larger project that will build on quantitative measures. The final limitation of the thesis
is its focus on the case of Pakistan, and whereas the theoretical foundations of colonizing of
consciousness rooted in the critique of the neo-colonial framework is a comparative concept that
can be transposed to other post-colonial states, the cultural specificity that has been investigated is
distinct to the people of Pakistan.
CHAPTER 1:

Historicizing Classical Marxism & African Liberation

I must begin by asking: What is the relevance of Marxism and the decolonial paradigm? The answer lies in the very asking of that question because when we ask regarding the relevance of Marxism and whether it has anything to offer to the problems of our time, we ask that question within the dominant mode of rationality, which is the bourgeois mode of rationality. This naturalization of capitalist thought becomes an endowment with every passing generation, to the degree that we are forced to find the solution to the problem of capitalism within the capitalist framework without asking ourselves to question that very framework. If one strives to engage in this project of disillusionment, an initiative of decolonizing oneself - and that is only possible by examining the dominant mode of reasoning – then one always needs Marxism. The second relevance of Marxism is its ultimate concern with material realities. Antonio Gramsci insisted on preventing Marxism from mutating into a metaphysical form and rearticulated it as the philosophy of praxis, which transformed theory into practice. This meant not simply interpreting the material reality but engaging in changing it.

Hence, Marxism is a methodology that is independent of time and space.¹ For this reason, it can be used by different societies for their liberation, which will each lead to another form of struggle. The critique of capitalism that Marxism engages with has been employed to deconstruct the bourgeois reasoning across geographies and generations. In this chapter, I will explore the efforts of the Black Marxists of Africa to transform Western Marxism by adapting it to their colonial condition. The decolonial period saw a rise of African intellectuals who contributed

---

extensively to the project of Black Marxism and adapted it to theorize their decolonial struggle. This section aims to investigate the project of reconciling Karl Marx with Frantz Fanon through a comparative analysis of the worker under Western capitalism and the native in the capitalist colony, and second, to prove the necessity of reexamining the Marxist tradition (or what Fanon calls “stretching”) from a Fanonian perspective to apply effectively to the decolonial condition. The second project of this section is to inquire whether the roots of a new form of humanism can be found in this ‘stretching’ of the Marxist concepts. This chapter serves as a theoretical interrogation of the relevance of the Marxist conceptualization within the African decolonial project and whether that theoretical discourse can be transposed to be applied in the case of the Pakistani question. Alienation and Superstructure are the two Marxist concepts under investigation because they set the foundation of the neo-colonial framework with consciousness and the construction of the system of social relations within the post-colonial society - a theoretical project I engage with in Chapters 2 and 3.

**Alienation: Of Worker and the Native**

In the chapter of the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*\(^2\) titled Estranged Labour, Marx puts forth a theoretical framework for the estrangement of man under the capitalist environment. This chapter also serves as a critique of Hegelian ethics. Hegel’s influence on Marx’s writing is an inescapable fact. Hegel’s conception of consciousness directly links to Marx’s understanding of the worker’s estrangement. Hegel posits consciousness as not something that the individual develops innately.

---

“Consciousness knows something; this something is the essence or is per se. This object, however, is also the per se, the inherent reality, for consciousness. Hence comes ambiguity of this truth. Consciousness, as we see, has now two objects: one is the first per se, the second is the existence for consciousness of this per se. The last object appears at first sight to be merely the reflection of consciousness into itself, i.e. an idea not of an object, but solely of its knowledge of that first object.”\(^3\)

Instead, one’s consciousness is a tension between the subject and the object where the subject is the individual and the object is the reality of circumstances in which the subject finds itself. In that sense, the subject’s consciousness is conceptualized internally and externally. In other words, the subject’s consciousness reflects its objective reality. For Hegel, de-alienation begins when the subject conquers the object and molds it according to its free will. This relatively short analysis of Hegel’s concept of consciousness helps us understand Marx’s influence and his inevitable deviation from what consciousness was under Hegel. Understanding Marx’s idea of estranged labor, we can then explain Fanon’s alienation of the native. Like the Hegelian philosophy that influenced Marx in his writings, Sartre’s work left an impression on the young Fanon. Sartre’s existentialist critique of Marxism also played a role in redefining the Marxist dimension. In Search of Method, Sartre writes:

As soon as there exists a margin of real freedom for everyone beyond the production of life, Marxism will have lived out its span; a philosophy of freedom will take its place. But we have no means, no intellectual instrument, no concrete experience that allows us to conceive of this freedom or this philosophy.\(^4\)

Sartre reinforces that the individual becomes the self by her relation to others and under her actions in her external reality. He defends the position of existentialism against the nihilistic critique and


posits that existentialism has everything to do with action, and changing the material reality begins by gaining awareness of the self.

Marx's problem with the subject’s consciousness under Hegelian ethics is its abstract tendencies. On the other hand, Marx is concerned with not just the subject’s consciousness reflecting its circumstances but rather the ability of the subject to change the object to meet its needs. For Marx, that is the truth embedded in the idea of praxis. The critical difference between Marxist materialism and Hegelian idealism is that for Marx – as mentioned previously – the object is a “material” object in the sense that it originates from material reality. In contrast, for Hegel, the object is a projection of human consciousness. The point of departure is that Marx insists on engaging with the material world to change it. In contrast, Hegel emphasizes the abstract, meaning its connection with reality is poor. Marx explains the estrangement of the worker when he writes that “...with the increasing value of the world of things proceeds in direct proportion the devaluation of the world of men.”

In this chapter, Marx lays out the foundations of the commodification of labor – a concept that he fully conceptualizes in *Capital*. Marx believes that our work towards our objective reality should reflect ourselves. An individual’s labor, after all, is a physical part of their life. In that sense, labor under the capitalist system creates an estrangement between the worker and the creation of his work. This is because the object created by the worker’s labor is more valuable than the work he puts in - for that is the only way to make it profitable. If we multiply this scenario, “the more objects the worker produces, the fewer he can possess.” In other words, when the object that is the creation of man comes into existence and confronts him as an entity superior to him, that causes a

---

5 Ibid, p.72
sense of alienation between the worker and the object, like a woman working in a shoe factory and watching that shoe at Walmart only to realize that she cannot afford it.

However, there is another form of estrangement that Marx refers to as alienation through the act of production where the worker’s product is not his own and hence is external to him. For this reason, man perceives work as a coercive need that must be fulfilled. Also, since the worker does not own his production, his product belongs to someone, and because of this, the individual is estranged from his labor. This also leads to what Marx calls the alienation of man from man because it brings into existence a hierarchical order under which the worker dissociates from the capitalist to whom his product belongs. The man who perceives himself as a species-being belonging to a universal class is forced to adopt an individualist view of the world. The consequence of this individualism that has arisen alongside capitalism is that it dissociates the being from the collective and frees the being from any obligation to his material conditions. This individualist view of the world entails upon the subject an alienation from the consequence of her produce. The critical point of Marx’s analysis above is the interaction of the subject with the object. Under capitalism, the worker is forced to become alienated from his product, from himself, and his fellow men. Marx writes:

“First, the fact that labour is external to the worker, i.e., it does not belong to his essential being; that in his work, therefore, he does not affirm himself but denies himself, does not feel content but unhappy, does not develop freely his physical and mental energy but mortifies his body and ruins his mind. The worker therefore only feels himself outside his work, and in his work feels outside himself.”  

---

6 Ibid, p.74
At this point, it is imperative to introduce Fanon's understanding of the subject/object dialectic, which attempts to draw comparisons with Marxist analysis. From a critical perspective, an investigation of Fanon’s *The Wretched of the Earth* serves a dual function to our overarching theme of reconciling the two theoreticians. First, it provides a critical account of alienation in the colonial subject from a racial perspective, and second, it highlights the insufficiency of Marxist analysis regarding race. The tension between the subject and the object in Marxism takes the form of the native and settler under Fanonian ethics, where the native is constantly alienated as he finds himself in an objective reality that is hostile to his existence. In this case, the objective reality refers to the settler colony that justifies its existence through the conceptualization of race, where white skin becomes synonymous with civilization, goodness, and beauty, and black skin denotes savagery, evil, and horror. Fanon writes:

“The true disalienation of the black man implies a brutal awareness of the social and economic realities … the Black problem is not just about Blacks living among whites, but about Blacks exploited, enslaved, and despised by colonialist and capitalist society that happens to be white.” (BSWM)

The purpose of this racial project is twofold. First, to not contradict the values of Western humanism that include human dignity for all individuals, the racial project serves to identify the native as sub-human, “who is declared insensible to ethics; he represents not only the absence of values but also the negation of values. He is, let us dare to admit, the enemy of values, and in this sense, he is the absolute evil.” and hence not a subject to those “universal” values of enlightenment. Second, as Fanon points out, it is not enough for the affluent white settler to buy land and acquire capital. The settler requires more than just economic hierarchy; he needs

---

8 Ibid, p.41
naturalistic rhetoric to maintain the reason for his advent, and the racial project precisely achieves that. The civilization mission becomes a pretense for occupation. Fanon explains in *The Wretched of the Earth*:

> Everything up to and including the very nature of precapitalist society, so well explained by Marx, must here be thought out again. The serf is in essence different from the knight, but a reference to divine right is necessary to legitimize this statutory difference. In the colonies, the foreigner coming from another country imposed his rule by means of guns and machines. In defiance of his successful transplantation, in spite of his appropriation, the settler still remains a foreigner.⁹

The point of explaining the colonization process is to revert to the native’s dilemma. The subject (the native) can either resist the object (the settler colony), in which case he will face a severe disadvantage, or the subject can let the object overcome his existence. In this case, the subject’s consciousness is not simply a reflection of his objective circumstances; instead, it is created through the machine of whiteness working against the native’s instincts, and it is this that causes the subject to become alienated from himself because the object forces him to exist outside of himself and in the process be rewarded for it. In other words, the “whiter” the native becomes through how he speaks or dresses, the more civilized and proper his external reality perceives him and, consequently, his internal reality. And following the same logic, the more he tends to follow his instincts, the more savage he becomes, prohibiting his access to socioeconomic benefits.

The estrangement of the Worker and the Alienation of the Native share a similar thread: the relationship between the object and the subject. Both the workers under Marxism and the natives, from Fanon’s perspective, are forced by their objective realities to dissociate from themselves and adopt a false identity. This mistaken identity, over time, eradicates the subject’s

---

⁹ Ibid, p.40
instincts and becomes real. Another similarity between Marx and Fanon regarding the subject and object dialectic is their concern with the natural consequences of the circumstances. Both the Worker and the Native are in a position of disadvantage where they develop hate towards the capitalist (settler) but at the same time want to replace them. The worker must accumulate enough to become a capitalist, and the native seeks to resemble the colonizer's ways.

Marx’s account of class conflict was a reaction to the advent of industrialization in Europe and its rapid growth. Hence, to posit that Marx was concerned with the working class as a universal phenomenon would be an exaggeration. Moreover, investigating Marx and Engel’s work on the Asiatic mode of production, Kumar\textsuperscript{10} points out their fascination with Indian villages as a pre-capitalist mode from which they could derive rhetorical assumptions. He also posits that at a point, Marx welcomed the English colonizers, hoping that they would play a revolutionary role in dismantling the archaic social structure, for example, the caste system in India, but later outgrew such notions when it became clear that the presence of the English colonizers was only for the economic exploitation and did not result in the deconstruction of the caste system rather transformed it in network of patronage that allowed the English control to spread across the local level. For a long time, Marx and Engels had thought that a colonial revolution could only be a sequel to the revolution in the metropolis.”\textsuperscript{11}. Still, Kumar concludes that “Marx and Engel did not leave behind any theory of a colonial revolution … [they were] concerned primarily with the


\textsuperscript{11} Ibid, p.500
cognitive problem of analyzing a society and economy so differently structured from the European.”

The brief account above clarifies that Marx’s work engaged with the question of race. However, his engagement was more from a socio-economic perspective than an individual approach. Reverting to our problem then, the comparison between the alienation of the worker and the native must then account for the project of racial domination that is colonization. The worker is the worker, not because he was born white but because he was born poor. It is an economic matter, not a racial one.

For this reason, when the white worker observes his objective reality, he finds the worker and the capitalist the same color as he is and does not feel dismembered. Under the project of colonization, the black man is poor because he is black. The structure of the racial hierarchy is stringent in effect and inhibits upward mobility to a far greater extent. Reverting to the subject/object dialectic, there is a difference between the feeling of alienation of the worker because his work reflects the person he is and the colonial condition where the entire native race is declared an epitome of degradation. In that sense, the native in the colonial setting shares more with the black slave on the cotton farm in America than he does with a white factory worker in Germany. Nonetheless, decolonial Marxism does not disregard the Marxist spirit because it places the capitalist system of exploitation at the center of the problem.

Nancy Fraser's distinction between exploitation and expropriation can also help parse the worker and the native and understand the racial dynamic. Fraser explains that “expropriation is

---

12 Ibid, p.501
accumulation by other means [which] works by confiscating capacities and resources and conscripting them into capital’s circuits of self-expansion.” Fraser further explained that “the subjection of those whom capital expropriates is a hidden condition of possibility for the freedom of those whom it exploits.” She posits that expropriation, which in other words can be considered as an inter-temporal degradation of a species as part of the racial project under colonization – or any other form of racialization such as slavery – creates the suitable environment for the “… the construction of distinctive, explicitly racialized forms of exploitation,” under capitalism. Fanon and Fraser would agree that the expropriation of the natives under the racial project of colonialism transforms into the post-colonial capitalist system where the native worker is still exploited under racial lines. The structure of this racialization in the colony and its transformation during the decolonization, which builds on the concept of racial hierarchy and its relationship with the socio-economic position of the natives, will be discussed in the next section.

**Introducing the Superstructure and Historical Materialism**

This section aims to introduce the superstructure concept essential to the Marxism project. In this section, I present the superstructure by analyzing Marx’s conceptualization of historical materialism and the naturalization of capitalism. The superstructure has been a significant point of discussion in the Marxist tradition partly because Marx and Engel’s work rarely employed specific terms and often used them implicitly. Nonetheless, the extensive discourse that has been produced

---

13 Expropriation and Exploitation in Racialized Capitalism: A Reply to Michael Dawson, Nancy Fraser Critical Historical Studies 2016 3:1, 163-178

14 Ibid, p.167
allows us to understand each society's political and economic arrangements. In the German
Ideology, Marx posits what has been widely regarded as a premise for the base and superstructure:

In the social production of their existence, humans inevitably enter into definite
relations independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a
given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality
of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the
real foundation on which a legal and political superstructure arises and to which
correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of
material life conditions the general process of social, political, and intellectual life.
It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social
existence that determines their consciousness.\(^{15}\)

Hence, the mode of production, which includes the relation and means of production, constitutes
the base that does not restrict itself to the economic structure but also consists of the social relations
of production. The superstructure comprises the political consciousness of the state - I will later
discuss the ideological implications for the consciousness - and the legal mechanism contributing
to the state's culture, religion, and philosophy. Marx further elaborates in the 18th Brumaire that
“upon the social conditions of existence, rises an entire superstructure of distinct and peculiarly
formed sentiments, illusions, modes of thought, and views of life. The entire class creates and
forms them from its material foundations and the corresponding relations.”\(^{16}\) This helps us
contextualize Marx’s interest in historical materialism as a foundation of the superstructure and
provides us evidence that Marx had an evolutionary sense of the base, which consequently
transformed the superstructure. Now that we have a brief understanding of the superstructure's
nature under examination in this paper, we begin by formulating the Marxist reasoning of the
superstructure. But before we start with that analysis, it is pertinent to provide a critical Marxist

1972.

\(^{16}\) Marx, Karl, 1818-1883. The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte. Translated by Daniel De Leon.
account of the position of the bourgeoisie in the capitalist system and the fundamental nature of the system that not only creates the superstructure but also perpetuates it.

The problem with the modern political economy, particularly for Marx, is a set of assumptions it takes for granted: the conception of private property and the interests of the capitalists as the ultimate cause. To that degree, it is essential to contextualize the relationship between private property and freedom. Brenkart explains Marx's analysis of modern private property whereby "the power [is] possessed by the private individual in the means of production allows them to dispose of as they will of the worker's labor power." At the center of the capitalist system is the tendency to "accumulate surplus value [which] requires that worker receive less than he produces; part of his labor unpaid." Brenkart, explaining the relationship between private property and freedom, elaborates that freedom originates from one’s conscious and rational control over the conditions of his existence to develop his capacities. The problem with the existence of private property is that it has created a world where one’s position is not “voluntary” but natural. In other words, we are born into the inequality created by private property and perceive ourselves within that reality. This naturalization of capitalism that legitimizes the existence of social hierarchies and class conflicts fuels the development of the false consciousness whereby the individual is convinced of his material reality. The consequence of this naturalization is that the individual is disincentivized from questioning the existence of the social arrangement and is forced to find solutions within the system. The individual is forced to have a false starting point. Furthermore, Marx writes:

---

Political economy proceeds from the fact of private property, but it does not explain it to us. It expresses, in general, abstract formulae, the material process through which private property actually passes, and these formulae it then takes for laws. It does not comprehend these laws - i.e., it does not demonstrate how they arise from the very nature of the private property.\textsuperscript{18}

For Marx, monopoly and competition originated from the concept of private property, and one must question the existence of private property to understand its derivations. In essence, capitalism's foundation is built on more than just these economic hierarchies. Instead, it justifies them without engaging in the historical context of how they came into existence.

To understand the bourgeoisie class under Marxism, you must realize Marx’s view of history, and for that, we must inquire into the process of what Marx defines as Historical Materialism. Historical Materialism is Marx’s understanding of the historical development of mankind by referring to the forces of production and the relations of production combined with the division of labor that determines property relations and variations. He describes a trajectory of modes of production, from Tribalism to Slavery to Feudalism and eventually Capitalism. An extensive analysis of each of these modes is beyond the scope of this paper. Still, the key is to understand that each mode of production can be characterized by the relationship between the forces and relations of production in which the forces of production tend to develop and gradually overcome the old relations of production. In other words, new relations emerge from the ashes of the old mode of production, and Marx believes the revolution causes the change in the output mode. In that regard, Marx sees capitalism as a rational progression of that historical development, but what is unique about capitalism, as he points out, is the stark division between the two classes: the property-owning capitalists and the propertyless workers, whom he calls the proletariat. Hence,

the revolution in which the proletariat overcomes the capitalist machine will be conclusive as it will lead to a classless society, which is his vision for communism. Another aspect of the Marxian critique of the modern political economy is the transformation of man from a “species-being” to an individual object that has alienated himself from social tendencies. Through the division of labor under the capitalist system, a curtain between men inhibits the communal experience. The consequence of the Smithonian Invisible Hand is the blindness of one worker toward the struggle of the other worker. It denies communal solidarity by declaring the supremacy of the individual over the collective being, which becomes the basis of the exploitation of the working class as a collective.

A Decolonial Critique of Marxism

The relationship between consciousness and ideology is a common theme explored throughout the thesis. Hence it is essential to understand Marx’s work on ideology and its relation to consciousness. The concept of ideology will be further constructed in Chapter 2. Still, this analysis introduces Marx and Engel’s abstraction of ideology and investigates the relationship between the transformation of ideology and a new form of humanism. For instance, McCarthy contextualizes the ironic argument that Marx puts forth on ideology.\(^1\) He explains that the “study of men's "consciousness" (ideas, beliefs, cannot be separated from the study of the material conditions of life; for what they think can be nothing more than an expression of what they do.” In other words, what we perceive as reality reflects our social existence. We perceive the truth as a “falsification of reality.” McCarthy points out two reasons for that falsification: “(1) the

separation of mental production within the social division of labor; and (2) the division of society into ruling and ruled classes.”20 Both of these issues are joined by the problem of objective versus ideological thinking. Ideology, as described by Engel, is a process that is “accomplished by the so-called thinker consciously . . . but with a false consciousness.”

Simply put, the ideologist bases the truth of reality on an illusion of thought, which is a natural endowment (you believe in God because you were born in a religious household), but the objective thinker searches for the “independent source of thought” which forces him to investigate his social existence. The second mistake owed to the problem of ideology is the tendency to generalize our individual experience. McCarthy explains the ideologist by writing:

“Since he believes that ideas rule his own life, so he general is ruled by ideas. The ideologist is thus twice deceived: he is deceived about the true origins of his own ideas and the true cause of historical events”21

But the logic applied here needs to be revised on teleological grounds - by which I mean the intended purpose. Marx and Engel posit that ideology originates from a vacuum of consciousness created by the social division of labor and the division of society into classes, and the solution to overcome this problem is creating a classless society where there will be no need for an ideology. The irony lies in the abstract nature of that argument since there has never been a classless society. Hence, the tension is that if the division of labor causes this false consciousness, then the only answer can be found in a classless society. Hence, the Marxist solution itself is an abstract solution that needs to be proven.

---

20 Ibid, p.207
21 Ibid, 203
Althusser’s refutation of Marx lies in reinspecting the differentiation between the scientific (objective) and ideological by highlighting their distinct purpose. Ideology, for Althusser, is a “system of representations” that creates the social reality in which we achieve awareness. He further explains:

“That consciousness is "false" only in the sense that it does not express directly the "relation between men and their conditions of existence," but it is "true" insofar as it expresses "the way they live the relation" between themselves and their conditions of existence. Put another way, ideology is a socially determined perception of the world, not as it is, but as it is experienced and represented by men to themselves. Ideology, in this sense, is "an organic part of every social totality" and cannot be done away with in any conceivable society. To suppose that it can is itself a species of ideological thinking.”

Althusser departs from the traditional Marxist view by first acknowledging the inevitable nature of the existence of ideology as imperative to the evolution of society. For him, ideology is "not an aberration or a contingent excrescence of history; it is a structure essential to the historical life of societies.” In other words, Althusser does not think that the solution lies in the transformation from the ideological to the scientific, nor does he think it can be practically achieved.

The role of ideology in the colonial setting is different than in Western society. To understand that, we have reanalyzed Fanon’s work on ideology and the shaping of the national culture, and for that, we revert to Nursey-Bray’s article. He points out that under the colonial setting, the settler and the economic transformation also influenced an ideological shift. The two, however, are interlinked. The settlers conducted this ideological transformation in the form of rewriting the historical evolution of the colonized society that presents the natives as barbaric and

---

22 Ibid, p.207
the coming of the Europeans as saviors from barbarism. If we connect this to Marxian analysis, 
*the native-born in the colony is not just “deceived” by his social reality but “forced” because the 
only possibility of objective thought lies in the colonial perspective by which he will accept his 
barbarism*. Hence, scientific thinking becomes a tool for Westerners to justify the racial project. 
Rationality, in the colony, is an ideology itself. Fanon’s emphasis on the national culture is a 
pathway to overcome this ideological oppression. As Nursey-Bray indicates:

> But the defeat of the colonial power is not enough. There must, be a process 
> whereby a new consciousness, embodied in a new national culture, is formed, 
> and the old ideology of domination dispersed.  

In other words, the transformation of the economic structure must also be accompanied by 
the social transformation of the natives' political consciousness. For Fanon, that means detachment 
from the Western conceptualization of freedom. “The basic limitation of approaches to culture 
such as that of writers lies, for Fanon, in the fact that those intellectuals who in Africa's past for 
surrogates to replace a no-longer-acceptable heritage were still operating within the parameters 
prescribed culture. They used the language, the techniques, and the definition of culture given to 
them by the colonizers.”  

Nursey-Bray explains that the concept of the national culture does not 
imply the reimagination of pre-colonial Africa; instead, it has to be rooted in the present colonial 
reality from which the colonial subject has to be liberated. Fanon describes the national culture as 
*“the whole body of efforts made by a people in the sphere of thought to describe, justify and praise 
the action through which that people has created itself and keeps itself in existence.”*  

---


24 Ibid, p.139

However, this prioritization of the national culture does not limit the scope of Fanon’s work. It does not imply that Fanon speaks only of the Algerian liberation. Fanon claims, and Nursey-Bray defends, that creating the national culture must also lead to a new form of humanism for both the colonized and the colonizer. This “revolutionary humanism,” for all humanity, must require a total departure from the colonial mindset because decolonization without restructuring the political consciousness will reinforce the colonial ideology through the class structure. Nursey-Bray states in the article:

Thus neo-colonialism appears as one of the “pitfalls of national consciousness” where national consciousness “instead of being the all-embracing crystallization of the innermost hopes of the whole people, instead of being the immediate and most obvious results of the mobilization of the people, will be in any case only an empty shell, a crude and fragile travesty of what it might have been.26

Regarding the origin of political consciousness, particularly in the colonial setting, Fanon deviates from Marx. Whereas for Marx, the struggle of the working class is at the center of their tendency to organize, Fanon refutes that claim by highlighting that the colonies are not a highly industrialized capitalist society where the industrial workers constitute the majority of the labor. In the settlement, the worker only represents a tiny portion of the population. In other words, the proletariat in the colonies is a “pampered class” who owes their relatively privileged status to the colonizers. Hence, Fanon points out the inevitable tension between the natives in the urban centers who can benefit from their alliance with the colonizers and the rural natives who do not benefit from that alliance.

Moreover, there is also a departure from the Marxist tradition that Fanon's faith is not in the industrial worker, for the workers in the city owe their status to the colonizers; the colonial

syndrome infects them. It is from the country districts that the spontaneous revolutionary charge originates. Marx refutes and rebukes the lumpenproletariat for their lack of awareness of the collective interest as an oppressed class. For this reason, the colonizer might attempt to sway their support. Contrary to Marx, Fanon believes that it is the lumpenproletariat that will “constitute one of the most spontaneous and the most radically revolutionary forces of a colonizer people.” For Fanon, it is the lumpenproletariat that is prompted to participate in the rebellion for freedom because they are the ones most disadvantaged by the atrocities that are committed upon them by the system. Hence, they will become the core of the consciousness for national liberation. Fanon, however, is aware of what he calls the “pitfalls of political consciousness,” where he explains that in the aftermath of decolonization and the supposed liberation from the colonizers, the national bourgeoisie becomes in charge and makes coalitions with the former settlers and the capitalist bloc. In other words, the national bourgeoisie take control of the state's ideology and start reinforcing the political consciousness of their interest - to maintain their socio-economic hierarchy. The result is the reinforcement of a neo-colonial mechanism whereby the class divide inhibits collective solidarity.

For a philosophy to be a philosophy of liberation, it must engage with the question of oppression. It cannot be a work of sophistication; it seeks to rebel against exploitative forces. In his work on The Poverty of Philosophy (1847), Marx criticizes a philosophy concerning academic discipline instead of revolutionary practice. However, regarding the colonial question, Marx’s work holds a contradiction at its center. Sabelo J. Ndlovu-Gatsheni and Morgan Ndlovu explain that:

If Adam Smith provided a manifesto of capitalism, Marx advanced a manifesto of communism. From Europe, therefore, was born both the promotion and negation of capitalism. Its European origins and blindness to the colonial problem and the problem of blackness in the world were what made black philosophers of liberation ponder and reflect on the limits of Marxism … 28

This was because, on the one hand, Marxism placed the industrialized West as the flag-bearer of revolutionary praxis because of the role it played in shaping history and, on the other, claimed to provide a mechanism of global liberation by the most oppressed. Hence, Black Marxism is not only a critique of the Eurocentrism and racism of the Marxist Philosophy but a project of emancipation by the oppressed race with a prospect of revolutionary humanism. Put another way, the focus of Marxism was mainly on capitalism production in which the question of colonial capitalism became secondary, and this is why the African Marxists had the burden of domesticating Marxism to make it relevant to the oppression of their people vis-a-vis the colonial subject. Therefore, the decolonial critique can be summed in the fact that “whereas Marxism underscored the problem of capitalism as a global challenge, decoloniality identifies colonialism and global coloniality as significant problems. Marxism gestures towards socialism, while decoloniality pushes for the completion of the incomplete project of decolonization.” 29

29 Ibid, pg. 19
CHAPTER 2:
The Colonization of Consciousness

Introduction

Chapter 1 was a descriptive analysis concentrated on the concepts of Marxism that are relevant to the project of this thesis, as well as tracing the initiative of the Black Marxists of Africa to adopt Western Marxism for their liberation struggle. In particular, the need to create a new form of humanism that shall be placed at the core of political consciousness is a concept that will be a common thread throughout the thesis. So far as our analysis has engaged with the dichotomy of the worker and the native, but within that framework, we have restricted our investigation to the colonial setting. Chapter 2 is an inquiry into the decolonial paradigm. In other words, this chapter questions the shift in the superstructure vis-a-vis the emergence of nationhood during the process of decolonization from an ideological and economic standpoint and, after that, the reproduction of the culture which transforms itself into what Gramsci calls the “common sense”\(^\text{30}\). This inquiry aims to theorize the paradox of colonization of consciousness during decolonization. The paradox refers to the change in racial perception during the decolonial period, whereby the indigenous bourgeoisie became the ruling class and formed the neo-colonial state. Neo-colonial, in the sense that the framework that allowed their progress is adopted and continues.

Simply put, the white colonialists leave behind a class of people who are of the same color as the rest, be it black or brown, but under their skin, there is whiteness, or at least the eagerness to be white. It is this paradox that I intend to investigate through which I hope to provide a theory of colonization of consciousness. The case of Pakistani Nationalism and its independence in 1947

serves as a case study for this colonizing of consciousness. The chapter not only delves into the decolonial stage but also studies the mechanism through which the cultural hegemony, once established by the ruling class, is naturalized into the status quo, in turn inducing a false consciousness amongst the people.

**On Consciousness and Ideology**

A critical analysis of consciousness is required to understand the colonizing of consciousness. In particular, how do we know consciousness in the colonial condition? It is equally important to distinguish between consciousness and ideology, where the latter is a subset of the former. In other words, ideology is the product of the colonizing of consciousness that, once established, is reproduced until it naturalizes into commonsense. In this section, I examine Marxian critiques of ideology and its relationship to consciousness.

For Marx, at least in his earlier writings, ideology derives from the false consciousness that is a product of the alienation that the human undergoes in the capitalist society. False because it originates under a 'generated' reality that can never represent a true essence. In other words, Marx posits that the social formations within society are not just economic but also ideological, and the latter is crucial for maintaining the social hierarchy. Marx explains that the “Abstract theoretical context of discussion of social classes: in this context "ideology" refers to a set of ideas and concepts held and used by the dominant classes, in class society, to maintain its dominance over the exploited classes.”

However, in the later writings, Marx reconstructs his concept of ideology, which is rooted in the historical specificity of the people and their everyday experiences. Marx here does not consider ideologies entirely false; they possess a sociological foundation. For

---

example, within the capitalist mode of production, the relation of production between the worker and the owner is more than just the position of their labor; it represents the limitations of their being. Marx explains thus:

At the concrete level of social formations, ideology refers to the historically defined sum of ideas and beliefs that have arisen as a consequence of, and together with, specific social conditions. In other words, it refers to collective representations of a given society at a given epoch.  

George Lukacs argues in *History and Class Consciousness* (1971) that the actions of members of a class within a society are always relative to other classes. For example, the bourgeoisie in the capitalist society, due to their socio-economic location, can subsume the totality of meaning whereby their ideological propositions profess to be in the interests of all classes. It is this reason why Lukacs defines the bourgeois consciousness as partial, for it truly represents only a fragment of society. By doing this, Luckacs upholds the cause of the proletariat at the center of the prospect of a liberated consciousness that strives to achieve freedom for all classes within a society. Hassan elaborates on Lukacs work by positing that “the problem of history is the problem of consciousness - imputed correct consciousness is the solution and cure for all mankind's problems.”  

Furthermore, Poulantzas defined ideology as a 'coherent ensemble of representations, values, and beliefs ... ' where it determines how the subject is formed. The subject’s lived experience becomes their ideology. For Althusser, on the other hand, ideology does not have a general theory rooted in historicism since it derives from the lived relations between human beings and their world. And
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because there can never be a social totality vis-a-vis triumph over the false consciousness, the relationship between humans and their lived conditions will always be imaginary:

What seems to take place outside ideology (to be precise, in the street), in reality, takes place in ideology. What really takes place in ideology seems therefore to take place outside it. That is why those who are in ideology believe themselves by definition outside ideology: one of the effects of ideology is the practical denegation of the ideological character of ideology by ideology: ideology never says, 'I am ideological.'

What, then, is to be understood regarding the relationship between consciousness and ideology? Hassan (1986) expounds on consciousness by contrasting it with ‘being.’ He explains that “their mutual relation has to be conceived dialectically: as "being" is thought, thought is also lived (people may live social expectations that are imposed upon them by dominant conceptual categories).” The reality the subject perceives is not “the products of our thoughts only; it has its independent existence.” Hence, the argument is that the subject is not just acting on the material reality of her existence but also changing it, which changes her nature. It is implicit in Hassan’s argument that nature, be it of the external world or our existence, is in constant flux. Consciousness can be considered an amalgam of our being that is lived throughout material reality and transforms it as much as it does our being simultaneously. Consciousness does not exist as an autonomous phenomenon but derives from social beings and is interrelated to the ideas and conception of material reality. Marx explains in The German Ideology that “consciousness ... flatter[s] itself as something other than the consciousness of existing practice that it represents something without representing something real; from now on consciousness is in a position to emancipate itself from the world and to proceed to the formulation of pure theory, theology, philosophy, morals, etc.”
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Hence, if consciousness determines the network of social relations and the individual is the basis of material reality, it can supposed that there is a dialectical relation between consciousness and material production (Hassan, 1986), where the old form of consciousness can be maintained while the new ones are formed due to the changing historical circumstances. This is to say that multiple social consciousnesses co-exist in a social strata. Nonetheless, there is a prevalence of a social consciousness that allows a particular class to legitimize the exploitation of the other classes. This dislocated form of consciousness that maintains the surplus through the exploitation of other classes is what defines ideology.

It is essential to point out that consciousness does not develop into an ideology in the evolutionary sense. However, it is a dislocated form of it. Their ideology relates to those forms of consciousness maintained to exploit the relations of production in any class society. It has to be functional to be an ideology. The argument is that ideology can present itself positively. For example, using the English language to achieve upward mobility is a positive and realistic proposition grounded in the material since working-class members climb the social ladder; however, it only provides a temporary solution. It will never propose the upsetting of the status quo. It will never work against the deconstruction of the dominant class. Hassan explains thus:

Ideology is unscientific because it does not deal with transforming social relations of production. Furthermore, since it is not consciousness proper, this explains why terms such as illusory, upside down, or simply false are used.35

The problem with ideologies is that they are always presented as non-ideological. They are naturalized in the system. However, within the ideology, for they are a distorted form of consciousness, there are inconsistencies, and through the exposition of these contradictions, the
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ideological content can be shown. But the ideological struggle has to go hand in hand with economic and political forms of struggle, which Gramsci advocates too. The task before us now is to understand the mutation of consciousness under the colonial condition and what results the colonization of thought produces.

**Colonizing Consciousness: A Sociogenic Analysis**

I have briefly engaged with the definition of consciousness and ideology, where the ideology has been contextualized as a disjointed form of consciousness that allows the ruling class to exploit a surplus by manipulating the subaltern classes. I further my analysis by investigating the colonizing of consciousness by employing a sociogenic analysis. Sylvia Wynter, deriving inspiration from Fanon’s work on *Black Skin White Masks* (1952), contributes to the theory of sociogeny, which refutes the biological basis for human identity and instead argues that the human condition is an amalgam of cultural and societal factors which morphs the human consciousness by mediums of symbols, language, and stories.

Reacting against the constitutionalist tendency of the late nineteenth century, Freud insisted that the individual factor be taken into account through psychoanalysis. He substituted for a phylogenetic theory, the ontogenetic perspective. It will be seen that the black man’s alienation is not an individual question. *Beside phylogeny and ontogeny stands sociogeny . . .* (Frantz Fanon, Black Skins, White Masks, 1967) (emphasis added)

Wynter builds on Fanon's sociogenic framework, particularly by analyzing his third-person explanation of his lived experience whereby Fanon perceives his reality - his apparent barbarianism - through the eyes of the civilized white Other. In other words, Wynter’s sociogenic project concerns the liberation of the formation of knowledge itself. Wynter is constructing what Mignolo, in his article “*What Does it Mean to be Human?*” calls decolonial scientia, which is a
refutation of Western Humanism that is literally placed and built around the ‘white man.’ It is the
dominion of these Western forms of knowledge that the Wynterian project rebels against.

Wynter explains the socio-historical conditions through which the European man defined
Man as Human and places this idea at the foundation of racism. This scheme of rehistoricization
questions the geography of reason and, in turn, the universality of Man’s consciousness. Scott
elaborates on Wynter’s point in “The Re-enchantment of Humanism”:

It is the story in which the idea of humanism, of its de-godding of our modes of
self-inscription first erupts, where Man and its human Others—that is, Indians,
Negros, Natives (and I would add, Jews and Muslims)—are first invented. And this
history is the history of the expansion of the West from the fifteenth century
onwards, and an expansion that is carried out within the terms of its own cultural
conception of its own origins.36

In other words, the Wynterian project relates to colonizing consciousness by
conceptualizing the origin of knowledge. The crucial point is that if the West was the first to
transform from man to human, this humanism is exclusive in two senses. The first exclusion
defines the category of people it considers a subject, the white man, for centuries. No other race or
gender was extended membership to this humanism. The second exclusion regarding Western
humanism is implicit in ‘West,’ which means that the knowledge upon which it is formed is
restricted to the form of knowledge originating in the West. Hence, the Wynterian project is
radical, for it highlights the hypocrisy of Western humanism, which presents itself as universal
when its foundation is set in the West. By undertaking this rehistoricization, Wynter had rooted
the colonizing of consciousness in the creation of humans by the West because the moment the

Western man shifted to the human was when the non-western man shifted to the savage, which was the beginning of the colonial form of knowledge. Scott (200) explains thus:

And now the rupture with these forms of truth- is going to be made possible only by means of the two intellectual revolutions of humanism, the first which took place in the Renaissance Europe, the second which took place at the end of the eighteenth century in Great Britain. . . . Or to put it more precisely, in our case, an ethno- class or Western bourgeois form of humanism, whose truth- for at the level of social reality is truth for Man cannot be truth for the human.  

I will now build on Wynter and Fanon’s work to examine the colonizing of consciousness during the colonization period by focusing on the use of language as a medium of expression of being and the establishment of a foreign language alienates the colonial subject from her own existence which now is perceived to be uncivilized. Her language not only represents the inferiority of being but is more devastating because it represents an absence of thought.

For Fanon, the hegemony of the language represents a cultural conquest whereby the colonized person is mystified in the sense that she has been alienated from her being. Hence, linguistic assimilation is at the core of the project of colonization because it is not simply the replacement of means of communication; it is a denial of humanity. This assimilation further categorizes the native population into those who engage with the colonizer’s language through the colonial machine and utilize the avenue for economic mobility and those who either do not have access to such avenues or are rejective of such systematic eradication of culture. Either way, this lingual assimilation contributes to creating the class divide. As we shall further explore in the case of Pakistan and the transformation of its feudal system, linguistic assimilation is not the only way to become a patron of the colonial system. The landlords in Pakistan, although lacking in the ways and manners of the English, nonetheless benefited from the alliance with the colonizers and, after
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that, in the post-colonial state of Pakistan, became critical stakeholders in the political systems of the state. Reverting to the Fanonian analysis, language is the means of creating the natives in the colony. Here, we see the practical implications of the Western form of humanism that Wynter expounded on and its forms of knowledge through means of language. Fanon explains thus that “. . . to speak means to be in a position to use as certain syntax, to grasp the morphology of this or that language, but it means above all to assume a culture, to assume a process of thought.”

In other words, Language demarcates the colonizer from the colonized. It is at the core of signifying the natives as barbarians who did not have a past and, thereby, needed civilization. Language is a way of communication. It is a medium of expression, thought, and the human experience. For the colonizer to assume that the native language represents, any form of culture is to presume that the native has no capability of thought. Fanon writes that "No one would dream of doubting that its major artery (i.e., of the Negro's self-division) is fed from the heart of those various theories that have tried to prove that the Negro is a stage in the slow evolution of monkey into a man.” There is a common thread between Fanon’s critique of language as not just the cultural conquest but also the negation of the native’s being and what the African American sociologist W. E. B. DuBois described as ‘Double Consciousness.’ In *Souls of Black Folks*, Du Bois ascribes the black American as being entrapped as a conflicted self that is not entirely black or white. He writes:

> It is a peculiar sensation, this double consciousness…one ever feels his two-ness, an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two un-reconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder. 40

39 Ibid, p.17  
Du Bois's concept of double consciousness invokes a significant theoretical tool to understand the crisis of identity that members of a group have to undergo when confronted with a dominant culture. Claudia Wright further builds Du Bois’s double consciousness and colonial native who is alienated from her original self and culture whereby “the colonial natives’ use of the colonizer’s language becomes a measure of acculturation and is recognized as evidence of the level of assimilation achieved. The externalized native enters the colonial world through language. The ability to earn a decent living is reciprocally related to the degree to which one has demonstrably adopted and mastered the language and culture of the colonizer.”

In other words, her arguments posit that if it is through the English language that the colonial subject becomes aware of the material reality and, in turn, the self, then the subject has achieved awareness of this reality and herself under the colonial framework. A false consciousness has been subdued in her existence since the beginning, and the more the colonial subject alienates herself from her instincts, the more civilized she will become. Still, no matter the extent of this alienation, in the eyes of the colonizer, the subject will always be inferior. That is the problem for the colonial subject. The only way of humanizing herself is through the colonizer's language. This humanization has come at the cost of her own cultural instinct. The subject has to defy her language and her instincts to be civilized. The subject’s consciousness, subsequently, is damned, trapped in an inescapable paradox where she is not native enough for her authentic culture or white enough for the colonizer’s. This defines the colonial condition, and it is this question that the paper seeks an answer to.
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For Fanon, the answers lay in creating a revolutionary class that creates “a new nation and transform themselves into new persons in the course of the national liberation struggle and the social revolution.” However, this New Human that Fanon referred to did not take shape. Decolonization did not result in the liberation of consciousness; instead, new forms of consciousness were created by the indigenous bourgeoisie to establish a dominant ideology. Culture is the main constituent of this ideology and reproduces it to become common sense. This reproduction is owed to the fact that culture is at once the creation of the subject and is created by the subject. However, culture can never exist independently of ideology, for it is at the center of it. Epstein, elaborating on the Fanonian ethics on national liberation, claimed that the space between the cultures, which he calls Tansculture, can free the consciousness from subordination. He explains that “in the supernatural, we have the world of the creator, and in nature, we have the world of creations … the coincidence of these two roles in a human being [that] makes him a cultural being.”

Case Study: The Pakistani Question

Whereas Wynter and Fanon’s work sets the epistemological foundations of the colonizing of consciousness, the investigation of this thesis endeavors to build further on the neo-colonial implications. In other words, how do we contextualize the colonial subject in the post-colonial state where the racial lines are no longer demarcated? Where the oppressor is the same color as the masses he oppresses and yet, for reasons that I will examine, white at the same time. A post-colonial analysis must be undertaken with what Caesair would call “particularisms within universalism,” which means it is crucial to surgical examine the context of creating a post-colonial
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state by indulging in its specific cultural contexts. The particular case study for this thesis, as mentioned in Chapter 1, is Pakistan. Pakistan is a unique case for the analysis of neo-colonialism as the socio-economic system of governance consists of a mutated form of linguistic assimilation where the English language is an asset both from a social and economic perspective. The English language promises upward mobility and social status; however, it encapsulates only a form of ideology in the social consciousness. The other primary form of ideology is the religion of Islam, which has, at a fundamental level, been integrated into the social strata, particularly the peasantry and the lower-middle classes, which form the majority of the population. It is the investigation of these interrelated nexus of commonsense that is at the core of the social consciousness of the state and reproduces the systematic oppression that follows the case of Pakistan. The case study is divided into three stages: first, it examines the pre-partition era and the transformation of the Indian society at large from feudalism to a form of peripheral capitalism; second, it inquires into the Pakistan National Movement that led to the independence of Pakistan in the August of 1947, and third, it briefly interrogates the post-partition period and the rise of the rhetoric of an Islamic State and its affirmation within the subaltern classes.

Stage 1: From Feudalism to Peripheral Capitalism

To understand the decolonial paradigm and the emergence of nationhood, we must preface it by briefly investigating the colonial mode of capital and conceptualizing how the concept of the state comes into existence in the colonial setting and contrasting it with a classical Marxist concept of the state. This inquiry employs the case of Pre-Partition India, and after that, Pakistan, to explain the colonial mode of production. Hamza Alvi was a Pakistani Marxist sociologist whose

44The term Pre-Partition India has a history of being employed in several contexts depending on the literature. In this thesis, the term refers to the contemporary states of Pakistan, India, and Bangladesh under British Imperialism also known as the British Raj in India from 1858 to 1947.
work provided a new framework for understanding Pakistan's social situation. This inquiry reanalyzes the work of Hamza Alvi because it engages deeply with the conceptualization of the formation of the state in the decolonial period, the transformation of the superstructure, and the inception of new classes whose interaction creates the complex network of the state apparatus.

Alvi, in his essay titled *The Structure of Peripheral Capitalism*, problematizes the classical Marxist theory that, though considered the destructive role of colonial capitalism, envisioned it as a process of dismantling the pre-capitalist social order vis-à-vis the feudal system in pre-colonial India that would allow the transformation of the society towards a new social location. However, contrary to Marx’s assumption, the expansion of colonial capitalism did not entirely dissolve India’s social order. Yes, it partially displaced the feudal system in India, but the colonialists also preserved the old mode of production. My purpose for engaging with Alvi’s analysis of the mode of colonial capitalism is to understand the development of the indigenous capital, which leads us toward the formation and psychology of the class of native elites, which, after all, was at the center of the partition movement. Alvi explains:

> It takes the legacies from the past as the raw materials for building its society of the future, combining them with new societal and cultural realities that it also creates. This often results in an illusion of continuity, where profound changes have occurred, when social phenomena are looked at in an empiricist way, disregarding underlying structural discontinuities and new significance and meanings that are infused into old forms thereby.45

Alvi’s argument regarding the dichotomy where the old modes of social reality are being maintained while the forces of a new mode, in this case British Imperialism, are being constructed puts Marx’s historical materialism under a surgical lens because, as Marx posited the concept of historical materialism indicated the dissolution of the previous mode of production upon which
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the capitalist mode is built. In other words, Marx assumed the process of historical materialism has a discreet periodic nature. However, Alvi complicates this argument by proposing that colonial capitalism, in particular, is not a coherent transformation but rather elements of feudalism, in the case of pre-partition India, are preserved and included within the colonial system of governance as they have the possibility of serving the colonialist.

Building his theory of peripheral capitalism designed to exploit the colony, including its natural resources and human capital, for the benefit of the imperial power, Alvi is primarily concerned with generalized commodity production and the extended reproduction of capital. In his project contrasting colonial capitalism with metropolitan capitalism (capitalism in the non-colonized world), he highlights the difference in the form of “integration,” which he refers to as the process of developing the economy. This integration was absent in the development of peripheral capitalism in the colonies designed to be subsumed by the interests of the mother nation. In other words, the character of production in peripheral capitalism becomes dependent on the metropolitan system of capitalism. Alvi’s reflections share a common thread with Immanuel Wallerstein, the proponent of World System Theory⁴⁶, whose work he praises and critiques. However, the idea stated at the core maintains that structure by constantly exploiting the states in the periphery, which can be said to have influenced Alvi greatly. He further elaborates on the making of peripheral capitalism:

The circuit of generalized commodity production in peripheral capitalist societies is not internally complete, as in the case of metropolitan capitalism. For then, that circuit is completed only by their links with the metropolitan economy, by production for export, and as markets for colonial imports. The structural condition of generalized commodity production in peripheral capitalism is satisfied only under the link with the metropolis.⁴⁷

⁴⁷ Ibid, pg. 181
Referring to the reproduction of capital, Alvi points out Marx’s *Capital*, where he explains that the capitalist employs the “surplus” value to increase production capacity. Suppose that is applied to the case of colonial capitalism. In that case, the surplus extracted from the labor of the colonized people does not increase the growth in the colony but the metropole. And whatever increase in the production capacity within the colony is directed towards extracting further surplus by employing cheap labor in the colony. This causes an intergenerational underdevelopment of the colonial society that, unlike the metropolitan capitalist society, prohibits the evolution of the collective consciousness.

Furthermore, Irfan Habib’s insight into the change in agriculture related to the mode of production in the aftermath of British colonialism can serve as an example of the shift from feudalism in Mughal India48 to the peripheral capitalism that the mother country imposes. Habib studies the transformation of the power structure of *zamindars*49 (landlords) in the village where in pre-colonial North India, *zamindars* “directly controlled the peasant and their labor and forcibly extracted surplus from them.”50 However, the surplus created was often consumed and not reserved for generating further capacity for surplus, which, in Marxist terms, would be “extended reproduction of capital.”51 The British imperialists separated the political power, which resided in the colonial state only, and the economic power, which transformed the *zamindars* from landlords

---

48 Mughal India refers to the Mughal Empire that preceded British Imperialism and ruled the Indian sub-continent from 1526 to 1857. It was during the reign of the forth Mughal Emperor ‘Jahangir’ during which the first English explorer William Hawkins, as a representative of the East India Company, reached India.

49 The word *Zamindar* is Persian for ‘Landowner’. The term was employed by the Mughals for large landowners with full proprietary rights. They were the feudal rulers who acted in autonomous or semi-autonomous capacity.


to landowners. Elaborating on how the shift in the power of zamindars affected the peasants, Habib writes:

Peasants were now legally free to leave their zamindar. But being dispossessed, they could have no access to the means of their livelihood without turning to the landowner for whom they now worked out of economic compulsion, "freely." The peasants were thus trapped, as sellers of labor power by their dispossession. From now on, their demand was to be for security of tenure rather than for freedom to leave the lord.52

In other words, the feudal system of Zamindari was dismantled and integrated within the framework of the colonial economy. This was the first step towards transforming the social relations of production whereby the peasant was dissociated from the means of production and, consequently, her livelihood. So far as I have analyzed the features shaping peripheral capitalism under colonial rule and briefly contrasted it with the development of Western capitalism. The colonization of the economy was a crucial step in the colonization of consciousness because the rationale of capitalism determined the value of labor. Hence, British capitalism was a form of parasitism that had started to interfere with the social consciousness of the natives and deny their consciousness an evolutionary path, one that was seen in European capitalist societies. Further, I examine the rise of the native elites which mutates the class structure within the colony and sets the foundation of a recolonization of consciousness of the social being.

The superstructure of the colonial subject was not independent of the racial project. Hence, while we begin to understand the superstructure in the colonial environment, we must also confront the Marxist ideals critically. Fanon takes the project initiated by Marx and applies it to the colonial setting. For Fanon, the question of race is the core. He writes:

When you examine at close quarters the colonial context, it is evident that what parcels out the world begins with the fact of belonging to or not belonging to a given race, or a given species. In the colonies, the economic substructure is also a superstructure. The cause is the consequence: you are rich because you are white, you are white because you are rich. This is why Marxist analysis should always be slightly stretched every time we have to do with the colonial problem.\(^{53}\)

Fanon departs from traditional Marxism by putting race at the center of the analysis but does so by providing a comprehensive account as to why. When he explains the colonies where \textit{the economic substructure is also a superstructure}, he defines the interdependent relationship of race and class. As Fanon puts it, this is essential because the economic high-class membership is limited to the white race. In the rare circumstances where that membership is extended to the native, it requires that the specific individual is equipped in the ways of the settler and subsequently becomes an agent of the settler to maintain its hierarchy. It is not the ownership of the private property that creates the hierarchy for the settlers in the colony. It is the creation of the other race that legitimizes the structure. Fanon dedicates extensive space to theorizing the subjugation of natives to violence to manufacture their inferiority. Furthermore, Nursey-Bray explains Fanon’s conception of the superstructure where the \textquote{economic relations are themselves conditioned by the existence of racism, and that the resultant ideological structures possess, in certain situations, degree of relative autonomy.} \(^{54}\)

The process of decolonization, particularly in India, was not entirely on the shoulders of the political leaders at the forefront. The Bolshevik revolution in Russia inspired a chain of anti-imperialist attitudes worldwide. But more important in the case of Great Britain was its deteriorating economy in the aftermath of WWII. Alvi explains that the decolonization resulted


from the mother country tending to their white masses who, in the wake of an economic
catastrophe, were considering the possibility of their secessionist movements.

It is true that the colonies were not or were no longer profitable for the parent
countries and that direct political domination had become a burden. But this
negative factor is not enough. ... This can only be explained by a positive motive,
i.e., the home countries' need at a certain moment to steal a march on their own
settlers who were threatening nearly everywhere to secede and form white
states.55

Once the decolonization began, the colonies, who had been the subject of oppression and
exploitation, started to be perceived as clients with whom an economic partnership could be
established. In other words, it became clear to the colonial motherland that if the informal empires
had to be maintained and the exploitation of the peripheral nations for natural resources, cheap
labor, etc., had to continue, it had to be done through the facilitation of the decolonization which
in the post-war time had become inevitable. From this premise, we can understand that during the
process of decolonization, the colonizing bourgeoisie comes to realize the impossibility of
continued domination and seeks to strengthen their alliance with the native elites, in turn,
empowering the national bourgeoisie that has already benefited from the peripheral capitalism by
becoming patrons of the colonialists.

Fanon’s primary focus is to contextualize the process of fake independence, whose nature
is ceremonial. Although national political leaders led this independence movement, it was merely
a pretense for the departing colonizer’s interests. And because of this, any authentic mass
mobilization is shut down as a threat. It is also interesting to note Fanon’s critique of a nation
becoming independent and then joining the capitalist bloc, giving further rise to the forces of
capitalism that reiterate the superstructure whereby the coalition between the national bourgeoisie

55Alvi, Hamza and Teodor Shanin. “Introduction to the sociology of "Developing Societies".” International Journal
of African Historical Studies 16 (1982): 742, pg. 93
and the elite in the motherland uses the ideological state apparatus to manipulate the people. Fanon explains thus:

The unpreparedness of the educated classes, the lack of practical links between them and the mass of the people, their laziness, and, let it be said, their cowardice at the decisive moment of the struggle will give rise to tragic mishaps.\textsuperscript{56}

The new states, subsequently, are forced to become economically dependent on their previous masters. The national bourgeoisie, in that regard, is an exploiter - the same as the colonizer - who benefits from the atrocities of the subordinate classes. But one might ask, how is the nature of subordination changed, or in other words, how is the national bourgeoisie that now holds the power different from the settler colonizers? The short answer is that there is a difference. In the colonial setting, due to the strict racial hierarchy, the divide between white privilege and black degradation was evident. Hence, the struggle to rebel against the white settlers became the point of unification for the people because, first, by engaging in violence against the whites, the native decolonized his consciousness of the inferiority that was instilled in him. Secondly, from an economic perspective, it was a fight for prosperity. However, as discussed, the liberation struggle was a ceremonial changing of the flags that gave power to the native elites. It is not the white that oppresses the brown; instead, the oppression has mutated into an amalgamation of class, race, and gender. This is problematic because it has made the racial project invisible by blurring the lines of demarcation. This native elite has undergone the colonial machine where they have been educated in the school constructed by the colonizer, and they have been alienated from their language their cultural values; in other words, their social being has been mutated where they repudiate their fellow men and infatuate their oppressors. Through this process, they have been rewarded with economic

mobility, allowing them to engage in the political sphere. This is the evidence of the colonized mind, the colonized consciousness.

*Stage 2: Pakistan National Movement: A Case of Ideology*

So far this chapter has engaged with the advent of British imperialism and the transformation of the mode of production from feudalism to what Alvi calls “peripheral capitalism,” Secondly, this chapter has further elaborated on the concept of superstructure, in particular the racial project within the colony that consequently subsumes the consciousness of the native whereby the patrons of the colonial system are rewarded in turn creating a native elite that becomes central during the decolonization. The purpose of this section is to deconstruct the concept of ideology as a form of colonization of the consciousness. The case of Pakistan Nationalism in the pre-partition period is an example of studying the phenomenology of ideology. Pakistan has faced an identity crisis since its inception. It consists of a convoluted set of ideals that often contradict one another. It is also a nation whose identity has been constantly revised according to the changing status quo. This section sets the stage by inquiring about the ideological implications that resulted in the making of Pakistan.

In the case of Pakistan, it is common sense that the nation was founded in the name of Islam, and the first brick of Pakistan was planted with the advent of Muhammad Bin Qasim, the first Muslim conqueror who came to India. However, this is not true. This "Muslim Nationhood" had little to do with the Islamic ideology serving as a basis for the new nation and more to do with preserving the economic and social interests of a particular class, which Alvi terms "salariat". They were the indigenous bourgeoisie in the urban centers and, therefore, had a coalition with the departing colonizers. It was within the colonial framework that Pakistan's independence was
shaped. The salariat class had direct control over the state apparatus in the post-colonial state because the freedom resulted from the coalition of the salariat class with the metropolitan bourgeoisie. There is no democratic political control over the state from the start. Within the "salariat" class, there is a propensity for ethnic fragmentation. Hence, when the salariat class secured its political and economic interests after independence, the league was vulnerable to ethnic divisions. The salariat class broke up right after independence, and Punjabi dominance was established as they had a higher proportion of members in the bureaucracy and military. This is the beginning of the military-bureaucratic complex discussed in the second section.

Once the Punjabi dominance was established, the Muslim ideology employed the military bureaucracy complex dominated by the Punjabi to create a nationhood based on Islam as an ideology. This was only a pretense to curb the ethnic divide. The Muslim salariat class in Punjab is dominant but still relatively less than the Hindu salariat. That motivated them to join the Muslim movement, which, after independence, was why Punjab became a dominant player in the army and bureaucracy. The slogan of Islam was used to curb any regional ethnic movement. You can’t be a Baloch, Sindhi, or Bengali because you are a Muslim. And all Muslims are equal. Alvi’s analysis is related to Fanon’s suspicion of political consciousness because of the independence movement that was started by the salariat to secure their economic status - because a Hindu-dominated India would have put their interests in jeopardy - resulted in the creation of a Punjabi dominance that exploited the ideology of Islamism. The Islamic narrative did not stop after the independence rather gained its influence. An ideology is a fluid phenomenon whose narrative changes with the incentives of the one driving it, which in this case was the Jamiat-e-Islami, which engaged with the military-bureaucratic complex in a power struggle.
An analysis of Hamza Alvi and the theory of the Overdeveloped State can aid us in understanding the transformation of the superstructure under the colonial setting. The construction of the nation-state in the European context results from the struggle of the “indigenous bourgeoisie, in the wake of their ascendant power, to provide a framework of law and various institutions which are essential for developing capitalist relations of production.” However, the bourgeois revolution in the colonies is not a replica of the one happening in Western society. Alvi elaborates by defining the three intermediating classes in the colony: the metropolitan bourgeoisie, the indigenous bourgeoisie, and the landed classes. Alvi writes:

In carrying out the tasks of the bourgeois revolution in the colony, however, the metropolitan bourgeoisie had to accomplish an additional task that was specific to the colonial situation. Its task in the colony is not merely to replicate the superstructure of the state which it had established in the metropolitan country itself. Additionally, it has to create a state apparatus through which it can exercise dominion over all the indigenous social classes in the colony. It might be said that the ‘superstructure’ in the colony is therefore ‘over-developed’ concerning the ‘structure’ in the colony, for its basis lies in the metropolitan structure itself, from which it is later separated at the time of independence. The colonial state is, therefore equipped with a powerful bureaucratic-military apparatus and mechanisms of government which enable it, through its routine operations, to subordinate the native social classes.

The critical difference that Alvi highlights is that the superstructure that the colonizer imposes is overdeveloped relative to the societal conditions that it is being imposed. In other words, the political maturity that the Western societies experienced was absent in the colonial condition, and reverting to Fanon, the Manichean world of the colony divided between the settler and native played a role in that underdevelopment. Contrary to a form of Marxist discourse that

---


58 Ibid, p.61
analyzed the positive effects of colonialism as a transition from pre-capitalist society to capitalism as some distorted vision of the unification of the proletariat experience, the superstructure in the colony employs the racial project to inhibit the political development and institutes a concentrated power to the military-bureaucratic oligarchy which itself is a coalition between the metropolitan bourgeoisie and indigenous bourgeoisie. During the process of decolonization, the indigenous bourgeoisie inherited the military-bureaucratic complex and reinforced the mechanism of superstructure to control the classes.

Whereas Alvi’s thesis of the Overdeveloped State provides a framework to understand the hegemony of the military-bureaucratic complex, which, through the coalition with the metropolitan bourgeoisie of the motherland, was able to secure a political location in the newly independent Islamic State of Pakistan, the implicit assumption in his thesis is the underdevelopment of the civil society in the decolonial paradigm. This dichotomy of the Overdeveloped State vis-à-vis the underdeveloped society is an essentialized premise. The second critique of Alvi’s framework is that it is static and does not represent the change in how the social classes interact within the system of governance. It is a functionalist theory of the state that, though it theorizes the structure of the dominant classes, pays little attention to the struggle and resistance of the subordinate classes. Aasim Akhtar critiques that “[W]hile Alvi’s model of this state has offered much insight into the legacy of colonialism and the state forms it left behind, arguably the most gaping hole in his theoretical treatise is the lack of attention paid to the politics of the subordinate classes, or in other words, the working people upon whose exploitation the entire
system of power rests.”59 In other words, his point of contention with Alvi’s work on the lack of transient political circumstances in the post-colonial state.

The summation of this section must elaborate on the relationship between Fanon’s political consciousness and Alvi’s Overdeveloped State. Fanon defined political consciousness as the awareness of the political and social structure that maintains colonial oppression whereby the power, be it repressive or ideological, is exercised over the subaltern classes systematically. In other words, political consciousness, for Fanon, is a project of liberation first from the colonial mindset and then from the colonial system. He writes:

To educate the masses politically does not mean, cannot mean, making a political speech. What it means is to try, relentlessly and passionately, to teach the masses that everything depends on them; that if we stagnate it is their responsibility, and that if we go forward it is due to them too, that there is no such thing as a demiurge, that there is no famous man who will take the responsibility for everything, but that the demiurge is the people themselves and the magic hands are finally only the hands of the people.60

This particular consciousness empowers the natives to overcome the pathology of colonialism: the inferiority of being. Fanon’s political consciousness is revolutionary in that it endeavors to dismantle the oppressive systems to create a new decolonial paradigm where the individual can achieve self-determination and engage in radical social transformation.

Alvi’s thesis on the Overdeveloped State exists within the Fanonian framework, providing insight into the failure of the masses to achieve that political consciousness due to the vacuum between the native elites that led the independence movement and the peasantry masses. It contextualizes the tension between the native elites that owe their political position to the colonial framework and naturally want to reproduce a framework that maintains their socioeconomic

interests and the peasantry masses within the decolonial paradigm, which are not politically mature and hence are underdeveloped as opposed to the native elites. It must be pointed out that in this definition of underdevelopment of the masses, Alvi does not consider the inability of the masses to undergo the colonial machine as a reason for underdevelopment but rather the framework in which the independence movements are shaping is a neo-colonial reality where the colonial form of knowledge holds a naturalized superiority. In other words, Alvi’s point is that this intellectual vacuum disallowed the masses the prospect of revolutionary political consciousness and, in the post-partition state, gave rise to an Islamic fundamentalist school of thought that constituted another form of colonization of consciousness. This will be the subject of inquiry in the next section.

Stage 3: Reproducing Commonsense in Post-Partition Pakistan

So far as this chapter has examined the advent of British Imperialism and the colonization of the feudal economy and its transformation as a form of peripheral capitalism in the colony, this section delves into the question of national culture, analyzes the Gramscian framework, and adapts it to the Pakistani ideology.

Simply put, if the dominant class is responsible for the exploitation of the subordinate classes – which has been a frequent theme of this thesis – why is it that we do not see the resistance from below or, in the instances where there is, the attempt has either been misplaced or uncoordinated. Examining the posited question is the purpose of this section, which investigates the making of the national culture in the case of post-colonial Pakistan. I use the Gramscian framework to assert the concept of commonsense and how it has been reproduced to win the “war
of position” over civil society. I start by engaging with Gramsci’s work in *The Prison Notebooks*, particularly the concept of cultural hegemony that he lays out. The second part of the section attempts to dismantle the nexus of commonsense and concentrate on the three aspects of the Pakistan case: military, religion, and education. Whereas the three concentrations hardly exist in isolation, for they constantly interact with each other to produce the status quo, it is helpful to separate them and observe their evolution to inquire about their ability to adapt to the changing socio-political culture.

Commonsense, for Gramsci, is not a biological phenomenon. It is created by individuals and groups to naturalize the social strata and manufacture the masses’ consent. Gramsci elaborates on using language ‘lingua’ as a form of symbolism to develop popular culture. He explains that "… the process of formation, diffusion, and of development of a unitary national language occurs across a complex of molecular processes." Gramsci differentiates between civil society, which consists of private bodies, including schools, religious institutions, and journals, and political society, which includes public institutions like the army, police, and legal courts. Civil society contributes to “folklore,” which the ruling class defines as the state narrative. Still, political society exerts a direct dominion over the masses and curbs any deviation from that narrative. Landy explains the Gramscian framework:

The "ruling class" is more than the producers of wealth and power; it reproduces itself through the institutions and the attitudes and behavior of individuals and social groups. Consent through seduction and co-optation as well as through coercion is responsible for reproducing social relations…

---

Commonsense, for Gramsci, is not necessarily a negative aspect. It is simply how the masses make sense of the circumstances in which they are born. The oppression of the subaltern classes has to be contextualized to turn it into folklore. This naturalization of the status quo requires a vacuum between the social classes whereby the politics of the subordinate classes never become an intellectual struggle against the dominant ideology but only remain uncritical and dispersed, which causes its inevitable predicament. However, this vacuum between the social classes is purposefully created by the mechanism controlled by the ruling class, and the second part of the section explores those mechanisms. However, commonsense is an artificial construction integrated by the ruling class and accepted by the subordinate classes. There is a dichotomy in which it operates.

So far as we have critiqued Gramsci’s work that provides an understanding of the incentives of the dominant class to attain a cultural hegemony to reproduce the consent of the masses, what remains to be investigated is the reception of the dominant ideology by the masses and an inquiry into the nexus of modes, particularly in the case of Pakistan, whereby the commonsense is sustained in the subaltern groups. Raymond William elaborates on the proposition that “social being determines consciousness” in that the deterministic tendencies that Marx refers to do not imply that the structure is stasis; instead, he is “opposing an ideology that had been insistent on the power of certain forces outside man.”

Simply put, Marx emphasizes avoiding a naturalistic view of the structure. William prioritizes the analysis of the base, which plays a pertinent role in our understanding of the “realities of cultural process.” Base, he claims, is often regarded as static. Still, as mentioned
earlier, the dynamic is constantly varied, which is also in line with Marx’s view of history with the
fluctuations of social relationships.

“We have to revalue 'superstructure’ towards a related range of cultural practices, away from a reflected, reproduced, or specifically dependent content. And crucially, we have to revalue “the base” away from the notion of a fixed economic or technological abstraction, and towards the specific activities of men in real social and economic relationships, containing fundamental contradictions and variations and therefore always in a state of dynamic process.”64

He further explains that referring to the productive forces within the capitalist economic relationships in the base is crucial from a holistic perspective. These forces are responsible for the “primary production of society ... of men themselves ... and reproduction of real life.” Furthermore, William recontextualizes Gramsci’s concept of Hegemony as a phenomenon that affects the “limit of common sense for most people” and, consequently, the object they believe to be reality. William emphasizes that the strength of ideology lies not in its forceful imposition but in its merger with the social consciousness of society - an experienced reality. In other words, an imposed dogma does not work. We must believe in it. If it were to be imposed, it would be easier to overthrow. But it is not. Because we are born in it, cultural dominance becomes our reality. The paper's third section tackles the question of ideology as a state mechanism to reinforce power structure and the role of political consciousness.

The Muslim scholars in Pre-Partition India did not support the idea of a separate state because it hindered the "solidarity of the global Muslim community or ummah.”65 The question then becomes how the religious wing, which was not in support of the creation of Pakistan, mutated its narrative to become a strategic stakeholder in the nexus of powers to the degree that no political

64 Ibid, p.34
party can come into power without having an understanding with Jamaat-e-Islami (the popular religious, political party). The preface to this analysis can be rooted in the ambiguity of Pakistan's identity during the decolonial period. Toor argues that the identity of Pakistan had to be created as an antithesis to India. She provides the evidence by highlighting the imposition of Urdu as the official state language of Pakistan, disallowing the Bengalis the right to their language and identity. This was because Urdu was considered the ‘lingua franca’ of Muslims of India, and Bangla shared the same notation as Hindi; hence, any traits that resembled the emerging Indian Republic were repudiated by the Pakistani establishment. This tendency to turn to Islam as the means of nation-building and incorporating the idea of Muslim Ummah to subdue the regional empowerment opened the leeway for the religious parties, particularly Jamaat-e-Islami, to actualize the Islamic rhetoric which so far the establishment was merely employing to rationalize the making of Pakistan and reiterating Alvi’s point that the concept of Muslimhood that led the Pakistan movement was a bourgeois coalition whose intent was to protect the economic interests that might have been at stake in a unified India where the Muslims would have been a minority.

In contrast, the creation of a ‘Muslim State’ required a genealogy of Islam to integrate the religion into the political as well as civic society. Simply put, to make Islam ‘the way of life’ required a rhetorical framework that was created by the Jamaat-e-Islami and its founder Maulana Mawdudi. Mawdudi reprimanded the Westernization of Islam, which he thought obliterated the spirit of what it meant to be Muslim. He engaged in his revivalist project on ‘What is Islam?’.

Lerman explains that for Mawdudi, “Islam is a total, universal ideology that can shape a perfect society; and that the purpose of Islam as a revolutionary movement is to govern the world, ’so that
peace, contentment, and well-being may fill the earth as waters fill the oceans." However, the rationalization of Islam in the political structures of the new nation cannot just be a hijack of the so-called secular promise that was Jinnah’s vision. The argument is that once the people were united under the banner of Islam, even though under a bourgeois framework, the seeds of its formulation were sown. In the aftermath of partition, due to a lack of civilian maturity, the rhetoric of Islamization was realized and incorporated within the institutions of Pakistan. The military was one of the stable and disciplined institutions under colonial rule. Hence, in the post-partition, Pakistan inherited that reputation and adopted the Islamic rhetoric that was taking form to legitimize its supremacy over the masses. This integration of the armed forces with the Islamic rhetoric gave them the title of ‘the protector of Islam.’ This slogan resonated with the impoverished masses who did not share the same interests as the ruling elite. This reputation of the Pakistan army as the guardian of Islam set the stage for Pakistan to become a garrison state, which protected the state from forces that threatened the existence of Islam. This religious twist allowed the army to create a perennial crisis that could justify its expansion and keep a hold over civilian development.

It can be inferred from the analysis above that in Pakistan, the creation of commonsense is rooted in cultural appropriation and historical revisionism. A social narrative that appeals to the masses also maintains their underdevelopment and suppresses any attempt at political consciousness. The next chapter investigates the concept of political consciousness and proposes
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a Gramscian framework under which the project of consciousness can be actualized in the case of Pakistan.
CHAPTER 3:
On Counterculture and Revolutionary Humanism:
Political Consciousness and Education

Introduction

Thus far, the thesis has expounded on the need for a Marxian approach to analyze the post-colonial condition. In particular, the concepts of ideology and superstructure have been at the center of our investigation. Chapter 2 was an inquiry into the definition of consciousness and its relationship with ideology. The colonization of consciousness was examined by providing a sociogenic analysis that critiqued the Western form of humanism as setting the foundation of colonialism and presenting its form of knowledge as universal. The case study of Pakistan was employed to understand in detail the process of colonizing the consciousness during the decolonial paradigm that gives rise to forms of ideology that are reproduced till they are naturalized as common sense to preserve the hierarchical structure with the ruling elite as the malefactor.

The chapter provided a historical analysis of the mutation in the superstructure that resulted in the rise of a national bourgeoisie that worked within the colonial framework and shaped the independence movement during the decolonial period to protect their economic interests. The case of Pakistan, and consequently the formation of a Muslimhood which post-partition morphed into Islamic rhetoric, was an example of ideology and how it interacts with class to produce a nexus of common sense and reproduce the ideological superstructure to legitimize the arrangement of the social strata.

If Chapter 2 was the contextualization of the contemporary political landscape vis-a-vis the oppression of the people in the post-colonial state, Chapter 3 aims to investigate the avenues of revolutionary praxis by which I intend to examine the requirements of such action and contributes to paving the path towards fracturing the ideological hegemony of the ruling class - the neo-
colonialists - which continue to exploit the people to their gain. Chapter 3 serves a two-fold purpose: first, to provide an analysis of the Gramscian framework of counter-hegemony and investigate the role of the lumpenproletariat in this ideological ‘war of position’ and second, to contribute towards the discourse on revolutionary humanism by examining the negritude movement and providing a critique of private education in Pakistan as a mechanism that reinforces the socio-economic alienation within the society. Before I begin my analysis, it is vital to reiterate the problem of the colonization of consciousness - the one I intend to resolve in the analysis henceforward. The colonization of consciousness refers to the alienation of the colonial subject from gaining awareness. In other words, the circumstances under which the colonial subject becomes aware are hostile to her existence. This hostility is not only racial but is derived from an economic hostility, which is a product of intergenerational underdevelopment of the individual by first the peripheral capitalism institutionalized by the imperialists and, after that, the neocolonialists vis-a-vis the ruling elite of the post-colonial state. The question, then, is how one corrects it. How does one undo the hijacking of consciousness, which is not individual but collective, not temporal but intertemporal? The short answer is that we do not undo it because, simply put, we cannot. The past, which has determined our present, cannot be erased. But not just that, erasing the past will not benefit the oppressed. What is required is developing a project that revolutionizes consciousness by building over the foundation. As Grace Lee Boggs writes in *The Next American Revolution:*

“Our challenge, as we enter the new millennium, is to deepen the commonalities and the bonds between these tens of millions while at the same time continuing to address the issues within our local communities by two-sided struggles that not only say "No" to the existing power structure but also empower our constituencies to embrace the power within each of us to create the world anew.”68

In other words, the political consciousness must refute the neo-colonial reality. This involves reigniting the decolonial struggle, but not in the name of nationalism, which historically has been a bourgeois movement, but a collective struggle to overthrow the colonial structure and its forms of knowledge, which continue to oppress the masses. This political consciousness will be the beginning of revolutionary humanism. I begin Chapter 3 with this preface, further building on the abovementioned concept.

**The Anglo-Imperialism and the Lumpenproletariat**

*An Epistemological Critique of the English Language*

Anglo-Imperialism in Pakistan is the domination of English as the tongue of the bourgeoisie. But something serious is at play under the disguise of status and posh that English represents. I focus on English as a form of colonization of consciousness in the post-colonial state, as it is a phenomenon at the center of social relations within a society. This thesis proposes that the transformation of these social relations will result in revolutionary humanism that works towards forming a collective man who represents society's multicultural foundations. Hence, a critique of the English language is pertinent to creating a revolutionary framework. Therefore, to investigate English as a means of colonizing consciousness, we have to begin by analyzing language as a medium through which the subject understands the material reality. I investigate the role of the English language as a social force working against revolutionary humanism as it contributes to perpetuating the class divide. In other words, I focus on the private education system, the core avenue for integrating the English language. Since private education is restricted to only a class of people, it creates a vacuum between the lived experiences of the socio-economic classes. Revolutionary humanism has to be rooted in multiculturalism. Since language is central to the conceptualization of culture, there is a need for *de-anglofication* in the post-colonial state, whereby
native languages are empowered as knowledge-generating mediums. The intersectionality of these native cultures has the prospect of overcoming this alienation amongst the classes and, in the process, striving towards making a counter-culture against the dominant mode of ideology. The essence of this de-anglofication is not the English language but the colonial form of knowledge. In other words, The English language is only a medium through which imperial knowledge systems reproduce the neo-colonial framework. Be it the romanticizing of the history of independence or turning a blind eye to the reasons for Bengali separatism, the forms of knowledge present in the neo-colonial state of Pakistan posit a political narrative that eludes the masses and, in turn, manufactures the consent for their exploitation. It is the dismantling of these forms of knowledge that the de-anglofication refers to. In other words, de-anglofication propounds a resituation of Anglo-centrism where it does not exist as a colonial relation of linguistic and racial domination.

As a language, English is a socio-economic player in Pakistan, making it crucial to the identity and what the people think as common sense. English, therefore, represents upward mobility, particularly in the urban centers of Lahore and Karachi. The private school systems are usually English-medium education and are often the only avenues of quality education. Put another way, to acquire quality education; the subject is forced to work against her instincts, thereby impeding the natural formation of the identity that she ought to have. The forms of knowledge that the subject is introduced to use the medium of English. The subject begins to understand the world through English and subconsciously gains awareness. However, with this consciousness, this ability to think and formulate words, and the skill to express, the subject tacitly consents to the subservience of his original culture. This Anglo-imperialism not only embeds itself within the class structure but also within the social strata. There is a superiority complex that one attains by
speaking fluent English as if it is a merit of civilization. As Fanon explained in The Black Man and the Language:

Historically, it must be understood that the Negro wants to speak French because it is the key that can open doors that were still barred to him fifty years ago. In the Antilles Negro who comes within this study, we find a quote for subtleties - for refinements of language, so many further means of proving to himself that he has measured up to the culture. 69

Put differently, the ruling elites determine the definition of culture. Since the ruling elite are working within the Anglo-imperialist framework, the parameters of sophistication are rooted within Western humanism, which naturally makes the non-English speaker a sub-human. But a funny yet unfortunate irony must be shed light on. Suppose a Pakistani who has attained all the qualifications set forth by Western Humanism (imagine a brown man speaking fluent British English and wearing a tailored tailcoat) happens to visit Great Britain. In that case, he will still not be given the status of equality amongst the whites. He will undoubtedly be considered far ahead on the path of sophistication but has yet to reach the destination. It is not because of his self but the collective self, vis-a-vis his race, that he is the representative of. He belongs to the race of sub-humans and will always represent unless he peels off his skin and makes it white. This superiority of the language is only applicable in the colony, where it is employed to distinguish between the classes.

Not only does the subject accept the common sense that the English language is synonymous with sophistication and mannerism, but at the same time, she purposefully dissociates herself from the identity that reminds her of her originality. However, this scheme of alienation has an economic incentive at its core. This promise of social mobility naturalizes the lingual alienation to the extent that the subject scarcely questions it. The economic value of the English
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language in Pakistan can only be understood in that English is one of Pakistan's most crucial primary education assets. The city of Lahore has recently seen a rise in PR Firms (Personal Relations Firms), Calling Centers, and the Freelancer Economy, all of which rely on participation with foreign companies (or individuals), and expertise in English can increase your chances of making a decent living. For example, Rahman (2005) indicates that the English language in Pakistan has a symbolic power. He borrows an idea from Bourdieu’s concept of linguistic power.70 Furthermore, Fang and Haider (2019, 2017) extensively researched the role of the English language in Pakistani society. They explain:

There is a dire need to encourage the use of local languages in education and provide support to empower local languages to reduce people's reliance on the English language. The educational policy should make local languages mandatory for students studying in all schools, ultimately making elite-class children acquire and recognize the importance of local languages. This will lead to the empowerment of local languages and reduce reliance on the English language.71

Reverting to the point that the working class in the post-colonial state is constantly attempting to follow the economic incentives of private English-medium education in pursuit of the promise of social mobility. The point worth elaborating on is that during this process of gaining consciousness through the medium of English at the risk of one’s original identity, the subject implicitly accepts the cultural hegemony of the Western form of humanism. The legacy of colonialism is revised whereby the West becomes the civilized, and she becomes the savage. Amidst this, the subject adopts the social hierarchy as is and climbs the social ladder within the framework set by the ruling classes that reinforces common sense. The subject does not question

the existence of the oppressive system or explore the possibility of change, which is trumped by the passage of economic prosperity, which she envisions within the system.

**Lumpenproletariat: The Prospect of Revolution**

As discussed in Chapter 2, the post-colonial state comes into existence within the fabric of peripheral capitalism that instills in its subjects a false consciousness to naturalize the social structure of the society where the patrons of the colonialists (politicians, landlords, businessmen) form a nexus of alliances to maintain their status at the hierarchy of social relations. The working class that emerges in these societies does so within the dominant framework of the neo-colonialist bourgeoisie class. Consequently, the proletariat does not join forces but becomes subservient due to the incentive of upward mobility or contentment of their status. This is caused by economic and ideological relations reinforcing the norms - referring to the critique of English-medium education. Building on Fanon’s defense of the lumpenproletariat, I argue that the working class in Pakistan has the incentive to indulge in the dominant neo-colonialist culture. I begin by briefly analyzing the genealogy of the lumpenproletariat and subsequently make a case for their political consciousness through education as imperative to revolutionary cultural hegemony.

Bussard describes Marx’s analysis of the lumpenproletariat as the “passive decaying matter of the lowest layers of the old society, is here and there thrust into the [progressive] movement by a proletarian revolution; [however,] by its whole way of life, it is more likely to sell out to reactionary intrigues.”

Put another way, the lumpenproletariat was classified as the lowest stratum of society. It did not possess the rationale to form a class consciousness and was exploited for its brute and reactionary instincts. “They were vagabonds, discharged soldiers, discharged
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convicts, runaway galley slaves, swindlers, ...”\textsuperscript{73} who, according to Marx, were too socially ignorant and self-interested to be playing a positive role in society. However, the lumpenproletariat is not the mass of peasantry in the Grasmcian sense. They are similar in that neither owns the means of production within a society; the peasantry still produces food within the capitalist environment. Their economic positioning depends on their working within the system. The lumpen, on the other hand, are non-producers who barely interact with the dominant framework, and this autonomy from the commonsense and their transmutation within colonial society is what I intend to investigate as a prospectus of revolution.

The analysis that started with the investigation of the socio-economic aspects of English has explained the naturalization of common sense in Pakistan and refuted the Marxist optimism for the working class to become a revolutionary class. The lumpenproletariat, due to the autonomy of the dominant framework, has the prospectus of becoming a revolutionary class, for it does not yet have an economic incentive to indulge in the dominant framework. In contrast, it works against them to maintain their economic position as the oppressed class. Fanon, for example, departed from the Orthodox Marxist tradition and recontextualized the role of the lumpenproletariat in society:

It is within this mass of humanity, this people of the shanty towns, at the core of the lumpenproletariat, that the rebellion will find its urban spearhead. For the lumpenproletariat, that horde of starving men uprooted from their tribe and their clan, constitutes one of the most spontaneous and most radically revolutionary forces of a colonized people.\textsuperscript{74}

My argument is that the lumpen is not a “dangerous class,” as Engels would describe them, but an underdeveloped class that has, over generations, been deprived of basic human needs. In

\textsuperscript{74}Fanon, Frantz, 1925-1961. The Wretched of the Earth. New York: Grove Press, 1968, pg. 129
the case of Pakistan, I have contextualized the lumpen as those living in the slums of urban centers (Kachi Abaadis), which have no drinking water or sanitary services. They work on a “Dihaadi system” (Daily Wage); some days, they work as mechanics, painters, or plumbers, and on days they do not get a wage, they beg for food and money. They are inescapably stuck in a poverty trap that is not only economic but also nutritional, health, and psychological. Dismissing them as a useless product of the surplus population negates the investigation into the cause of their socio-economic position at the bottom and the prospect of them being a revolutionary class. It is this class of people that has been discarded by the state and isolated in the slums of the city whose empowerment is required for a prospect of revolution. What, then, is the relationship between education and the lumpenproletariat, and how are they intertwined with the prospect of a new revolutionary humanism?

Education determines the consciousness of the Subject (the individual), which molds her objective reality (the collective) to make common sense of the world she inherited. The problem is that education is a part of the objective reality that the subject encounters and perceives as impartial. Education of any kind is anything but unbiased, especially when it concerns political education. Put another way; if education is a medium through which the subject attains consciousness, and education is already a part of the fabric that is stitched by the machines of the dominant ideology, then the subject has been fooled twice: she thinks that she is self-conscious all the while being a subject of common sense. In contrast, when the subject is deprived of education, which often reflects the position of the lower-middle classes, the subject’s reality represents the atrocities of the truth, and it is under these harsh circumstances, that she attains consciousness. Here, I refer to the lumpenproletariat.
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Here is a dichotomy that must be examined. On the one hand, we have the subject with access to English-medium education who will be alienated from his consciousness through the pursuit of social mobility, and on the other, we have a subject that belongs to the lumpenproletariat with no access to English-medium education or any education for that matter. This subject is the product of deprivation of the circumstances as she belongs to a class that the state has discarded. She seldom perceives the prospect of social mobility through the neo-colonial framework. Hence, hers is a consciousness colonized through a different ideological framework. This ideology, I argue, is rooted in religious fundamentalism that has equally naturalized into common sense as the English language. This ideology restricts her agency to her abode, where her life is one of service. Albeit, it enslaves her being: her body and her mind. Here, the decolonization of consciousness cannot be rooted in expanding English-medium education, which extends the promise of social mobility to the lumpen. Otherwise, we will be replacing one form of colonization with the other. Instead, what is required is a new form of revolutionary education that allows the development of skills but not at the cost of the abandoning of instincts. Simply put, the educated are damned by the artificiality of their environment, and the uneducated by the lack of skills that education could have given them. The answer to the Pakistani question lies in the latter: educating the lower classes can formulate a revolutionary culture that poses a counter-hegemony. This education is fundamentally multicultural. This revolutionary education is the beginning of civilization, defined by decolonial economic, social, and political relations, allowing for a new political consciousness and, ultimately, revolutionary humanism.

**Counter-Hegemony and The Collective Man: A Gramscian Framework**

So far, the chapter examines Anglo-imperialism, which is how the English language colonizes consciousness and perpetuates an intra-class alienation. We also inquired about the
lumpenproletariat as a social location in the society necessary for revolutionary humanism rooted in multiculturalism, empowering the native language as a medium of knowledge. This section concerns itself with creating a counter-hegemony in the Gramscian sense. In other words, the project of revolutionary culture should be the path to creating a counter-culture that challenges the dominant framework of ideology that benefits the ruling class. Hence, this chapter is an interrogation of the formation of this counter-culture and its requisites. Gramsci lays the foundation of counter-hegemony, which is the refutation of the hegemonic culture (discussed in Chapter 2), in creating a proletariat culture. Inquiry into the said proletariat culture is the center of my analysis. Although Gramsci does not define the nature of the proletariat culture, he positions it as an antithesis of the bourgeois culture. Gramsci explains:

Nothing in this field is foreseeable except for this general hypothesis: there will be a proletarian culture (a civilization) totally different from the bourgeois one and in this field, too class distinctions will be shattered. Bourgeois careerism will be shattered and there will be a poetry, a novel, a theatre, a moral code, a language, a painting, and a music peculiar to proletarian civilization, the flowering and ornament of proletarian social organization.76

For Gramsci, culture is not temporal. It is not simply a set of linguistic or symbolic ideas that continue to exist linearly with every generation passing. It is an ideological struggle in which the dominant class wins hegemony and legitimizes the ideas as norms.

There is a radical implication in Gramsci’s proposition of the counter-culture. The counter-culture is rooted in the notion of civilization-building. In other words, creating political consciousness within this counter-culture requires the reinvention of knowledge and institutions and, consequently, of a new human. In other words, this revolutionary culture is actively created77,

making it an ongoing project. Following that logic, Gramsci proposes a counter-culture that represents the intersectionality of civil society and has to be constructed upon the empowerment of marginalized social relations. Here, the system of social relations refers to classes’ social, economic, and political location and, more importantly, which class acquires the power to produce ideas and knowledge. In the post-colonial state, the ruling elite inherited the colonial framework, the knowledge-producing class that benefits from the oppressive status quo. However, Gramsci is mindful that this counter-culture has to be created within the framework of the dominant class, which has the incentive to reproduce common sense. Gramsci describes the relationship between the ‘intellectual’ and the masses to position this counter-culture within the dominant ideology. This counter-culture requires a methodology whereby the social relations within a society must be encompassed in the revolutionary framework.

*The Engaged Intellectual and National-Popular Collective Will*

Since the masses, due to their socio-economic position within the system, are both consumers and producers of the commonsense, the spontaneous action led by the masses is instinctually rooted within the dominant framework of ideology. That is to say that the spontaneous revolt by the peasantry is not revolutionary as defined by Gramsci, for it does not result in a transformation of the proletariat culture “but have been formed through everyday experience illuminated by ‘common sense,’ i.e., by the traditional popular conception of the world.” Gramsci describes the relationship between the ‘intellectual’ and the masses to position this counter-culture within the dominant ideology. This counter-culture requires a methodology whereby the social relations within a society must be encompassed in the revolutionary framework.

rational capacity to change the feelings of the masses into a reasoned account against the dominant culture. Gramsci explains:

The popular element ‘feels’ but does not always know or understand; the intellectual element ‘knows’ but does not always understand and in particular does not always feel ... The intellectual’s error consists in believing that one can know without understanding and even more without feeling and being impassioned not only for knowledge in itself but also for the object of knowledge.\textsuperscript{79}

However, it is not through their superior intellect that Gramsci analyzes the role of the intellectual, but the role she plays in producing knowledge in the masses. In other words, possessing knowledge does not define the intellectual; it is her capacity to instill knowledge in the masses and provide structure to their feelings that represent their oppression. Gramsci demonstrates the role of the intellectual:

The most widespread error of method seems to me that of having looked for this criterion of distinction in the intrinsic nature of intellectual activities rather than in the ensemble of the system of relations in which these activities (and therefore the intellectual groups who personify them) have their place within the general complex of social relations.\textsuperscript{80}

Gramsci’s framework for the intellectual is a realistic portrayal of the masses. He recognizes the inability of the oppressed masses who are the subject of cyclical underdevelopment: they do not possess the intellectual capacity to organize against the dominant culture, and their economic position bars them from attaining an intellectual capacity.

Antonio Gramsci’s division of intellectuals into "traditional" and "organic" categories must be highlighted. The 'traditional' intellectuals are seen as impartial and rising above current or sectarian concerns in the service of reason and truth. In other words, they are more likely to have an extent of autonomy. Conversely, "organic" intellectuals represent a particular class's interests.

\textsuperscript{79} Ibid, pg. 418
\textsuperscript{80} Ibid, pg. 8
Furthermore, whereas organic intellectuals work to gain support for counter-hegemonic ideas and goals, traditional intellectuals are confined to the institutions of the preceding hegemonic system. Gramsci is concerned with producing intellectuals who will naturally align with the objectives of the working class and, as a result, find a position within the revolutionary party. The difference, as phrased, vanishes if conventional intellectuals are seen to be 'interested' on behalf of a class. Gramsci is often criticized for claiming that the mass of the peasantry does not produce their organic intellectuals. He explains:

[I]t is to be noted that the mass of the peasantry. However, it performs an essential function in the world of production, does not elaborate its own ‘organic’ intellectuals, nor does it ‘assimilate’ any stratum of ‘traditional’ intellectuals. However, it is from the peasantry that other social groups draw many of their intellectuals, and a high proportion of traditional intellectuals are of peasant origin.81

However, scholars such as Kate Crehan, in her book Gramsci, Culture, and Anthropology, defend the accusation that Gramsci had essentialized the role of the peasantry vis-a-vis the underdeveloped classes. Crehan refutes the criticism by positing, "Gramsci here is talking about Italian peasants, not some general theoretical category, ‘peasant.’"82 She elaborates that “not all classes-in-themselves” have the potential to become classes-for-themselves83, by which she refers to the ability of a class to engage in the struggle of gaining self-consciousness. Gramsci reverts to Marxism and his historical development of the forces of production that determine the economic locations. As hinted above, the economic positioning of the mass of peasantry disallows them from striving to understand their reality. As we shall see in the next section, Gramsci’s optimism for the working class becomes the victim of the dominant culture when applied to the post-colonial

81 Ibid, pg. 6
83 Ibid, pg. 44
condition. Gramsci does not invalidate the peasantry's revolutionary prospectus but emphasizes its need to ally with the working class, which can produce its intellectuals.

Gramsci’s writing on the National-Popular Collective reiterates the need to undermine the dominant mode of ideology through the radical transformation of civic society. The cultural hegemony of the revolutionary class must predate the political dominance. Echoing Marx’s writing that people may make history but not as individuals, Gramsci centralizes the collective experience, shaping our reality. The formation of this collective will first require rationalizing the economic relations, which naturalizes their positioning in the social strata. In other words, Gramsci proposes making a political narrative within the counter-culture that contextualizes the oppressed classes and merges them into a collective self-conscious force. Secondly, Gramsci necessitates forging a mass movement that advocates the expectations of other classes. By this, he referred to the importance of the alliance between the working class and the mass of the peasantry:

A historical act can only be performed by ‘collective man’, and this presupposes the attainment of a ‘cultural-social’ unity through which a multiplicity of dispersed wills, with heterogeneous aims, are welded together with a single aim, based on an equal and common conception of the world, both general and particular, operating in transitory bursts (in emotional ways) or permanently (where the intellectual base is so well rooted, assimilated and experienced that it becomes passion).84

_The Collective Man and System of Social Relations_

The Gramscian concept of the Collective Man is essential for investigating the system of social relations. Therefore, we ask: What is the Collective Man, and how is it related to the thematics of this thesis, particularly the political consciousness? The idea of the collective man is a refutation of the isolation of individual beings. In other words, the construction of the individual is shaped by the complex system of social relations and a collective concept of identity. A network

of overlapping and interconnecting ideas that naturalize themselves into the civil society. It is these ideas that are at the root of the consciousness of the individual. Put another way, the individual has no autonomy to create herself. The individual is always a part of the collective being through which the consciousness comes into existence. The socio-economic location where the subject is born determines her perception of herself and, in turn, creates the socio-economic positions of other classes relative to her own. However, this collectivity refers to class and the reality of gender, race, and religion. The conceptualization of these ideas exists in the collective space. Since the individual is born into that space, consciousness cannot be created outside of the collective.

The question then becomes if the collective space can be transformed. In other words, is there a prospect of changing the “collective man” in the status quo that represents the ideology of the ruling class? After all, revolutionary humanism implies an evolutionary nature of the consciousness - a project that must be ongoing. Gramsci posits that the collective man is not homogeneous but a nexus of interlocking social groups constantly in flux. In other words, this collective man can create new forms of political organizations beyond the limits set forth by the hegemonic culture. This transformation of the collective space is the basis of revolutionary humanism that must result in the metamorphosis of the system of social relations present in the dominant mode of ideology. How then are we to solve this paradoxical situation: if there is no political consciousness that exists outside of the collective man and the ideas and culture produced in the collective are van guarded by the ruling class, how then do we transform this collective space into a revolutionary culture - a decolonial political consciousness that rebels against the dominant ideology.

The de-anglofication of forms of knowledge through a revolutionary education rooted in multiculturalism is a course of action that can set the path of morphing the collective species from
which the individual derives political consciousness, which determines the system of social relations. But what do I mean by the de-anglofication of knowledge, and how does it change the dominant ideology, particularly in the case of Pakistan? As discussed in the section above, the Anglo-Imperialism in the post-colonial state of Pakistan has resulted in the rise of private education systems where the English language becomes the dominant form of knowledge and takes precedence over regional languages like Punjab, Pashto, Baloch, Saraiki, and even Urdu which is the official state language which represents their own culture and system of values. The fact that these regional languages have been neglected indicates a bourgeois mode of knowledge generation limited only to a class which, through this medium, becomes alienated. Hence, de-anglofication can be defined as a transposition from English-medium education, the only avenue of quality education, to empowering regional languages as modes of knowledge. This de-anglofication can shift the collective man by including the marginalized communities and making knowledge accessible. If the collective man, which currently represents a neo-colonial framework, has to be morphed, it can only be done by a multilingual form of revolutionary education. Because of the multicultural foundation, this revolutionary education works for the lumpen class, which the state has discarded. The empowerment of this class will fundamentally shift the system of social relations, resulting in the transmutation of the collective man that gives birth to a new form of political consciousness. This political consciousness will challenge the Anglo-imperial status quo that reproduces the supremacy of Western humanism. Moreover, it must be pointed out that this de-anglofication is not only of the language but of knowledge, for it not only questions the English language as means of education but also works against the inferiority complex that is an effect of the dominant mode of ideology. Paulo Freire writes in the Pedagogy of the Oppressed:

"Education either functions as an instrument which is used to facilitate integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about..."
conformity, or it becomes the practice of freedom, the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world.\textsuperscript{85}

**The Poetics of Negritude and the Pakistani Question**

What of the Pakistani question, then? The one that has burdened this analysis from its conception. Who is the New Human, and how does it answer the Pakistan Paradox (See Chapter 1) Our study has been grounded in the colonizing of consciousness from a socio-economic and lingual perspective. This chapter, in particular, has concerned itself with forming a counter-culture against the dominant framework of ideology, which represents the interests of the masses by forming interclass alliances helmed by an assembly of intellectuals. This counter-culture must engage in intellectual discourse to reanalyze the historical revisionism deployed over generations as a weapon for political obedience. In other words, a revolutionary movement is the necessity of the time. By revolutionary, I refer to challenging the social norms and recontextualizing the social narratives that the ruling class has weaved to inhibit the intellectual progress of the underdeveloped classes. The answer to the Pakistani question has to be found in Cesaire, as he explained:

Provincialism? Not at all. I am not burying myself in a narrow particularism. But neither do I want to lose myself in an emaciated universalism. There are two ways to lose oneself: walled segregation in the particular or dilution in the ‘universal.’ *My conception of the universal is that of a universal enriched by all that is particular, a universal enriched by every particular: the deepening and coexistence of all particulars.* (My emphasis) (Césaire 1956: 38)

The negritude movement was an intellectual struggle for humanizing African civilization. It was a refutation of the French colonial humanism. It was a critical movement that endeavored to redefine the Black African and recontextualize its cultural and political history. Fanon’s critique

of negritude was rooted in its tendency to “primarily look towards the past, not the future”\textsuperscript{86}. Revolutionary humanism and praxis have been central to this thesis. An inquiry into the Negritude and its critique can provide insight into a new form of humanism, and it is there I find an answer to the Pakistani Question. The negritude was partly a ‘return to the self’ by which the black power was glorified. Senghor, who founded the movement along with Aimé Césaire, described it as ‘the ensemble of values of black civilization’\textsuperscript{87}. In other words, the negritude movement raised the issue of black identity and, through the process of liberating it intended to inaugurate a new form of humanism - one that acknowledges the contribution of African civilizations to Western civilization. It posits the emancipation of the blacks from their shackles as the center of the liberation struggle. This new humanism, which is negritude, became a negation of the European humanism that eradicated blackness as a being - it was an affirmation of a negation\textsuperscript{88}.

\[T\]he African has always and everywhere presented a concept of the world which is diametrically opposed to the traditional philosophy of Europe. The latter is essentially static, objective, and dichotomic; it is, in fact, dualistic in that it makes an absolute distinction between body and soul, matter and spirit. It is founded on separation and opposition: on analysis and conflict. The African, on the other hand, conceives the world, beyond the diversity of its forms, as a fundamentally mobile, yet unique, reality that seeks synthesis.\textsuperscript{89}

Jean-Paul Sartre, the renowned French existentialist from whom Fanon draws inspiration, lent his support to negritude as revolutionary poetics. In \textit{Black Orpheus}, Sartre examines the question of the ‘consciousness of race’ that negritude raised and contrasted that with the white workers who faced oppression by the material forces of industrial capitalism. Sartre explains thus:

\textsuperscript{89}Léopold Sédar Senghor, 'Negritude: A Humanism of the Twentieth Century', in Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory, ed. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993
“The Negro, like the white worker, is a victim of the capitalistic structure of society, and he discovers a solidarity of interests beyond the nuances of skin with certain classes of Europeans oppressed as he. Such solidarity incites him to plan a society without privilege where the pigmentation of the skin will be treated as a simple accident. But, if the oppression is a common one, it is patterned after historical and geographical conditions. The black man is a victim of it, inasmuch as he is black, in his role as a colonized native or as a deported African. And he is oppressed in his race and because of it, it is first of his race that it is necessary for him to take conscience. He must compel those who, during the centuries, vainly attempted, because he was a Negro, to reduce him to the status of the to recognize him as a man. (Black Orpheus, 14-15)

Put another way, blacks are deprived of personhood. It is denied the subjective construction of being through which they can perceive their objective reality by which Sartre refers to industrial capitalism. Sartre prefaces the problem of class with the issue of race. Hence, to become an active economic agent, the black individual first must gain consciousness of her being. In contrast, the white worker becomes aware through material means that do not require the poetics of negritude. According to Sartre, Negritude is a means through which the black realizes the consciousness of self. However, Sartre's support for negritude is not without critique. Concerning the purpose of negritude, Sartre raised the question of the movement not being an end in itself. The glorification of blackness entails the possibility of anti-racist racism. Still, since negritude is the only path toward black consciousness, Sartre warns that its end goal ought to be the abolition of all racial privileges. He explains the dialectical move of negritude where white supremacy is the thesis, the poetics of negritude an antithesis that can be synthesized to produce a classless society without racism:

Négritude appears as the weak stage of a dialectical progression: the theoretical and practical affirmation of white supremacy is the thesis; the position of negritude as antithetical value is the moment of the negativity. But this negative moment is not sufficient in itself and the blacks who employ it well know it; they know that it serves to prepare the way for the synthesis or the realization of the human society without racism. Thus negritude is dedicated to its own destruction, it is passage and not objective, means and not the ultimate goal. (BO, 59-60)
Fanon, on the other hand, is rejective of this dialectical framework. His critique is grounded in the positioning of the black individual as a negative in this dialectical. Fanon critiques that “Jean-Paul Sartre had forgotten that the Negro suffers in his body quite differently from the white man. Between the white man and me, the connection was irrevocably one of transcendence.” (BSWM 138) Fanon’s critique of negritude derives from its efforts to create a mythical past at the cost of the present. This essentialist rhetoric is what Fanon disapproves of, for he would rather hope for an opaque African future than work towards glorifying the past. Fanon’s argument for negritude as a means of gaining consciousness is that it is not due to the remembrance of an illustrious past that the ‘Indo-Chinese are rebelling against French Colonialism, but because they are oppressed.’ Simply put, oppression is the reason for rebellion, and “the sufferings of the Negroes, as well as the colonized, must not be sought just at the level of culture and subjectivity, but at the level of history and politics.”

Thus, the problem with Negritude is that it diminishes the cultural and historical differences between the African people and their individually different lived experiences. Fanon explains that “[t]he object of lumping all Negroes together under the designation of ‘Negro people’ is to deprive them of the possibility of individual expression”90 It advocates a return to a mythic time when the Black was glorious, but that removes the Black of today from the real consequence of the present and affects the future possibility. Whereas for Césaire, negritude was a means for black consciousness where the political awakening can be rooted in the empowerment of culture, which, due to colonization, is exploited by the white ideology, Fanon’s critique lay in the inhibition of a genuine revolutionary praxis due to the glorification of the past. He explains thus:

Rediscovering tradition, living it as a defense mechanism, as a symbol of purity, salvation, the decultured individual leaves the impression that the mediation
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vengeance by substantializing itself. This tailing back on archaic positions having no relation to technical development is paradoxical. The institutions thus valorized no longer correspond to the elaborate methods of action already mastered.

How, then, do we contextualize the critique of negritude with the Pakistani question? There are two interconnected methodologies implicit in the analysis of negritude that can be transposed in the case of Pakistan. First is Sartre’s dialectical reasoning to quantify negritude as an antithesis to the white supremacist thesis, which is the material reality. In the case of Pakistan, the thesis is the Anglo-Imperial form of knowledge, which naturalizes Western humanism and formulates a system of social relations that allows the ruling class to reproduce the dominant mode of ideology and oppress the subaltern classes. The contribution of this paper has been towards the construction of the antithesis. This antithesis represents the de-anglofication that empowers marginalized cultures through a revolutionary education that morphs the collective being. The synthesis is the creation of a new humanism that calls for the decentralization of power and challenges the dominant mode of ideology. This new form of humanism must lead to a decolonial political consciousness that includes diverse social movements and is evolutionary. Like Sartre’s critique of negritude, this revolutionary education, rooted in multiculturalism, is not an end in itself, for the system of social relations must always be in flux.

The second critique applicable to the case of Pakistan is the focus of the negritude on redefining the cultural history of Africa as a preface for attaining consciousness. But whereas the recontextualization of history is pertinent, the glorification of the past must not be alienated from the material reality of the status quo where the dominant framework is neo-colonial and the subaltern classes are oppressed. The purpose of the redefinition of history must be rooted in empowering the marginalized native cultures and the project of revolutionary education that liberates the lumpen class. In other words, if the glorification of history does not work towards
improving the material reality of the lumpen, then it risks inhibiting the liberation project. Put differently, this glorification is within the bourgeois framework and is inaccessible to the lumpen. In this case, history redefining operates similarly to English-medium education, which restricts itself to a particular class.
CONCLUSION

This thesis aims to contribute to the decolonial paradigm and mainly focuses on the epistemologies of the colonial framework, which in the post-colonial state constructs the collective from which the political consciousness is derived. The Pakistani Question posited at the beginning of this thesis was a question of the post-colonial state that inquired about the relationship between knowledge formation and reproduction of the power structure. In other words, the core of this thesis lies in searching for a theory of colonizing consciousness through a system of social relations where the ideas of the ruling elite become hegemonic, which determines the political locations of the subaltern classes within a society.

Chapter 1 ventured into laying the foundations of the structure of the thesis by elaborating on the substance of classical Marxism particularly and an investigation of the concept of alienation as central to the notion of consciousness. The main aim here was to reconcile the efforts of African Marxists like Frantz Fanon with the work of Marx and Engels. This set the parameters of the decolonial paradigm upon which a theoretical framework can be built. Chapter 2 was the beginning of a theory of colonizing consciousness. It first investigated the relationship between political consciousness and ideology, whereby ideology was defined as a dislocated form of consciousness employed by the ruling class to extract the surplus of the subaltern classes. In other words, ideology is always of an exploitative nature that is grounded in material reality.

Furthermore, Chapter 2 provided a sociogenic analysis of the epistemology of Western humanism, which shed light on the contradiction of the Western form of knowledge as the pretense of universalism. At the same time, the project of colonialism was essentially the subjugation of the “Other.” This dehumanization of the other was the basis of Western humanism, hence analyzing
Wynter’s work that challenged the supremacy of the Western form of knowledge rooted in the colonial relations of repression. Hence, the theory of colonizing of consciousness that the thesis posited was within the Wynterian framework, whereby the culture-forming forces of the ruling elite in the post-colonial state work within a neo-colonial framework. The critical examination of the English language as a socio-economic asset in the case of Pakistan is evidence of a neo-colonial mechanism at the foundation of the state. A colonial and decolonial case study of Pakistan allowed for a thorough analysis of the shifting of the superstructure, the rise of a native bourgeoisie, and the formation of a nexus of forces that interact to naturalize their hegemony. In other words, Chapter 2 outlined the problem of colonizing consciousness in the post-colonial state rooted in the vacuum between the native bourgeoisie that led the independence movement and the underdeveloped masses. This vacuum between the classes gave rise to other forms of ideologies, such as Islamic fundamentalism.

Chapter 3, then, attempted to solve the problem that the thesis had proposed. Put another way, Chapter 3 was a search for a revolutionary humanism that was required to make a counter-culture that challenged the cultural hegemony of the ruling classes that had inter-generationally the masses and deprived them of political consciousness. To do so, it first provided a critique of Anglo-imperialism, which investigated the role of the English language as a system of neo-colonialism and the private education system as the avenue for the prevalence of the bourgeois mechanism. The thesis made an argument contrary to Marx, who saw the proletariat as the prospect of a revolutionary class; however, within the post-colonial state, because of the hegemony of the bourgeois form of knowledge, the working class has an incentive to become subservient to the mechanism that promises social mobility. I argue that it is through the empowerment of the lumpenproletariat, the class discarded by the state, that revolutionary humanism can be found. The
progress of the lumpenproletariat relies on a de-anglofication of knowledge that enfranchises the native languages and cultures. The counter-culture must be formed through an alliance of marginalized cultures that work against the dominant mode of ideology within Pakistan. The transformation of collective man, which determines the individual consciousness, relies on the emancipation of the native culture that must dismantle the Western epistemologies.

In the end, I must concede to the limitation of the analysis and suggest a path for future research. Although the thesis analysis mentions religious fundamentalism as a form of consciousness, there must be a theoretical framework encompassing the interaction of the ideas that together form the collective, which is reproduced into common sense. This refers to the urban-rural dynamic and ways in which the development of their consciousness differs. This must also refer to the gender dimension, which, particularly in the case of Pakistan, is a problem that is connected to religious conceptualizations. Hence, while this thesis plays a pertinent role in setting the foundation of a theory whereby consciousness is colonized and provides a prospect of a revolutionary humanism rooted in the de-anglofication of knowledge that empowers the marginalized cultures, it generalizes a problem that is multi-dimensional and requires an isolated analysis.

Given this, I sense the need to continue pursuing this theoretical project in the future. I believe I am on the trajectory of developing a linguistic theory of colonialism and, consequently, theorizing the formation of a decolonial consciousness rooted in making a counter-culture that transforms the system of social relations. If given the opportunity of a book project, I will explore these avenues of research.
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