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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In an era which has seen the emergence of newly independent nation-states by revolutionary means more rapidly than any other time in recorded history, the obvious absence of sociological investigation into the phenomenon of revolution is questionable and may be due to the absence in the discipline of a theoretical model which can adequately deal with abrupt change. As Wilbert B. Mills asserts:

Paradoxically, as the rate of social change as accelerated in the real world of experience, the scientific disciplines dealing with man's actions and products have tended to emphasize orderly interdependence and static continuity.¹

Yet, if one investigates the historical function of the social sciences, sociology included, what Mills discerns as a paradoxical situation attains a level of logical continuity. George Lichtheim develops the argument as follows:

The importance of this break with philosophy is exemplified by the key role played in modern sociology by the ideal of a value-free science which no longer sets itself up as a judge of social institutions, let alone as an instrument for helping men to attain either freedom or felicity.

It is the theses of this paper that the above statement is but an illusion, Maya in the Hindu sense; a theoretical stance which serves to reinforce a science of systematic control without confronting or dealing with that function.  

This function of which Lichtheim speaks can be viewed in political terms, that is supportive of the prevailing social system.

Social scientist have tended to have the same relationship with their data as government officials. In the words of Ossowski, 'the relation of the state to the sociologist is that of a drunk to a lamp-post, it wants support not light.'

Hence, sociology serves the state by providing scientific datum, hence an aura of natural legitimacy to the status quo. Within this context, the relative absence of sociological investigation into the area of social conflict as it relates to social systems compared with the equilibrium models that permeates the discipline can be viewed as a manifestation of a number of underlying assumptions of sociology which are consequences of its political function. A fundamental assumption which works to limit, if not negate, investigatory work into social change to any significant degree is forwarded by Robert H. Lauer. He contends that:

A considerable amount of sociological thinking has viewed change as in some sense a


violation of the normal...This reflects a conservative strain which has pervaded sociology throughout its history...Sociologist then have been far more concerned with structure than with process and even where they have dealt with processes they have tended to delimit them within structurally legitimate bounds. Persistence and regularities have been viewed as the normal state of affairs; change has been viewed as a kind of social deviance.¹

The inner-discipline assumptive conception of change as having inherently a deviant quality cannot be separated from the political function of sociology as supportive to the status quo which may partially account for the absence of a sociology of revolution in general and serious consideration of Frantz Fanon as a revolutionary theorist in particular. Granted, revolutionary doctrines as forwarded by Karl Marx, Lenin and several neo-marxist are given serious consideration within the sociological profession, but the newly emergent states are responding to a set of circumstances unrealized by the "19th century theorist" and hence must be analyzed from a different theoretical stance. Frantz Fanon provides a starting point for developing just such a model.

Frantz Fanon, the Algerian psychiatrist and revolutionary theorist, has not received serious systematic attention in the field of sociology. There does exist a Frantz Fanon Research Institute in Enuya, Nigeria dedicated to 'the mental emancipation of the black man all over the world from neo-

Yet I submit, after an intensive review of the literature on Fanon's works and his life that a systematic investigation of his thinking within the context of sociology has not yet been attempted, even though he posits definite theories on violence and revolution, alienation, the politics of class structure and elite formation, the politics of economic independence and decolonization, nation-building and national reconstruction; all of which are historically valid concerns of sociologist. It is not within the context of this investigation to search for the cause of this benign neglect, although previously cited functions of the discipline may point to partial answers. It is enough to discern the situation and to make an effort to remedy it.

It would be impossible within the confines of this paper to offer a complete survey of the literature which deal with or make reference to the works of Frantz Fanon, such a work would in itself constitute a thesis. Articles discussing Fanon's ideas are appearing with increasing frequency in academic journals and there exists in print three full-length treatments of Fanon. His thought was so catholic and the realm of ideas with which he dealt so
encyclopedic that a number of wide-ranging journals from the most conservative to the most radical all seem to pay attention to him. Articles on Fanon appear in the most unlikely places and references to his theoretical model and subsequent conceptualizations are increasing with seemingly heightened intensity, especially in the areas of political science and psychology. It must be stated that a great deal of the writings on Fanon are either apologetic or works of absolute condemnation and do not even make a superficial effort to analytically approach the totality or specificity of Fanon's analysis hence these presentations are steeped in rhetorical utterances and are myopic in scope rendering an ambiguous if not a perverted interpretation of the man.

The existing body of literature on Frantz Fanon, worthy of consideration, can be classified under three major headings, namely, biography, social and political ideas and the influence and significance of Fanon.

The nature of the biographical treatment of Fanon's life is general in scope and relatively void of meaningful interpretation. The one book-length biographical study of Fanon is Peter Geismer's work entitled simply Fanon.¹ Geismer traces the life history of Fanon from his birth and bourgeois upbringing in Martinique, his education along French assimilationist lines, his service in the French army

and his first contact with French racism, his study in France and his contact with the French intellectual left, his disenchchantment with France, his service in Algeria both at the hospital in Blida and for FLN, his role as an active revolutionary in Tunisa and his role as diplomatic representative for the Algerian Provisional Government in Accra and his illness and death in Washington. Geismer does all this in a narrative story-telling style devoid of any effort to interpret Fanon's works or the interaction between his revolutionary ideology and the consequences of his life.

Another, more intimate source of biographical information on Fanon can be found in "Homage to Frantz Fanon,"¹ a collection of pieces contributed by Fanon's friends and admirers among which are Aime Cesaire, Jacques Berque, Jean-Marie Domenack, Edgar Morin, Kwame Nkrumah and Francois Maspero.

Most of the articles which touch on the life of Fanon deal with the main outlines of his life which are well-known, every article dealing primarily with his ideas give a brief sketch of his life as background. There does not exist as yet an interpretive biography of Fanon. A number of writers among whom are Geismer and Zolberg claim that Fanon's revolutionary activity can be explained in terms of his personality and the neurosis of his own personal life and the

¹"Homage to Frantz Fanon," Presence Africaine XII (October, 1962), pp. 130-52.
cultural and intellectual ambivalence which he faced. None as yet has followed this theme and developed it with any degree of conceptual clarity and expertise in the area of psychodynamics.

By way of introduction to the category of writings on the social and political ideas of Fanon, it must be understood that it is the intention of the author to familiarize the reader with the dominant areas of concern and criticism derived from Fanon's work. It is not the intent to solve or offer solutions to the conflicts only to present them as relevant background to this paper.

Beyond a shadow of a doubt Fanon's conception ergo legitimization of violence as a liberating tool within the colonial context has received the most attention from both his supporters and critics. Peter Worsley in an article entitled "Revolutionary Theories" defends Fanon against those who would argue that his discussion on violence affords him the title of "apostle of violence." He writes

Fanon is commonly spoken of as an 'apostle of violence,' one who elevates violence into a mystique as an end in itself. This is a travesty of Fanon. For him violence is no absolute, its significance is relative and situationally determined. It is legitimate, indeed sacred where it is used instrumentally as the means of revolution, and through revolution leads to the beginning of a higher social order and the development of new human potential.¹

Worsley also discusses Fanon's ideas about the role of the peasants in social revolution and unlike other critics of Fanon seems optimistic about the revolutionary potential of the peasant class, a controversial subject among Fanon's critics.

Much of the criticism of Fanon on the question of violence stems from a lamentable misunderstanding of his position. Hannah Arendt's statement that Fanon glorified violence for its own sake and like Sorel and Parets, he was motivated by hatred of society\(^1\) or Emile Copuza's characterization of his treatment of violence as simplistic\(^2\) can only be resultant from a naivete of the realities of the colonial matrix from which Fanon wrote.

The main weakness about much of the writings on violence and revolution in Fanon, as with the treatment of his ideas in general, is that far too often writers are content to reproduce or restate Fanon's argument without any further discussion or analysis. And those who attempt analysis of Fanon's ideas on violence and revolution often do not see the necessity to discuss the analytical concepts like violence, revolution, decolonization, etc. which Fanon employs. Hence from this analytical fog comes such absurd assertions that Wretched of the Earth is a plea for non-violence\(^3\) or Caute's


description of Fanon's early existential view of violence as "non-violence."\textsuperscript{1} Next to the question of violence, discussions on Marxism in his writing rank second in terms of volume. Paul Nursey-Bray argues that Fanon made use of Marxist categories both in his analysis of the domestic and international situation, but that he was by no means a Marxist. Fanon, says Nursey-Bray used race as the major determinant of evolution of society and not economics. He writes:

The Marxist categories of class and class conflict, of social change and revolution and of dialectical progress are all present in Fanon's analysis, but this assertion of the importance of race marks a sharp break with a classical Marxian stance.\textsuperscript{2}

Hence lending support to Dennis Forsyth's argument that Fanon is a "Marxist, but a different kind of Marxist."\textsuperscript{3}

Alienation, a central theme throughout Fanon's work has received scant attention from his multi-dimensional critics. This subject, however, forms the substance of a book-length study by Renate Zahar, originally published in German under the title Kolonialismus und Entfremdung. The author discusses Fanon's concepts of alienation in the light of the use and discussion of the concept in the works of Marx and Hegel,

\textsuperscript{1}David Caute \textbf{Frantz Fanon} (New York: Viking Press, 1971), p. 81.

\textsuperscript{2}Paul Nursey-Bray, "Marxism and Existentialism in the Thought of Frantz Fanon" \textit{Political Studies}, XX (June 1972), p. 153.

\textsuperscript{3}Dennis Forsyth, "Frantz Fanon: Black Theoretician," \textit{The Black Scholar} (January 1970), pp. 5-10.
-touches on what she calls colonial "alienation," discusses
the functions of racism in promoting conditions of alienation,
and the efforts of overcoming alienation through violence.
David Caute in the first forty pages of his book entitled
Fanon devotes some space to a discussion of alienation and
identity but with a minimal of conceptual clarity and one gets
the feeling that Caute does not really understand the intensity
of the psycho-social dynamics of the colonial context.

In a comparative analysis of the two works Dr. C. Gerald
assesses their comparative value as follows:

While Caute understood the necessity for
explaining Fanonian thought in accordance
with the circumstances of his life, his
presentation of those circumstances is
fragmentary and assumes considerable prior
knowledge on the part of the reader.
Zahar devotes an introductory chapter to a
thorough biographical survey and through
it, explains much more satisfactorily how
the circumstances of Fanon's life
influenced the development of his thought.

With regard to the discussion of ideas in Fanon, perhaps one
needs to point to two fundamental ideas which are mentioned
"in passing" by a number of writers yet not discussed at
length by any of them, which are the questions of humanism
in the thought of Frantz Fanon and his ethical justification
of revolutionary violence.

The theme of decolonization and nation-building forms
the substance of another large body of writings on Fanon.

1C. Gerald, "Colonialism and Alienation in the Work
Martin Staniland addresses himself principally to an examination of the problems of class structure, elite formation, and the roles of different social categories in decolonization in his article "Frantz Fanon and the African Political Class." This area of concern is of immeasurable importance to newly emerging nation-state in that it offers an heuristic model of post-colonial politics. The question of the economic dependency of the countries of the Third World which logically leads to an analysis of neo-colonialism as a consequence of thwarted decolonization is discussed by Fred M. Gottheil in "Fanon and the Economics of Colonialism: A Review Article." Focusing particularly on the relationship between capitalism and colonialism, he applies his analysis to the case of Buyana.

The final category in which works on Fanon fall is concerned with the influence and significance of his works on the present generation. In other words, an assessment of his impact on the intellectual climate of the revolutionary and perhaps even the reactionary elements in the "thinking community." Except for the obvious inference derived from the volume of works attempting to deal with his theoretical model that is the fact that his work has stimulated controversy within the intellectual community, for there seems to

---


exist a compelling need to respond to Fanon or at least appear intelligible on the subject, this is perhaps the area where the literature on Fanon is the weakest.

Many writers assert quite boldly that Fanon's books have become the bible of revolutionaries in Africa and the Third World without the slightest evidence to support it. David Caute devotes a chapter of his book to a discussion of Fanon's influence and significance suggesting that Fanon's thinking has a more attentive ear in the United States than in Africa. Ernest W. Ranly\(^1\) considers Fanon a major influence upon the American radical left and claims that Kenneth Clark's Dark Ghetto and William G. Grier and Price G. Cobb's Black Rage have both followed Fanon's model.

Bobby Seale, in his book Seize the Time, talks of the influence which Fanon had on him and Huey Newton. He writes:

One day I went over to his house and asked him if he had read Fanon. I'd read Wretched of the Earth six times. I knew Fanon was right and I knew he was running it down...but how do you put ideas like his over? So I brought Fanon over one day. That brother got to reading Fanon, and man let me tell you, when Huey got ahold of Fanon and read Fanon...Huey would be thinking. Hard. We would sit down with Wretched of the Earth and talk, go over another section or chapter of Fanon and Huey would explain it in depth.\(^2\)

Above is one of the few, to my knowledge the only concrete admission of a direct influence of Fanon on individuals

---

\(^1\)Ernest W. Ranly, "Frantz Fanon and the Radical Left," America Vol. 121 (November 1, 1969), pp. 384; 387-388.

and subsequently the structuring and ideology of an organization. This is not to suggest that there is any skepticism on the part of the author that the impact of Fanon's thought is not evident in current thinking on black liberation in the colonial context (home or abroad) it is the nature of that influence which although speculated is relatively unknown.

As the survey of the literature developed especially as it relates to Fanon's social and political ideas, the glaring absence of sociological investigation should have become apparent even though the subject matter is definitely within the realm of the discipline.

The low intellectual esteem in which Fanon is held by contemporary sociologist is evidenced by the cursory treatment he is afforded by eminent sociologist, when his ideas are treated at all. To cite an example, Lewis A. Coser asserts in Continuities in the Study of Social Conflict that Frantz Fanon is "perhaps the most original thinker that the anti-colonial movement in the new nations has so far produced,"¹ and devotes a chapter to the treatment of his works. Then he proceeds to repeat Fanon's statements verbatim loosely connected by eclipses without the academic courtesy of reference citation, as he did in his chapters on Marx and Durkheim. Anyone without intensive prior knowledge of Fanon's work would be unable to discern where his ideas end and Coser's

commentary begins. Nor does he offer any serious discussion of Fanon's ideas but merely dismisses his work as myth-producing and hence dangerous. The question immediately arises dangerous to whom and the political function of the discipline again becomes apparent. Coser's denigrating treatment is exemplary of the manner in which Fanon's ideas have/have not been given serious treatment in the sociology profession.

The works of Frantz Fanon within the confines of this effort at systematization, will be presented from two fundamental perspectives or levels, which are the societal and the psychological, both structure and the dynamics functional at each level. Since Fanon's analysis of the psychological aspect is a logical consequence of his societal model, our analysis will begin with the higher level of group structure and dynamics and proceed to the more particularistic aspect of the psychology.

The sources for the sake of this inquiry will be, due to the nature of the inquiry, primary sources. That is the original works of Frantz Fanon, namely: Black Skin, White Masks, a penetration into the psychological consequences of colonialism; A Dying Colonialism, a descriptive analysis of the Algerian Revolution in motion; The Wretched of the Earth, the forceful analysis of decolonization and neo-colonialism and Toward an African Revolution, the posthumous collection of articles, letters and speeches by Fanon. The reasoning for primary reliance on original sources is a product of two
issues. One is that an effort of this sort, that is systematizing his ideas within a sociological context, has not to my knowledge been attempted, therefore source material is unavai-
able. And secondly, subsequent efforts at interpreting his works have fallen prey to rhetorical enunciations that lack theoretical orientation and rigorous logical thinking as evidenced by the survey of literature.

Chapter II will, therefore, be concerned with the social structures of a colonized situation, the dynamics of decolonization and nation-building. Included will be Fanon's analysis of colonial economics, neo-colonialism, elite forma-
tion and the functional aspects of the native bourgeois as well as the structural formulation of a decolonized, hence, liberated nation.

The focus of Chapter IV will be the consequences of colonialism on the individual and group psyche as conceived by Fanon. The peculiar nature of colonial alienation, the precarious ambivalence inherent in identity formation, the psycho-social foundations of negritude, the heightened identity crisis of the "acculturated-native" intellectual and, of course, the functionality of violence at this level.

In order to offer a background against which Fanon's sociology of revolution can be viewed, Chapter IV will be devoted to a comparative analysis, primarily on the level of generalities and differential assumptive reasoning necessi-
tated by the real difference in concrete realities with which they dealt, of the dominant European revolutionary doctrine as exemplified by the Marxism of Lenin.
Chapter V, the conclusion, will be an effort to draw upon the content of the preceding chapters to formulate a realistic theoretical model with which to view the present upsurge of nation-states striving to break the yoke of colonialism, capitalism, and neo-colonialism.
CHAPTER II

THE SOCIOLOGICAL MODEL

In order to transpose the ideology of Fanon into a sociological model, it is necessary to extract from his writings his definitions of the fundamental sociological concepts upon which his model rests. Namely, his conception of society, personality and culture. Since personality will be the focus of Chapter Three, we will concentrate on the societal and cultural definitions for the purpose of this chapter.

Fanon defines society primarily in terms of function, his concern being that a societies manifestations, that is its normative structures and institutions, should be designed to serve the needs of men, making man central and not superfluous to social structures. "Man is what brings society into being." And when social structures and institutions thwart the fulfillment of human dignity, hence man's potential humanity, it is a social system to be transformed in a radical sense.

The function of a social structure is to set up institutions to serve men's needs. A society

\[1\] Frantz Fanon, Black Skin, White Masks (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1967), p. 11.
that drives its members to desperate solutions is a non-viable society, a society to be replaced.¹

Fanon speaks of culture in two distinct yet complementary senses. He defines culture explicitly as "the combination of motor and mental behavior patterns arising from the encounter of man with his fellow man."² Hence, by virtue of definition, culture arises from human interaction therefore it is a social phenomena. Fanon designates spontaneity and openness to the future as necessary characteristics of a viable culture.

In relating culture to the colonial context Fanon is adamant in the position that culture is inherently national and hence there is no culture that exist without a national base.

For culture is first the expression of a nation, the expression of its preferences, of its taboos and its patterns....In the colonial situation, culture, which is doubly deprived of the support of the nation and the state, falls away and dies. The condition for its existence is therefore national liberation and the renaissance of the state. The nation is not only the condition of culture, its fulfillment, its continuous renewal and its deepening, it is also a necessity.³

Understanding that Fanon's model is based on a descriptive analysis of a real situation, namely the Algerian struggle,

²Ibid., p. 32.
it is inherently conflictual. Conflictual along two dimensions. It has elements of class conflict as evidenced by his differential analysis of certain sectors of the native population, which will be discussed later. But the overriding conflict exist between the races, identified as native and settler. The natives being the original population who are subjected to the systematic oppression and exploitation of an alien group who maintain preponderance in terms of intergroup power relations. It is the dialectics of this duo-conflict situation which forms the core of Fanon's model. Thus a logical analysis must include both dimensions of conflict and the nature of their substance and their interaction. Since Fanon's analysis of the different functional roles of the native population is a consequence of the overriding racial conflict, settler-native dynamics will be discussed first.

As expressed by Fanon the settler-native relationship in the colonial context is characterized by what he defines as "reciprocal exclusivity" which produces a "compartmentalized" society.

The colonial world is a world cut in two. The dividing line, the frontiers are shown by barracks and police stations....The zone where the native lives is not complementary to the zone inhabited by the settlers. The two zones are opposed, but not in the service of a higher unity. Obedient to the rules of pure Aristotelian logic, they both follow the principle of reciprocal exclusivity.¹

¹Ibid., pp. 38-39.
These dual-existent worlds are inherently different in the quality of material acquisition primarily because they are concrete manifestations of the differential in power relations in the colonial context. The native town is 'a crouching village wallowing in the mire' while the contingent town of the settler is 'a well-fed town..., its belly always filled with good things.' Hence the differential power relationship is established; an unequal equation fortified, the native is not equal to the settler. And it is this power perogative that every action of the settler is aimed at maintaining.

Fanon rejects the theses that this "reciprocal exclusivity" is purely a function of economic realities but contends that the racialization of economics in the colonial context functions to add another dimension to power relations.

The originality of the colonial context is that economic reality, inequality and the immense difference in ways of life never come to mask the human realities...it is evident that what parcels out the world is to begin with the fact of belonging to or not belonging to a given race, 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.1

Hence in Fanon's model of the colonial situation one is defined on the basis of his group, in this case race, and all subsequent behavior flows from the content of that initial

---

1Ibid., p. 40.
definition in a manner which approaches a caste-like rigidity. "The colonial situation standardizes relations, for it dichotomizes the colonial society in a marked way."¹

The content of that definition is the creation of the settler who being the power-holder in the situation proceeds to perform his traditional function of defining reality in such a way as to fortify and support the unequal power relations of his making. Hence it is necessary to create antithetical definitions to rationalize the unequal economic reality, thus the settler proceeds to diffuse his denigrating definition of the native with unrelenting intensity.

As if to show the totalitarian character of colonial exploitation the settler points the native as a sort of quintessence of evil....The native is declared unsensible to ethics; he represents not only the absence of values, but also the negation of values. He is,..., the enemy of values, and in this sense he is the absolute evil.²

It is Fanon's contention that the creation and crystallization of this racism is neither an historical accident nor a posteroir rationalization but a necessary condition of colonialism. Hence, the model is characterized by a racist infra-structure. A peculiar brand of racism which is elevated to a normative status. "The racist in a culture with racism is normal."³ The essence of a colonial structure is exploitation and racism is a necessary product of an exploitative


²Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth, p. 41.

³Fanon, Toward the African Revolution, p. 40.
A country that lives, draws its substance from the exploitation of other peoples, makes those people inferior. Race prejudice applied to those people is normal.\(^1\)

Another characteristic of a colonized state is its inherent violence. It is Fanon's contention that Colonialism is not a thinking machine nor a body endowed with reasonable faculties. It is violence in its natural state, and it will only yield when confronted with greater violence.\(^2\)

As is racism, violence is a cementing apparatus in a colonized state. It is the stuff which maintains, solidifies and supports the colonial system. It is the rule rather than the exception.

Torture in Algeria is not an accident, or an error or a fault. Colonialism cannot be understood without the possibility of torturing, of violating or of massacring. Torture is an expression and a means of the occupant-occupied relationship.\(^3\)

The colonial system would literally 'fall apart' if it were not for the utilization of violence as the primary means of social control as manifested in police policies which are supported by the overwhelming 'coercive technology of the settler.'

Hence, the colonial model is based on a reciprocal exclusivity characterized by economic exploitation supported

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 41.

\(^2\)Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth, p. 61.

\(^3\)Fanon, Toward The African Revolution, p. 66.
by a societally diffused racist ideology and inherent violence. Fanon's differential analysis of the function of segments of the native population derives from a perception of forms of reaction to this colonial model.

It is this colonial model which precedes and eventuates in an effort at decolonization. Decolonization is, by virtue of definition, the process by which the destruction of the colonial model, as previously explicated, is actualized. It is not merely the replacement of one oppressor by another. Even though Fanon makes such assertions in defining decolonization as it being "quite simply the replacing of a certain species of men by another species of men"\(^1\) and "the last shall be first and the first last,"\(^2\) a careful reading of his work reveals that his real concern was a redistribution of wealth, wealth being perceived as a concrete manifestation of power relation.

What counts today, the question which is looming on the horizon, is the need for a redistribution of wealth. Humanity must reply to this question or be shaken to pieces by it.\(^3\)

Decolonization, in contradistinction to a colonized state, is a phenomenon of visible process; a discernable level of dynamics which when compared with the dynamics of the colonized state reach gigantic proportions. It must be

---

\(^1\)Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, p. 35.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 37.

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 98.
understood that the colonized state is not a static social system, the inherent conflicts which are consistent tension producers preclude the maintenance of a truly static social system. Only in comparison with the broad levels of change of decolonization can a colonized state be viewed as relatively static.

Decolonization is aimed at the resolution of the broad levels of social conflict in the colonial context. First by eliminating the power and source of the primary element of conflict, namely the settler population. And, by achieving that end, eradicate the native class conflicts which derives its raison d'etre by virtue of the existence of the colonial system.

Decolonization is conceived as occurring in stages, each interrelated and a continuous expansion of the previous ones. It is initiated by spontaneous peasant up-risings in the country side which are characterized by a localistic perspective and at this point it does not constitute a national movement. The struggle through the mechanism of organization acquires a national perspective and indicates that the total liberation of the nation, not merely the provinces, from foreign domination is their goal. This uni-fication in the context of nationhood is immediately reacted to by the settler in a program of simultaneous repression and co-option. Petty reforms are offered, while national bourgeoisie, who do not truly represent the masses, and the settler concerning equal rights and justice. It is in this phase when the native's internal discipline and organization
is tightened in order to survive the repression of the settler.

Although the initial phase is characterized by localism and spontaneity, the second phase is characterized by internal organization, a national perspective and planned program of action.

The leaders of the rebellions come to see that even large-scale peasant uprisings need to be controlled and directed into certain channels. These leaders are led to renounce the movement insofar as it can be termed a peasant revolt, and to transform it into a revolutionary war. They discover that the success of the struggle presupposes clear objectives, a definite methodology and above all the need for the mass of the people to realize that their unorganized effort can only be a temporary dynamic.1

Thus spontaneous peasant uprisings are transformed into organized national struggles. Regionalism and tribal conflicts are submerged under a new national perspective and intra-group traditional loyalties extend to include all members of the national struggle.

The third and final phase, if decolonization is successful, is characterized by the emergence of a decolonized state with a radically transformed social structure designed to serve the needs of man.

A revolution is defined in the colonial context as the decolonization process primarily due to the particular nature of its genesis. Decolonization is a reaction to a particular set of conditions defined as a colonized state

1 Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, p. 136.
which eventuates in a revolution; revolution being defined as the radical transformation of self-perception, symbols and social structures.

The question of the reinterpretation of symbols and the redefinition of relationships in light of the nationalist struggle is a necessary condition for decolonization to manifest itself. Understanding that the colonial system has functioned to deny, negate and stifle national culture, the needs of decolonization demand a new dialectic in terms of a cultural revival. There develops a pragmatic approach to cultural tools and human value systems: what is conducive to the effectiveness of the struggle is defined as good irregardless of its previous connotation derived from the colonial context.

The customary and highly structured patterns of behavior that were the crystallization of traditional ideas suddenly proved ineffective and were abandoned.¹

A case in point. Prior to the onset of decolonization struggle in Algeria the settlers maneuvers to "unveil" and hence reveal the Algerian woman in public, which is tantamount to deflowering in the traditional Algerian family context was consistently resisted by the native population. The sanctity of Algerian womanhood, crucial to the Algerian family structure and therefore central to Algerian society was fortified. Yet once decolonization began, Algerian women began to define

¹Fanon, A Dying Colonialism, p. 100.
themselves functionally in terms of the struggle; they "unveiled" themselves but for a different set of reasons than the settler desired. The settler's rationale was aimed at the destruction of Algerian nationhood while the actual "unveiling" was a function of a new perception of the strategic role that could be played in light of the struggle by an "unveiled" Algerian woman. For in the colonial context a revealed Algerian woman is viewed by the settler population as a "Europeanized" woman and therefore can gain access to places blocked to other segments of the native population.

The same dialectics function in terms of technological mechanisms which prior to decolonization were defined as tools of the oppressor but the realities of the struggle demands a redefinition on the basis of utility. Hence, medicine once perceived as an instrument of oppression in light of the struggle acquires a new and positive value. Likewise, transistor radios, once viewed as a mechanism for the dissemination of the settler's culture, gains new significance when they become a crucial communication link among the natives.

These dynamics, redefinitions, new appraisals and interpretations of symbols and reality account for the vitality and innovative spirit of the revolutionary culture, a dynamism upon which the emergent national culture is to be based. Hence, in the process of decolonization, a new set of social relations develop, a new relatedness to the world and it is the continuities of these innovations which yield the new society. "It is the fight for national existence which
sets culture moving and opens to it the doors of creation.\footnote{1} The numerically overwhelming segment of the native population, those who Fanon defines as the peasant class plays the most persuasive role in his conception of the dynamics of decolonization, an analysis which has received much criticism from his dogmatic Marxist critics. The focus on the dynamism and destructive potential of the peasant-class is based on two fundamental premises. One, the peasant class because they derive their living from the land have a concrete physical as well as a psychological tie to the land. The land question constitutes a fundamental and binding concern for the peasant and considering that a national independence struggle is first and foremost a struggle for the land, the peasant class constitutes the logical dynamic population. As Fanon states "For a colonized people the most essential value, because the most concrete is first and foremost the land."\footnote{2}

The second point upon which Fanon rests his argument on the peasant class is that in a material sense they have nothing to lose by a total societal upheaval. In contradistinction to the peasant class, the native bourgeoisie has acquired a relative degree of prosperity as a result of continuous association with the settler class in the form of supportive services.

\footnote{1}{Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth, p. 244.}
\footnote{2}{Ibid., p. 44.}
...it is clear that in colonial countries the peasants alone are revolutionary, for they have nothing to lose and everything to gain. The starving peasant, outside the class system is the first among the exploited to discover that only violence pays. For him there is no compromise, no possible coming to terms; colonization and decolonization are simply a question of relative strength.¹

An analysis of the function of the other segments of the native population will serve to clarify the emphasis on the peasantry. The native bourgeoisie is composed of small shop owners, taxi-drivers, train operators and industrial workers. They function in the model as a pseudo-linking population between the settler and the peasant class. Although comparatively secure in a material sense, the native bourgeoisie suffer the most in terms of identity construction. Straddling between two worlds, they are marginal men in the classical sense.

The ambivalence of the functional roles played by the native population is a product of this identity confusion. Encased in an epidermal condition culturally defined as inferior by the society to which he aspires, the native bourgeoisie's behavior toward the peasant class is contemptuous while his always "imperfect" acceptance by the settler's society serves to keep him in a state of cultural anarchism.

The native intellectual, who comprise a special segment of the native bourgeoisie who are educated in the Western European tradition function in an even more intense ambivalence.

¹Ibid., p. 61.
Assimilated in the dominant culture in a superficial intellectual sense, endowed with the ideologies which accompany Judeo-Christian education, the native intellectual has completely severed ties, physically and psychologically, from the concrete realities of peasant existence and wallows in the plastic privilegedness of his status.

It is the combination of the national bourgeoisie and the native intellectual which usually comprise the pre-decolonization political party. Hence it is not difficult to discern why the National Political Parties emerging at this particular stage are not respondent to the needs of the masses of people. The national bourgeoisie seek to consolidate their privileged material status while the native intellectual seeks to actualize such theoretical abstracts as universal truths totally unrelated to the everyday realities of the oppressed.

The national political parties never lay stress upon the necessity of a trail of armed struggle, for the reason that their objective is not the radical over-throwing of the system. Pacifist and legalist, they are partisans of the order. On the question of violence, the elite are ambiguous.¹

An understanding of the differential objectives of the segments of the native population vis a vis the settler population should serve to bring a level of comprehension to the neo-colonial model and subsequent counter-revolutionary activity as well as eradicate the misconception of the native population as a monolithic whole. As previously indicated,

¹Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth, p. 59.
once decolonization is in process it is the peasant class, the disowned who places its demand on the land uncompromisingly while the national bourgeoisie's goals as manifested by its city-based political parties urges higher salaries for the betterment of his particular lot.

Because it is bereft of ideas, because it lives by itself and cuts itself off from the people, undermined by its hereditary incapacity to think in terms of all the problems of the nation as seen from the point of view from the whole of that nation, the national middle class has nothing better to do than to take on the role of the manager for Western enterprise.

With the knowledge that they constitute less than one percent of the total native population, true decolonization is beyond the perception of equality for the native bourgeoisie, for they are truly parasites of the colonial system the peasants wish to destroy. It is this inner-tension which subverts decolonization and usually eventuates in a neo-colonial state.

The national bourgeoisie as functionally defined previously is totally negated as a viable revolutionary tool, either in the decolonization phase or in the nation-building phase. "It is absolutely necessary to oppose vigorously and definitively the birth of a national bourgeoisie and a privileged caste," the reasoning being that their historical function within a colonial contexts is antithetical to a truly liberated "decolonized" nation. Fanon concedes that only if

---

1Ibid., p. 154.

2Ibid., p. 100.
the national bourgeoisie can negate itself in that it is bourgeoisie and place itself at the service of the masses of people can it become a viable force for national liberation and nation-building.

Another conceptual category heretofore viewed basically as a dysfunctional element of the population is redefined by Fanon in terms of the decolonization struggle, namely the lumpenproletariat existing on the rim of the urban areas is viewed as possessing the necessary strategic position as well as destructive potential to threaten the existence of the settler's cities. The lumpenproletariat dwelling in a twilight zone between the peasant class and the national bourgeoisie, is composed of pimps, prostitutes, petty criminals, hooligans, etc. They constitute an unassimilatable population segment inhabiting a crucial area close to the pulse of the settler world; the urban areas. Speaking specifically of the movement of the struggle from the country to the cities as a function of the lumpenproletariat, Fanon states

In fact the rebellion, which began in the country districts, will filter into the towns through that faction of the peasant population which is blocked on the outer fringe of the urban centers, that fraction which has not yet succeeded in finding a bone to gnaw in the colonial system...it is within this mass of humanity, this people of the shanty town, at the core of the lumpenproletariat that the rebellion will find its urban spearhead...the lumpenproletariat, once it is constituted, brings all its forces to endanger the "security" of the town.¹

¹Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth, pp. 129-130.
The role of the lumpenproletariat in terms of a positive relationship to the decolonization struggle is not absolute, for Fanon recognizes the ability of the settler population to transform the lumpenproletariat into a reactionary, anti-decolonization political force. Thus the importance of incorporating the lumpens into the movement early and educating them to the realities of the struggle is paramount, for the strategic geographical position they hold can possibly be turned against the decolonization process.

And the oppressor who never loses a chance of setting niggers against each other, will be extremely skilled in using that ignorance and incomprehension which are the weaknesses of the lumpenproletariat. If this available reserve of human effort is not immediately organized by the forces of the rebellion, it will find itself fighting as hired soldiers side by side with the colonial troops.¹

Within the same context, that is abetting the enemy, the settler utilizes the traditional authority figures in the native community to serve his ends. Namely, tribal chieftains, caids, and witch doctors who continue to hold the loyalty of the peasantry are systematically paid off by the settler in an effort to keep the native population "behaving properly."

Whenever there is a discussion of decolonization the question of violence must be addressed. Fanon asserts unequivocally that "decolonization is always a violent phenomenon."² This conclusion being based on a series of observations.

¹Ibid., p. 137.
²Ibid., p. 35.
One being the previously mentioned notion that the colonized state is inherently violent and will only yield to greater violence. Secondly due to the nature of native bourgeoisie's and native intellectuals' connectedness to the colonial structure, an absolute, categorical break must be made from the settler; a cutting of the cord which can only be an uncompromisingness of struggle as is the case with a violent decolonization.

Violence alone, violence committed by the people, violence organized and educated by its leaders, makes it possible for the masses to understand social truths and gives the key to them. Without that struggle, without that knowledge of the practice of action, there's nothing but a fancy-dress parade and the blare of trumpets, There's nothing save a readaptation, a few reforms at the top, a flag waving: and down there at the bottom an undivided mass, still living in the middle ages, endlessly marking time.¹

For if the break is not complete, if the national bourgeoisie is allowed to consolidate their eliteness a neo-colonial state will crystallize. For "the country finds itself in the hands of new managers; but the fact is that everything needs to be reformed and everything thought out anew."²

The new managers of which Fanon speaks are members of the national bourgeoisie, who once the settlers are removed from the colonial context, thereby eradicating that system, place themselves in the same rôle as the settlers performing the same exploitative functions. This national bourgeoisie

¹Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, p. 147.

²Ibid., p. 100.
becomes a caricature of the settler class which instead of creating new economic and social structures, moves within the confines of the structures previously laid out by the settler.

The National bourgeoisie steps into the shoes of the former European settlement:....The national middle class discovers its historic mission: that of intermediary...its mission has nothing to do with transforming the nation; it consist, prosaically of being the trans-mission line between the nation and a capitalism, rampant though camouflaged, which today puts on the mask of neo-colonialism.\(^1\)

By virtue of the nature of its relationship with the colonizer the national bourgeoisie has developed no other skills but ones of an intermediary type. Under the yoke of the colonial system, the national bourgeoisie is unable to accumulate sufficient capital necessary for investment in terms of production, as a means for cultivating creativity and innovativeness; the necessary equipment for a viable national middle-class. Infested with the psychology of the European middle-class, namely an individualistic motivation which can only be realistically defined as profiteering, after independence, if the national bourgeoisie has been allowed to maintain its intermediary relationship with the settler population, neo-colonialism is the inevitable consequence. Hence there is a realization which often accompanies a declaration of independence that for 95 percent of the population nothing has changed. Nothing has changed because the economic structures continue to function in favor of the European

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 29.
nations and a small native elite population.

On the social level, violence also functions as a cohesion producing mechanism. The realization that the settlers perceptual set functions to classify all natives basically within the same framework, the utilization of violence as a liberating tool, negates an individualistic approach to the power structure and transforms the native population into a monolithic whole in terms of its aggressive relatedness to the power structure, because one's epidermal condition presupposes certain behavior patterns. In the colonial context it defines a subordinate status and all the behavior patterns that reinforce that subordination, similarly in the decolonization phase that same objective physiological condition conveys a threatening aggressiveness on the part of the native. The settler is no longer secure in his superordinate status, incapable of separating the "good" native from the "bad" native in terms of their supportive function, all native are suspect. In terms of the dialectics of the native population this perceptual set functions to unify, and cementize native relationships.

Hence forward, the interests of one will be the interest of all, for in concrete fact everyone will be discovered by the troops, everyone will be massacred—or everyone will be saved. The motto "look out for yourself," the atheist's method of salvation, is in this context forebidden.¹

¹Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth, p. 47.
This interdependence for the sake of survival may function to enlighten certain segments of the national bourgeoisie and intellectual elite as to their relatedness to the peasant and lumpenproletariat class although it is not a necessary consequence.

The people who at the beginning of the struggle had adopted the primitive Manicheism of the settler—Black and white, Arabs and Christians—realize as they go along that it sometimes happens that you get Blacks who are whiter than the whites and that the fact of having a national flag and the hope of an independent nation does not always tempt certain strata of the population to give up their interests or privileges.¹

Hence, there is no categorical definition of the enemy. Although the settler population is categorically defined as the opposition, the realization that segments of the native population functionally behave negatively toward total decolonization serves both to heighten suspicions toward the bourgeoisie elements involved directly and/or indirectly in the struggle as well as tighten inner discipline against possible infiltration. Thus ritualistic behavior develops to initiate potential comrades into the fighting core. Inclusion is not solely based on the race factor but a series of behaviors are interpreted as sufficient proof of commitment to the struggle. Hence in the context of the organizational factors of decolonization the class factor among natives continues to play a dominant role around which other patterns must be organized. Thus an intragroup filtering process becomes

¹Ibid., p. 144.
institutionalized for the sake of preserving goal-orientation and the illicitation of appropriate behavior.

A decolonized state is the ideal consequence of decolonization. It is defined not merely by the absence of the settler population but by virtue of the dynamics of decolonization it is characterized by a radical transformation of social structures and value systems. As previously noted, a decolonized state in the ideal sense is not a necessary result of the dynamics of decolonization but as defined by Fanon one can only speak of decolonization when it results in the ideal. Conceptually, for decolonization to have occurred it must be successful and "the proof of success lies in a whole social structure being changed from the bottom up."¹ Thus if there is no radical transformation decolonization has not occurred, conversely if decolonization has occurred a decolonized state is the logical consequence.

A neo-colonial state is the most prevalent form that thwarted decolonization assumes. Essentially structurally and functionally similar to the colonized state; the "leaders" never completely sever ties with the settler population thus perpetuating the unequal distribution of wealth characteristic of the colonial state as well as the violence inherent in supporting that condition. Once the race factor is eliminated as status perogative, it is replaced by intraracial class factors which serves to create a new, although functionally

¹Ibid., p. 35.
identical, class hierarchy with the national bourgeoisie assuming the elitish and exploitative role of the settler. Yet there is no real shift in power. Hence, a neo-colonial state does not conform to conditions of the consequences of decolonization.

In contradistinction to the neo-colonial state a decolonized state is characterized by decentralization of political as well as economic activity. The national political party that emerges from the decolonization process is assigned the task of continuing the political education of the masses that began as a function of the dynamics of the struggle. Political education of the masses is viewed as an imperative function of the national political party and a necessary condition for the maintenance of a decolonized state.

During the struggle

The leaders...rediscover politics, no longer as a way of lulling the people to sleep nor as a means of mystification but as the only method of intensifying the struggle and of preparing the people to undertake the governing of their own country clearly and lucidly. ¹

Thus in this context decentralization is the structural mechanism which allows for an open political system governed by a politically knowledgeable base. Hence, a decolonized state is characterized by a political system of mass participation and the political elite, the national political party is charged with the responsibility of translating the collective will of the people into political activity.

¹Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth, p. 135.
A country that really wishes to answer the question that history puts to it, that wants to develop not only its towns, but also the brains of its inhabitants such a country must possess a trustworthy political party. The party is not a tool in the hands of the government. Quite on the contrary, the party is a tool in the hands of the people; it is they who decide on the policy that the government carries out.... For the people, the party is not an authority but an organism through which they as the people exercise their own authority and their will.¹

A much more equitable distribution of wealth is the logical consequence for it is a safe assumption that a people systematically oppressed under an exploitative economic system, will not continue in that state of economic deprivation.

Therefore, for Fanon, a decolonized state is characterized by a politically conscious mass base which through the channels of a decentralized political structure directs the course of the nation. A state where the national bourgeoisie has not entrenched itself as a privileged caste to the degree that the system of wealth distribution remains consistent with the pattern of the colonial situation. A state in which each individual is free to determine his destiny and thereby realize his humanity. Fanon's concern was not merely the decolonization of oppressed peoples but via this decolonization the emergence of a more humane, rationale mankind; no small task.

But a newly independent state will immediately be faced with a new phenomena one its status of independence has

¹Ibid., p. 142.
been secured. Namely, a confrontation in the international context with the "cold war" antagonist—the East and the West. This confrontation is manifested internally by the expectations of structuring a new nation on a model, with the available limitations being the capitalism of the democratic bloc or the socialism of the Communist world.

The Third World ought not to be content to define itself in the terms of values which have preceded it. On the contrary the underdeveloped countries ought to do their utmost to find their own particular values and methods and a style which shall be peculiar to them.¹

Yet, although he urges a redefinition of priorities, Fanon denies the possibility of incorporating capitalism into the "peculiar" system due to its fundamental workings.

Of course, we know that the capitalist regime, in so far as it is a way of life, cannot leave us free to perform our work at home nor our duty in the world. Capitalist exploitation and cartels and monopolies are the enemies of underdeveloped countries.²

Yet, on the other hand, the

...choice of a socialist regime, a regime which is completely orientated toward the people as a whole and based on the principle that man is the most precious of all possessions, will allow us to go forward more quickly and more harmoniously and thus make impossible that caricature of society where all economic and political power is held in the hands of a few who regard the nation as a whole with scorn and contempt.³

Thus, Fanon expresses his preference for the principle of socialism but not as it is manifested in any particular nation—

¹Ibid., p. 99.
²Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth, p. 99.
³Ibid., p. 99.
state, hence, paving the way for the development of specific declarations of "peculiarly" African socialism.

The international confrontation is also manifested in the question of aligning oneself with one of the major ideological blocs, the underlying reality being that the economic poverty of underdeveloped nations necessitates a source of support; a support which can only be forthcoming from an economically secure nation. At this point we come to an element of Fanon's conceptual framework which is customarily ignored by Fanonian analyst, that is his commitment to the idea of reparations. His belief that the European nations wealth, being a product of African exploitation, have an obligation to assure the development of stable African nations. This proposition is not naively based on an appeal to conscience or European morality but on Fanon's contention that the African nations, as a necessary consumer market for European commodities cannot support Europe without a stable economic base.

So when we hear the head of a European state declare with his hand on his heart that he must come to the aid of the poor underdeveloped peoples, we do not tremble with gratitude. Quite the contrary; we say to ourselves: "It's a just reparation which will be paid to us." Nor will we acquiesce in the help for underdeveloped countries being a program of "sisters of charity." This help should be the ratification of a double realization: the realization by the colonized peoples that it is their due, and the realization by the capitalist powers that in fact they must pay. ¹

Hence, Fanon does not deny the need for economic support from capitalist countries. He realizes that in the cold world

¹Ibid., p. 103.
of concrete realities independence neither feeds nor clothes the masses. It is the nature and consequences of the economic support which distinguishes reparations and neo-colonialism. Reparations results in the development of a stable economic base for the purpose of improving the material and spiritual conditions of the masses of people, while neo-colonialism perpetuates the same pattern of wealth distribution as characterized the colonial state; hence

"The distribution of wealth that it effects is not spread out between a great many sectors; it is not ranged among different levels, nor does it set up a hierarchy of half-tones. The new caste is an affront all the more disgusting in that the immense majority, nine-tenths of the population, continue to die of starvation."

By way of summary, a colonized state is characterized by a reciprocal exclusivity based on a racialization of economic, political, and social structures supported by its inherent violence. Decolonization is the process by which a colonized state is destroyed, national culture is created and a new social order, in terms of a decolonized state evolves. A neo-colonial state emerges when the native bourgeoisie maintains the political power in an independent state and proceeds to function as intermediaries between the settler and native. In a neo-colonial state there is no restructuring of the social order and the native class system is made more rigid.

---

1Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth, p. 167.
Decolonization, if successful, serves to eliminate simultaneously both race and class distinctions as they existed in the colonial state.
CHAPTER III
PERSONAL ORIENTATION

Personality is a dialectical phenomenon arising from external contacts with environment and personal interpretations of that environment, to that extent personality is a social phenomenon. The reality of the colonial context creates a neurotic social situation for the native.

The neurotic structure of an individual is simply the elaboration, the eruption, the eruption within the ego, of conflictual clusters arising in part out of the environment and in part out of the purely personal way in which that individual reacts to these influences.¹

In the colonial context the conflictual clusters, of which Fanon speaks are institutionalized into the social structures. For

if he is overwhelmed to such a degree by the wish to be white, it is because he lives in a society that makes his inferiority complex possible, in a society that derives its stability from the perpetuation of this complex, in a society that proclaims the superiority of one race; to the identical-degree to which that society creates difficulties for him, he will find himself thrust in a neurotic situation.²

Thus in the colonial context, the neurotic structure is

²Ibid., p. 100.
socialized into the individual native. Neurosis is thus derived from the inherent ambivalence of confrontations with the social structures, the shift then of responsibility for the condition is realistically away from an emphasis on individual's inability to cope with a social system onto a social system which makes it impossible for an individual to simply be human. For human, as we shall see, in the colonial context means white, a physical impossibility for the native.

Hence we are driven from the individual back to the social structure. If there is a taint, it lies not in the "soul" of the individual but rather in that of the environment.¹

Environment being the social institutions that foster, support and perpetuate exploitation and racism as normative patterns of behavior. When it is considered that "the criterion of maturity being in fact adaptation to society," a society which precludes that possibility for an objective segment of the population is a neurosis-producing society.

By virtue of the nature of the social structure of the colonial system, certain patterns of behavior are predominant, especially in terms of native/settler interaction. The racist ideology and violent reality of the colonial context functions to define all intergroup relationships; these definitions are diffused throughout the culture in such a manner that it also functions to categorize intragroup relations, producing a

¹Ibid., p. 213.
native class system which we will discuss later. In terms of black/white relations

The black man has two dimensions, one with his fellows, the other with the white man. A Negro behaves differently with a white man and with another Negro. That this self-division is a direct result of colonialist subjugation is beyond question.¹

That this self-division is a product of the nature of the colonial system; the racialization, hence, categorization of human interaction within the power context of the colonial system, is established. Social institutions and normative behavior patterns function to reinforce, perpetuate and institutionalize this self-division in every sphere of interaction. The social structure and dynamics of the colonial context functions to create neurotics in an absolute sense, en mass.

"The Negro is in every sense of the word, a victim of white civilization...the Negro lives in an ambiguity that is extraordinarily neurotic."²

Fanon quite explicitly states that there is a direct relationship between the nature and content of social structures and subsequent personality construction, especially in terms of the development of various defense mechanisms as it relates to efforts to confront and cope with one's environment. Fanon speaks directly to this relationship as it characteristically exists in the colonial context from the perspective of psychiatry.

¹ Fanon, *Black Skin-White Mask*, p. 17.
If psychiatry is the medical technique that aims to enable man no longer to be a stranger to his environment, I owe it to myself to affirm that the Arab (native), permanently an alien in his own country, lives in a state of absolute depersonalization....The Social Structure existing in Algeria was hostile to any attempt to put the individual back where he belonged.\(^1\)

Back to a sane relationship to reality.

The permanence of alienation of the native in the colonial context can be characterized as a normative state, for there exist no escape from the depersonalization, as long as the colonial system remains intact.

It must be emphasized that the alienation of the native is a necessary personality construction for it affords the native the necessary defensive mechanism to cope with a hostile, destructive social system.

The sense of alienation from colonial society and the mistrust of the representatives of its authority, are always accompanied by an almost mechanical sense of detachment and mistrust of even the things that are most positive and most profitable to the population.\(^2\)

Thus there exist a mechanization of an attitude of distrust which coats all spheres of native/settler interaction; an attitude which classical psychologist would define as a state of paranoia. Yet in the colonial context it takes on a different significance, because the source of danger is real,


it is not a manufactured projection but a highly technolized machine moving to destroy all realities of the native. Hence, the native's alienation in addition to being a reaction to a hostile environment simultaneously in its behavior manifestations of aloofness and avoidance functions as a defense against total cultural destruction.

Alienation is socialized into the native—by family, peers and associates for they are all carriers of the dominant society. Socialized in a society which defines black as negative (bestial) and the ontological perception of one's own being as belonging to that negative group produces a refined intragroup definition of blackness vis a vis whiteness. The native literally trapped within his own skin, for the sake of "sanity" must devise a mechanism through which he can achieve a sense of worthiness hence whiteness. This he does by accepting the premise of black equals evil, but revises its application to a moral level.

...the Antillean (Negro) has recognized himself as a Negro, but by virtue of an ethical transit, he also feels...that one is a Negro to the degree to which one is wicked, sloppy, malicious, instinctual. Everything that is the opposite of these Negro modes of behavior is white....In other words, he is Negro who is immoral. If I order my life like a moral man, I simply am not a Negro.  

This perceptual set takes on another dimension in the case of the intellectual elite. They perceive the total situation in terms of one's ability to intellectualize, the ability to

---

1Fanon, *Black Skin—White Mask*, p. 192.
maneuver the tools of western logic becomes the gateway into the world of whiteness. Yet in all cases of possible entrance, the betrayal is evident. For the absolute criteria for entrance into the white world remains the genetically determined state of whiteness.

"Quite simply, they are the instances in which the educated Negro suddenly discovers that he is rejected by a civilization which he has none the less assimilated."  

The intensity of internalization of the negative image of the Negro by the natives themselves varies throughout the system. Aside from degree of contact with whites, the educational system serves to inculcate and enforce the conception of the Negro as the personification of evil. Hence the intellectual elite find itself in the most ambiguous position.

The black schoolboy in the Antilles, who is in his lessons is forever talking about "our ancestors." The Gauls, identifies himself with the explorer, the bringer of civilization, the white man who carries truth to savages--an all white truth. There is identification—that is, the young Negro subjectively adopts a white man's attitude.  

Therefore, in the colonial context one of the primary socialization agents delegated with the task of imparting to the members of society the necessary tools to realistically fit into that society, is in actuality an alienating tool. An accurate or at least realistic identity formation in terms of relatedness to society is an impossibility for the educated

---

1 Ibid., p. 93.
2 Ibid., p. 147.
Negro, at least at the time of his education.

Little by little, one can observe in the young Antillean (Negro) the formation and crystallization of an attitude and a way of thinking and seeing that are essentially white.... Subjectively, intellectually, the Antillean conducts himself like a white man.¹

Subsequent reflection once bombardment with cold reality may force a modification of perception but the damage incurred during youth to identity construction is irreversible in its totality. And for this reason Fanon, recognizing the phenomena as the result of the same system of conditioning in himself, fatalistically cries out "there is no help for it: I am a white man. For unconsciously I distrust what is black in me, that is, the whole of my being."²

This unconscious element is the product of conditioning, reinforced by the norms and mores of the dominant social system that one has internalized through the mechanism of education. For in the process of socialization one internalizes to the degree of contact and intensity the prejudices and attitudes prevalent in that particular system. "It is normal for the Antillean to be anti-Negro. Through the collective unconscious the Antillean has taken over all the archetypes belonging to the European."³ The native intellectual acquires the prejudices to a greater degree than the native who has had a limited number and a different kind of contact (primary or secondary) with the colonial system. It must be stated that the difference

¹Fanon, Black Skin-White Mask, p. 148.
²Ibid., p. 191.
³Ibid., p. 190.
is one of degree not of kind; for the un-educated native is acculturated less subtly and does not utilize the mechanism of intellectualization (rationalization) in an effort to redefine his blackness. Thus the un-educated native has a clearer conception of the antithetical relationship of native/settler. Hence, the content or nature of the alienation is qualitatively different. In the case of the educated Negro:

...the alienation is of an almost intellectual character. Insofar as he conceives of European culture as a means of stripping himself of his race he becomes alienated. In the second case (the un-educated Negro) it is a question of a victim of a system based on the exploitation of a given race by another, on the contempt in which a given branch of humanity held by a form of civilization that pretends to superiority.¹

Fanon, analyzing the totality of the colonial context from a psychological or as he says sociogenic perspective, views the Negro as conceived in the context as performing for the white society a general psychological function. Namely, Negroes are the receptacle in which white society deposits all its negative components thereby freeing itself from its own id. In other words, the dynamics of projection are in process on a societal level, not simply individually. Explicitly, the function is cathartic

In every society, in every collectivity, exists--must exist--a channel, an outlet through which the forces accumulated in the form of aggression can be released... each type of society, of course, requiring its own specific kind of catharsis.²

¹Fanon, Black Skin-White Mask, p. 224.
²Ibid., pp. 145-6.
In the colonial context, the catharsis takes on the form of a cultural Negrophobia disseminated and diffused throughout the collective unconscious. The collective unconscious is a cultural phenomenon, because it is learned. It is purely and simply the sum of prejudices, myths, collective attitudes of a given group. In the colonial context the substantive content of the collective unconscious is also Negrophobic.

Negrophobia is a neurotic condition which applies a phobic reaction to Negroes. "Phobia is a neurosis characterized by the anxious fear of an object or an extension of the situation...it must arouse...both fear and revulsion." The fundamental characteristic of phobic behavior is that it defies logic or as Fanon asserts "the phobic is a person who is governed by the laws of rational prelogic and affective pre-logic." Hence, a phobic personality cannot be dissuaded from his view by the presentation of rational arguments or empirical evidence. The Negro in this context is defined as bestial, evil, but most of all sexually potent. Socially and culturally perceived genitally, this conception defies reality.

Is the Negro's superiority real. Everyone knows that it is not. But that is not what matters. The prelogic thought of the phobic has decided that such is the case.

And it is on this level of prelogical thinking that racism is bred and institutionalized.

---

1Ibid., p. 188.
2 Fanon, Black Skin-White Mask, p. 154.
3 Ibid., p. 155.
4 Ibid., p. 159.
Thus it is realized that racism and the structure of social institutions are intertwined to such a degree that only a total social restructuring could possibly change the relationship. In a colonial context, racism is the alienating tool of the power structure; a necessity for the maintenance of determining power.

It is not possible to enslave men without logically making them inferior through and through. And racism is only the emotional, affective, sometimes intellectual explanation of this inferiorization.¹

The inferiorization of the native serves to support the colonial system, alienate the native and define social relations along racial lines. Thus social interaction has a different dimension when the participants are from opposing social (racial) categories. The interaction reflects the power relations in the dominant culture. Avoidance behavior dominates the action of the native.

Colonial domination..., gives rise to and continues to dictate a whole complex of resentful behavior and of refusal on the part of the colonized. The colonized exerts a considerable effort to keep away from the colonial world, not to expose himself to any action of the conqueror.²

When avoidance is unattainable, the native purposely shadows his activities with half-truths. It is an intragroup consensus that one does not express truth to the settler, in context. Thus intergroup contacts are characterized by an

¹Fanon, Toward the African Revolution, p. 40.
²Fanon, A Dying Colonialism, p. 130.
obvious mistrust amplified by the absence of identifiable objective social cues that ritualize human interaction. Hence social interaction on a purely personal level is, in the colonial milieu, an impossibility. For the collective unconscious by means of Negrophobia has implanted an image of the Negro, which every intergroup encounter must react to, which precludes the possibility of a one-to-one social situation. Perceptions, prejudices, and attitudes determine interaction to such a degree that historicity predominates.

When people like me, they tell me it is in spite of my color. When they dislike me, they point out that it is not because of my color. Either way, I am locked into the infernal circle....I am given no chance. I am over-determined from without. I am a slave not of the "idea" that others have of me but of my own appearance.¹

Hence in the colonial context there exists a critical relationship between the Negro and his skin color. For it is on the basis of the connotation of his physical schema that he is reacted to in a social situation.

For not only must the black man be black; he must be black in relation to white....In the white world the man of color encounters difficulties in the development of his bodily schema. Consciousness of the body is solely a negating activity. It is a third person consciousness. The body is surrounded by an atmosphere of certain uncertainty.²

His individuality is of no significance in settler/native intercourses, even with his intellectual transmission of whiteness on an ethical plane, the native instinctually

¹Fanon, Black Skin-White Mask, p. 116.
²Ibid., pp. 110-11.
recognizes his entrapment in his physical being. Hence, the creation of an intragroup color hierarchy among the natives grounded in the theses that whiteness is inherently better. Consequently, interracial sexual relations attain a positive social significance, for seemingly the sole salvation of the race is eventual extinction, in that it is absorbed by the white race.

For in a word, the race must be whitened; every woman in Martinique knows this, says this, repeats it. Whiten the race, save the race, but not in the sense that one might think: not 'preserve the uniqueness of that part of the world in which they grew up,' but make sure that it will be white.¹

Hence, the lighter the child, the more white genes, the more beautiful the child; a complementary value system is erected in the native society which via the collective unconscious has internalized an existential dilemma, seeks to run from and eventually escape their blackness. And in the context of the colonial situation no viable alternative to human-ness is available, short of total social restructuring.

From the moment the Negro accepts the separation imposed by the European he has no respite, and 'is it not understandable that thence forward he will try to elevate himself to the white man's level? To elevate himself in the range of colors to which he attributes a kind of hierarchy.'²

Subsequently in native society, color gradation acquires significance thereby refining the categorical inferiorization

¹Ibid., p. 47.

²Fanon, Black Skin-White Mask, p. 82.
imposed by the settler in order to create a substitute channel toward human-ness. For in the colonial context, it must be remembered, one is human to the extent that one can be defined as white. An impossibility for a native yet he devises mechanisms to cope with this ontological dilemma.

Locked in an existential predicament that precludes entrance into the world of 'real' human-beings, in the colonial context, imminent decolonization forces a redefinition of reality hence humanity upon the native. For it is the explicit purpose of decolonization to call the whole colonial situation into question and racism being the primary buttress of the system requires immediate attention.

Thus the native discovers that his life, his breath, his beating heart are the same as those of the settler. He finds out that the settler's skin is not of any more value than a native's skin; and it must be said that this discovery shakes the world in a very necessary manner. All the new, revolutionary assurance of the native stems from it.¹

The world is colored anew, the collective unconscious is negated and the ideological foundation of the colonial situation crumbles. For the maintenance of superiority demands inferiors; those who behave in such a manner that affirms another superiority. The recognition of the fallacy in the argument of white/settler's superiority eradicates the subordinate/superordinate behavior patterns upon which the colonial situation rests?

For if, in fact, my life is worth as much as the settler's, his glance no longer shrivels me up nor freezes me, and his voice no longer turns me into stone.¹

Intergroup dynamics, as a result of decolonization take on a different dimension. A degree of arrogance becomes characteristic of the native attitude; an arrogance founded in his newfound perception of reality; his newfound perception of his self, in relation to the world of the other.

The dynamics of decolonization serve to redefine social relations and morality in a functional context. Morality becomes concretized in terms of its criteria; that is, morality of behavior becomes simply that behavior which leads to the destruction of the superior status of the settler.

As far as the native is concerned, morality is very concrete; it is to silence the settler's defiance, to break his flaunting violence— in a word, to put him out of the picture.²

In the context of this new morality and the previously explicated nature of alienation in the colonial state, the violence of the native takes on a dialectical significance. In terms of the struggle, it is both a moral act and a cleansing force.

At the level of individuals, violence is a cleansing force. It frees the native from his inferiority complex and from his despair and inaction; it makes him fearless and restores his self-respect.³

¹Ibid., p. 45.
²Ibid., p. 44.
³Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth, p. 94.
A new system of social relations is built on this new morality. Family structure once a function of traditionalism gains a dynamic quality linked to the new morality of the struggle. Changing structures change relationships and attitudes. The process of decolonization sets into motion a chain of events which leaves the native society totally renewed and replenished. National culture born out of the dynamics of the struggle; a redefinition of reality, by changing structures and relationships moves the native to a new self-realization. A self-realization grounded in the knowledge of his inherent human worth and his relatedness to other human beings bounded together against the settler.

In the context of the family, the realities of the struggle causes an abrupt change in attitudes within the family, itself. The traditional family hierarchy is redefined functionally in terms of relatedness to the struggle. The father is no longer the sole source of authority, the role of the eldest son as an authoritative figure is negated and the relationship of wife to husband is defined anew. The foundations upon which traditional Algerian society has been based succumbs to new forms and structures. In the process of the struggle, new roles grow out of the conflict.

Algerian society in the fight for liberation, in the sacrifices that it was willing to make in order to liberate itself from colonialism, renewed itself and developed new values governing sexual relations. The woman ceased to be complement for man. She literally forced a new place for herself by her sheer strength.1

1Fanon, A Dying Colonialism, p. 109.
A redefinition of the woman's role in a society serves to shape a new direction for all other social forms, women being traditional considered the carriers of culture. The Algerian woman by redefining herself and her relationship to her husband, family, and the national struggle catalyzed the development of a pragmatic morality upon which a couple's relationship can be sustained during the tensions and turmoil of the struggle, and upon which the post-decolonization's couple's life will be based.

To ask of a woman who was daily risking her life whether she was "serious" became grotesque and absurd. The militant girl, in adopting new patterns of conduct, could not be judged by traditional standards. Old values, sterile and infantile phobias disappeared.¹

Thus in the context of the family, standards of womanhood are redefined which consequently leads to a new criteria for manhood. Manhood becomes defined in terms of the struggle.

Reproaching one's husband for not participating in a combat known to be deadly is a paradoxical kind of behavior to say the least. But the women no longer consider the man's conditions as they did before. The man's job is patriotic activity and no one can affirm his virility if he is not a part of the fighting nation.²

By redefining roles, relationships change and the family structures and functions become crucial and not superfluous to the struggle. Similar dynamics are functional at all levels of interaction as a result of decolonization.

¹Ibid., p. 110.
²Ibid., p. 112.
Thus successful decolonization obliterates the personality construction characteristic of the colonial state. Inferiority is supplanted by a new found arrogance, reactive behavior gives way to actional behavior and traditional roles are defined in the context of the struggle. The dynamics of decolonization on the social level functions to redefine the psychology/personality of the native for the elimination of the racist ideology and alienating institutions of the colonial context, eliminates the grounds upon which colonial alienation is based.
CHAPTER IV

LENIN AND FANON ON REVOLUTION

A comprehensive comparison of Lenin and Fanon is beyond the scope of this paper. In order to present a relevant comparative analysis the subject will be approached generally in terms of the perspectives and approaches of the theorists and a selective look at the social phenomenon and conditions discussed in common. The selection is based on its relatedness to Fanon's model and will include nationalism, colonialism, capitalism, and class conflict. Lenin's formulation of his model aside from its theoretical basis was precipitated by the realities of possessing state power whereas Fanon's model remains more of a futuristic idealization, viewed as a consequence of contemporary reality but yet unrealized.

Also Lenin was a prolific writer for a long period of time extending from the early 1890's til 1921 whereas Fanon's work only covers a nine year span from 1952 to 1961. Lenin's ideology was continually revised as the Bolshevik Revolution approached and actualized therefore one cannot be assured of his adherence to views expressed early in his political career. Thus the analysis will concentrate on his expressions of latter years as he moved to concretize his revolutionary ideology.
On the level of generalities of perspective, Lenin's approach to social realities is grounded theoretical in Marxism, from his epistemology to his conception of history, which included the view of the inevitability of the proletariat revolution. Yet Lenin was a practitioner of theory who although absorbing Marxist historical perspective organized it in order to incorporate reality with theory. Thus revamping Marxism to fit the concrete realities of Russian society hence the creation of Leninism. Joseph Stalin relates to the relationship between Marxism and Leninism as follows.

What is contained in Lenin's method was in the main already contained in the teachings of Marx, which, according to Marx, himself, were "in essence critical and revolutionary,".... But it would be wrong to suppose that Lenin's method is merely the restoration of the method of Marx. As a matter of fact, Lenin's method is not only the restoration, but also the concretization and further development of the critical and revolutionary method of Marx, of his materialist dialectic.¹

Marx's ideology was a reaction to and analysis of 19th century Europe, Leninism is the concretization of Marxism to account for the realities of early 20th century Russia, just as Fanon's model is an effort to make some sociological sense out of contemporary decolonization struggles. According to the Marxist-Leninist analysis the nature of the capitalist economic system due to the necessity for exploitative mechanisms, subsequent alienation from the means of production, and the continuous

search for raw materials and new markets, revolution is an inevitable consequent of the workings of the capitalist system. As stated by Stefan T. Possony, editor of the Lenin Reader.

What is important is that the capitalist system cannot exist and develop without constantly extending its sphere of domination, without colonizing new countries and without drawing ancient, non-capitalist countries into the whirlpool of world economy.¹

Hence imperialism ergo colonization is conceived of as a function and/or an extension of international capital.

Joseph Stalin in Foundations of Leninism relates and defines Lenin's conception of imperialism as "moribund capitalism."

Because imperialism carries the contradictions of capitalism to their last bounds, to the extreme limit, beyond which revolution begins.²

Imperialism is the necessary extension of the capitalist system and according to Lenin it is "the eve of the socialist revolution."³

On the pernicious nature of the workings of capitalism Fanon and Lenin are in absolute agreement, it is on the inevitability of a particular consequence on which they differ. The absoluteness of Lenin's conception of the inevitability of the proletariat revolution resulting in socialism is questionable due to his indefatigable efforts at its realization.


Inevitability would be characterized by a knowledge that the desired end, socialism, would ultimately achieve itself, a conception that Leninism rejects. Socialism is a state which must be worked toward and molded thus it would be more realistic to conceive of the Leninistic perspective as one which utilizes the potential for a socialistic state in lieu of one that sees its evolution as inevitable.

In the same sense the Fanonian analysis proceeds on the assumption that only through the unified efforts of the colonized can the colonial system be demolished and a new system of society be erected in the form of a decolonized state. Fanon states

It is rigorously true that decolonization is proceeding, but it is rigorously false to pretend and to believe that this decolonization is the fruit of an objective dialectic which more or less rapidly assumes the appearance of an absolutely inevitable mechanism.¹

Socialism may conceivably evolve but not in response to an historical necessity or international plan but because it happens to respond to the needs of the people.

Fanon is quite explicit as to his conception of the nature of capitalism and the present forms of socialism, asserting that there is the need for a "peculiarly" African brand of socialism. One that satisfies the needs of African society and seeks to create a new mankind. Fanon states

...it is very true that we need a model, and that we want blueprints and examples. For many of us the European model is the most inspiring. Yet we have seen to what mortifying setbacks such an imitation has led us. European achievements, European techniques and the European style ought no longer to tempt us and throw us off our balance.

The European conception of scientific socialism and Leninism's conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat are ideological perspectives which according to Fanon's analysis are alien in origin to the colonial situation hence incapable of responding to the needs of the emergent African nations.

Lenin's model is dominated by economics, an analysis of the consequences in terms of exploitation and alienation of differential means of production, from which the class struggle eminates. According to Lenin the means of production juxtaposes economic classes in such a way that conflict is an inevitable consequence. Lenin states

...it is precisely the exploitation of wage labor that forms the basis of the predatory order of today, that it is wage labor that leads to the division of society into irreconcilably hostile classes.

As we have seen in Fanon's model that dominant source of conflict is not based purely on economics, but rather economics as it is manifested as a direct positive correlation of the race factor. Fanon states, in a colonial state:

---


It is neither the act of owning factories nor estates nor a bank balance which distinguishes the governing classes. The governing race is first and foremost those who come from elsewhere, those who are unlike the original inhabitants, "the others."\(^1\)

Thus in the colonial context, the economic reality is a manifestation of race factor, an alien importation.

Imperialism, what Lenin defines as moribund capitalism, is the creator of the colonial situation. But the capitalism of the colonial context acquires a racial dimension. A new sustaining dynamic that functions both supportively and independently of the economic situation.

Central to Fanon's conception of the dynamics of decolonization is the idea that it is a nationalist struggle, its immediate goal is the creation of a national entity. On the other hand, Leninism is an internationalist ideology, in that its goal is the emergence of the dictatorship of the proletariat on a world-wide scale. Therefore, although Lenin asserts that he is for the self-determination of peoples, he develops a selective criteria for supporting nationalist struggles.

The Communist International must support the bourgeois-democratic national movements in colonial and backward countries only on the condition that the elements of the future proletarian parties existing in all backward countries...(which) shall be grouped together to appreciate their special tasks, viz., the task of fighting the bourgeoisie-democratic movements within their own nations.\(^2\)

\(^1\)Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, p. 40.

According to Leninism nationalist struggles by their very nature are petty-bourgeois because they demand the recognition of the equality of nations in lieu of being internationalistic which

...demands firstly the subordination of the interest of the proletariat struggle in one country to the interest of the struggle on a world-scale; and secondly, it calls for the ability and readiness on the part of the nations which are achieving victory over the bourgeoisie to make the greatest national sacrifices for the sake of overthrowing international capital.¹

Thus, if a struggle does not satisfy the criteria of internationalism and/or has the potential for the proletariat revolution it does not receive the support of the communist movement. Leninism is an opportunist ideology in that the goal is definite, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and all activities which accelerate this possible-achievement are exploited by Leninism whereas all struggles which do not immediately or potentially fit into the "master plan" of socialism as defined by Lenin are negated. This opportunism accounts for the elasticity of Leninism, at one stage it can justify supporting a bourgeoisie-democratic nation while unequivocably its struggle is against the bourgeoisie class itself.

Leninism contends that the overthrow of capitalism is a necessary, if not sufficient condition for the elimination of the oppression which characterizes the colonial state.

¹Ibid., pp. 235-6.
Lenin states:

...the cornerstone of the whole policy of the Communist International in the national and colonial question must be to bring together the proletariats and the masses of toilers of all nations and countries for the joint revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the landlords and the bourgeoisie; for this alone guarantees victory over capitalism without which the abolition of national oppression and inequality is impossible.¹

Fanon recognizes the necessity for the abolition of the capitalistic means of production but Fanon's view is primarily nationalistic; a nation can overthrow the capitalist means of production within its nation and precede to develop an economic system which serves its needs without tying itself to an international movement on the level forwarded by Leninism.

Fanon's concern is not the dictatorship of the proletariat but a democracy of the masses, a difference which is concretized in the conception of the structural formulation of the political party.

Lenin conceives of his party as the vanguard of the working class characterized by a tightness of internal discipline; each member must tow the line of the party, (any deviation is labeled revisionism) and extreme centralization. The task of the Party is to raise the level of consciousness of the proletariat; it is by definition a class party. Lenin asserts

We are a Party of a class and therefore almost the entire class should act under the leader-

¹Ibid., p. 233.
ship of our Party, should adhere to our Party as closely as possible....To forget the distinction between the vanguard and the whole of the masses which gravitates toward it, to forget the constant duty of the vanguard to raise ever wider strata to this most advanced level, means merely to deceive oneself....

Whereas Lenin's Party is the vanguard for a specific class and a vehicle for the maintenance of the dictatorship of the proletariat, Fanon's party is the embodiment of the collective wills of the oppressed. Characterized by decentralization to the extreme the task of the Party is to ascertain and concretize the will of the masses. It is not a class party but a party of all the people whose goal is absolute decolonization and nation-building. It is a party characterized by a certain dynamic.

In an underdeveloped country, the party ought to be organized in such a fashion that is not simply content with having contacts with the masses. The party should be the direct expression of the masses. The party is not an administration responsible for transmitting government orders; it is the energetic spokesmen and incorruptable defender of the masses.

In Lenin's model the class which embodies the revolutionary spirit is the proletariat, which Lenin defines as "workers who own no land and no workshops, who work for other people all their lives." Whereas Fanon designates the peasant class as having truly revolutionary potential. Lenin includes

1Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, p. 111.
2Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth, p. 187.
the peasantry in his model as a supportive faction, not central to the struggle like Fanon but a necessary inclusion in the form of a coalition. In that its freedom is achievable only in connection with the working classes struggle.

The small peasantry may emancipate itself from the yoke of capital only by joining the labour movement by helping the workers in their fight for the socialist system and for converting the land as well as other means of production...into public property.¹

Again, the opportunism of Leninism is apparent, the peasant class is exploited to accelerate the proletariat revolution. The peasantry becomes an appendage of the proletariat and as Lenin asserts they carry the class war to the countryside.

According to Lenin the proletariat confined to an existence of direct exploitation by the means of production is the natural representative of the revolutionary spirit.

The worker can no longer fail to see that it is capital that is oppressing him and that he has to wage a struggle against the capitalist class. And the struggle, which is a struggle for the satisfaction of his immediate economics needs...inevitably demands that the workers organize and the struggle itself inevitably becomes a war—not against individuals but against a class.²

Whereas in Fanon's model from the onset of decolonization the antagonist is well defined. Morality is concrete: "the good is quite simply that which is evil for 'them'."³

¹Ibid., p. 237.
²Ibid., p. 453.
³Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth, p. 50.
The enemy of the people is not merely a class but a species, the "aliens." Although there are internal (intragroup) enemies in the guise of collaborators, namely the bourgeoisie who can be conceptually characterized as a resultant of the division of labor, Lenin's thesis would not hold true en toto in the colonial context.

Firstly, in the colonial context the native proletariat as conceived by Lenin is non-existent. The factory workers who Lenin designates as the primary occupants of the proletariat are, in the colonial situation a privileged class. They form part of the native bourgeoisie. Hence if the Leninist analysis was carried out to its final conclusion the native proletariat ergo the native bourgeoisie would be the embodiment of the revolutionary spirit and would struggle to achieve socialism, which is clearly not the case for reasons previously stated.

Therefore it becomes necessary to redefine and if necessary re-label classes in terms of their functional relationships in the colonial model instead of attempting to transplant the nomenclature of a system of analysis which grew out of another social system and another set of relationships.

Secondly, the colonial struggle is a nationalist and not a class-based internationalist struggle as Lenin would hope it to be. Its only ties with internationalism are related primarily on one level: the elimination of the oppression of the capitalist colonizers, the eradication of the colonial system so that each individual nation can proceed to elect and define its own destiny. For it recognizes the tenuous
status of an independent nation surrounded by colonized states.

Fanon states

The enemy of the African under French domination is not colonialism insofar as it exerts itself within the strict limits of his nation, but it is the forms of colonialism, it is the manifestations of colonialism, whatever be the flag under which it asserts itself.¹

African solidarity against oppression is the issue.

The African peoples are concretely involved in a total struggle against colonialism, and we Algerians do not dissociate the combat we are waging from that of the Rhodesians or the Kenyans.²

The struggle is waged first against a particular species namely the settler and secondly against their imported alien economic system namely capitalism.

The "struggle" from the native's perspective is directed against the settler, the struggle of the native from a Leninist perspective would be against the capitalist-bourgeoisie class. An overlapping distinction but not an identical one. Leninism asserts:

...the Socialist of the oppressed nations must unequivocally fight for complete unity of workers of both the oppressed and oppressor nationalities (which also means organizational unity).³

Thus the formulation of a coalition-type organization for struggle against the capitalist-bourgeoisie class is the Leninist goal whereas Fanon's model demands absolute opposition

¹Fanon, Toward the African Revolution, p. 171.
²Ibid., p. 172.
³Possony, Lenin Reader, p. 242.
between settler and native except in the instances when a native is conceived as counter-revolutionary as is the case with the traditionally functioning native bourgeoisie or conversely is the case of a particular settler who recognized the national autonomy of the natives and functions on the behalf of the nationalist struggle, but these are individual instances and should not be confused with a broad-class-based coalition.

Granted the ultimate struggle of the colonial context could be conceived as a struggle against the capitalist machinery for without such a confrontation neo-colonialism emerges but conversely without the removal of the settler it is inconceivable that one can radically change the economic system he has imported to support him.

Leninism seeks to demolish national autonomy whereas for Fanon the national question, that is the creation of a national entity is a crucial and central factor. Leninism states that

The idea of a lawful separation between one nationality and the other (the so-called national cultural autonomy) is a reactionary idea.¹

Whereas in the colonial context national cultural autonomy from Fanon's perspective is a revolutionary idea, for in demanding the existence of a national entity it demands the exorcism of the settler-oppressor.

¹Ibid., p. 242.
Lenin and Fanon have one crucial factor in common; they both sought and worked for the emergence of a new mankind. Understanding that man both creates and is a product of a social system, through systematic analysis of socio-economic realities they sought to both understand and change the world. They both accept the thesis that it is not enough to know the world, one must seek to change it. Yet viewing the world of realities from two distinctly different often opposed perspectives they arrived at different conclusions because the realities which they sought to understand are different. As Fanon so aptly discerned the colonial context by its inner workings creates its own dynamic of exploitation a conception of reality beyond the purview of Lenin.
Frantz Fanon offers to sociology a wealth of theoretical propositions that can only augment the depth and scope of the discipline. Through his perceptive, often subjective, analysis of a set of phenomenon which has traditionally been excluded from the field of sociological investigation due to either benign neglect or a lack of accessibility, a whole pattern of social relationships and social realities have been exposed.

Considering that the vast majority of social scientists are alien to the native population in a colonial system, the probability that an internal analysis of this sort, that is from the perspective of the native, could ever eminate from that source is dim. Seldom has the discipline been afforded the opportunity to view a phenomenon with the depth and sensitivity of a participant-observer equipped with both the perceptual set of the population under investigation plus the technical skill of "analytical" observation and recording. Historically, social scientists have prided themselves for being a professional class possessing a degree of scientific objectivity in relation to the phenomenon under investigation, as illusive stance to say the least. The quality of Fanon's subjective analysis should serve to illustrate the relative
advantage of an obviously bias analysis. Every social investigation proceeds from an implicit political orientation, it is naive to assume otherwise, Fanon's analysis has the quality of explicating, validating and examining the roots of that orientation.

Sociodiagnosis, that is the investigation of the social system for deficiencies in institutional functionings in lieu of the traditional approach which views the participants in the social system as deficient either in their relationship to the social system or each other, is the approach to investigating social realities employed by Fanon in his investigation of the colonial system. Sociodiagnosis is a perspective for approaching an investigation of a social system whose utility and validity has been forcefully explicated in the works of Fanon, especially as he explores the psychological dynamics of the colonized.

An analysis of Fanon's work suggest that a sociology of revolution would have to satisfy a set of objective criteria.

First, it must possess a level of abstraction so that its general framework can be applied to any social system. Secondly, it must be flexible enough to particularize decolonization phenomenon in terms of its unique social context. Fanon has offered a theoretical framework for a particular social phenomenon namely, decolonization. His model cannot possibly hold in a situation which does not satisfy the objective criteria for a colonized state which
by virtue of definition precedes decolonization. It is a general societal reaction to a particular situation.

The Lenin-Fanon comparison served to accentuate the theoretical confusion that results from an inapt application of societal models to social systems of a different nature and dynamic.

In that every social system is unique in its cultural dynamics, Fanon's in-depth analysis of the Algerian struggle will not hold true for all decolonization processes. Yet when one extracts from the particular to the general with a certain degree of caution it is possible to arrive at some relatively stable conclusions.

Fanon's analysis accentuates the necessity to analyze functionally the components of a population within its own cultural context. For it is naive to assume that classes in identical objective conditions relate functional to different social systems in the same and/or similar manner. Roles are defined and classified within a particular social context and must be approached functional from that perspective as to its relationship to the social system from which it emerged.

Fanon's analysis of the cultural dynamics of decolonization serves to theoretically account for the uniqueness of post-decolonization cultural and societal forms. For his model contends that cultural redefinitions and modifications are results of the dynamics of the struggle, each decolonization struggle being a different phenomenon. Thus efforts to totally pre-plan the elements of a post-decolonization culture
is a futile effort, for the national culture is a product of the concrete dynamics of the struggle and not an abstract ideal!

Post-colonial politics also acquire a level of comprehensiveness when viewed from the perspective of Fanon's model. The characteristic instability often attributed to a newly decolonized state after analysis can be viewed as a consequence of the intragroup class struggles of which Fanon speaks. Stable, Europeanized newly decolonized states can be viewed as possible neo-colonial state, a societal model worthy of serious consideration.

As previously mentioned, Fanon's model is valid only in the context from which he wrote. Granted there are elements of his model which explain behavior external to his system, but a wholesale transplant of his analysis, to another cultural context, without suitable modifications is a dangerous misapplication of his model. The current American craze of Fanonism left unchecked and unmodified could lead to a set of dangerous distortions of the American reality. As stated by Robert Blauner, who contends that

> Despite the appeal of Frantz Fanon to young black revolutionaries, America is not Algeria. It is difficult to foresee how rioting in our cities can function in a manner similar to the situation of overseas colonialism where such outbursts were an integral phase in a movement for national liberation.¹

Yet, even though the colonial model as explicated by

Fanon because of the particular cultural context of its evolution is not totally applicable to the American social system, due to its general framework in terms of power relations, cultural annihilation of the oppressed and the racist infrastructure of the system a modified application of the colonial model to the American situation is valid.

The dynamics of Fanon's model center around the process of decolonization which is a particular form of a more general phenomenon defined as revolution. It is revolutionary in that its ultimate goal is a restructuring of a social order. In that decolonization is revolution the converse does not necessarily hold true. Namely, all revolutionary struggles are not necessary efforts at decolonization, for decolonization presupposes a colonized state whereas a revolution need not be proceeded by that condition but may be a response to a different set of circumstances or social realities as evidenced by Lenin's proletariat revolution.

By way of conclusion, it must be stated that Fanon's model as explicated by Fanon and not his interpreter's defines and analyzes a particular social phenomenon heretofore excluded from sociology. It is the contention of the author that the colonial model, decolonization, and the decolonized-state model after having been made intelligible by the efforts of Fanon are valid theoretical social system models which could lay the foundation for a more realistic sociological comprehension of Third World revolutionary struggles.
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