Chapter 3

Postcolonial Theory and Fanon

Since the postcolonial societies have not completely recovered from the disastrous impacts of European colonialism, and, in many postcolonial countries formal independence has not succeeded in decolonizing the socio-political, economic and cultural spheres of life, the process of resistance which began with the onset of colonialism still continues. Besides, neo-colonialism is making subtle inroads into the newly independent Third and Fourth World countries. The psychological resistance to colonialism, and its expression actually began with the onset of colonialism. Therefore, as the editors of The Post-colonial Studies Reader observe, “Post-colonial theory has existed for a long time before that particular name was used to describe it” (Introduction. Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin eds. The Post-colonial Studies Reader 1). Arif Dirlik airs the same view when he observes that “most of the critical themes that postcolonial criticism claims as its fountainhead predates the appearance, at least the popular currency of postcolonial” (“The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism” in Padmini Mongia ed. Contemporary Postcolonial Theory: A Reader 294-320). In fact, there is no ‘ambiguity’ in the ‘post’ of ‘postcolonial’ as Ella Shohat declares. For, as she observes, “the twin process of colonization and decolonization are evoked by it”. Moreover, she says, postcolonial
embraces the two terms—colonialism and postcolonialism ("Notes on the Postcolonial" Social Text 31/32 [1992] 99-113). Further, the 'post' of 'postcoloniality', as Kwame Antony Appiah observes, is a 'post' that challenges earlier legitimating narratives ("The Postcolonial and the Postmodern" in The Postcolonial Studies Reader 119-24). Simon During is of the view that postcolonialism is emblematic of the unpolluted identity of the nations which were once subjugated by the imperial colonizers. During observes that "post-colonialism is regarded as the need in nations or groups which have been victims of imperialism, to achieve an identity uncontaminated by universalist or Eurocentric concepts and images" ("Post-colonialism Today" in Ashcroft et al, 1995 125-29). When one takes into account all these factors, "thinking at the limit", the description of Stuart Hall regarding the present status of 'postcolonial' is a too hasty one ("When was 'the Post-colonial'? Thinking at the Limit" in Iain Chambers and Lidia Curti ed. The Post-colonial Question 242-59).

That language was one of the most decisive tools instrumental for effective decolonization has been proved by almost all the radical anticolonial thinkers of the world through their writings. The authors of The Empire Writes Back are of the view that "one of the main features of imperial oppression is control over the language". The "hierarchical structure of power" which was perpetuated through imperial language is "rejected in the emergence of an effective post-colonial voice" (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 2002 7). What Fanon had
done in the 1950s was this actual abrogation of the authority of the imperial French language, and the very effective appropriation of the real power of it. It was Fanon’s seizure of the imperial language, and its eventual moulding for an effective discourse which helped him to come out with his concepts of authentic decolonization, true culture, and native literature. As Jean Paul Sartre observes in the Preface to The Wretched of the Earth, Fanon “bends” the French language, “to new requirements, makes use of it, and speaks to the colonized only”. Sartre further comments that, “the Third World finds itself and speaks to itself through his voice” (WE 9). The power of Fanon’s language, which he has wrested from the colonizer, Sartre says, is competent enough to ashamed the Europeans as a whole. Definitely, Fanon’s language is not French (emphasis mine), but an Antillean French. It is the very same language that strip-teases the much acclaimed European humanism, or what Sartre calls, “racist humanism” (Preface. The Wretched of the Earth 22), since the Europeans have been able to become men only through creating slaves and monsters.

Like Fanon, Albert Memmi, the Tunisian anticolonial revolutionary intellectual and writer, Ngugi wa Thiong’o, the Kenyan radical thinker and writer, and Renate Zahar, the German writer and Fanon enthusiast, have underscored the importance of the power that language can wield. It is the power of language that has contributed to the “insolent provocation” and “militant aspect” of Memmi’s anticolonial classic, The Colonizer and the Colonized (Memmi, Preface xvi).
It is indeed language, “that wonderful reservoir constantly enriched with new experiences” that makes *The Colonizer and the Colonized* one of the foremost theses on resistance to colonialism, and an “arm in the war against colonization” (Memmi 16). Memmi speaks of the “linguistic dualism” (Memmi 106) experienced by the colonized people on account of learning the history, literature, art and philosophy of the colonizer in the language of the colonizer and the eventual necessity of the colonized becoming bilingualists. He further says that in the ensuing ‘linguistic conflict’, the mother tongue of the colonized is crushed. The only way out of this ‘linguistic ambiguity’ (Memmi 108) is to write in the colonizer’s language. When the colonized finally gathers up the courage to write, he has no other option but to write to the conqueror’s own people. Quite naturally, the colonized writer in the newly appropriated language writes about the “malaise and revolt” of the colonized (Memmi 109). But unlike Fanon, Memmi argues that only through the liberation and restoration of the language of the colonized, can the colonized can “find again his lost continuity and that of his history” (Memmi 110). Though the liberation and restoration of the language of the colonized may hasten the recovery of the colonized from linguistic ambiguity, for authentic decolonization this is not imperative has been proved by Fanon by the effective appropriation and use of the imperial language.

Ngugi wa Thiong’o too speaks of the “psychological violence” perpetuated in the classrooms through the medium of the imperial
language. For, he observes: “In my view language was the most important vehicle through which that power fascinated and held the soul prisoner. The bullet was the means of the physical subjugation. Language was the means of the spiritual subjugation” (Decolonising the Mind 9). In order to “transcend colonial alienation”, caused, among other factors, by the imposition of the imperial language (English), Ngugi demands that the Kenyan people use their native ‘Gikuyu’ language. But, Fanon had shown in concrete terms how best the colonized people can transcend colonial alienation by making use of the language of the oppressor. Paradoxically enough, Ngugi admits that he would not have been able to open his mind’s door to a wide range of fiction, had he not been proficient in the English language. He further affirms the need of a national language (in the case of Kenya, the English language), but cautions that such a move must not be at the expense of the regional languages” (Ngugi 72-3). Even while deciding to make use of his native language for his creative imagination, Ngugi has no option but to turn to the European models for the form, thematic concern, and the range of techniques for writing novels. Curiously enough, in the proposed new literature syllabus at the Nairobi Conference of English and Literature Departments of the Universities of East and Central Africa, English is suggested as “the mediating language” (Ngugi 95). In other words, the conference stressed the inevitability of the continued use of the English language. All the same, the ultimate motive of Ngugi is the decentering of an
otherwise Eurocentric world. That is why Ngugi gives a new twist while interpreting the character of the much talked about, and celebrated gentleman of Kipling’s poem, *If*. Kipling’s man is a typical gentleman of the former European colonies, “who had not the slightest doubt about the rightness of colonialism” (Ngugi 93); he is not a totally liberated world citizen. However, Ngugi admits that a complete break with the colonizer’s language is quite impossible. For, even Ngugi requires the English language, the colonizer’s language, to “continue dialogue with all” (“A Statement” Ngugi xiv).

Even Chinua Achebe, while emphasizing the unassailable position of English in African literature, does not have in mind the *English* (emphasis mine), but a new ‘english’ “altered to suit new African surroundings” (qtd. from “The African Writer and the English Language” in Ngugi 8). Renate Zahar too has no doubt about the power of the language mastered by the colonized in effective decolonization. For, in her view, “learning the language of the colonizer is a prerequisite for any social advancement, for the mother tongue either has always only been passed on orally, or it has been deprived of its written form and is completely banned from public life . . . .” (Zahar 42). Zahar has the strong conviction that the colonized who has no opportunity of learning the foreign language will sometimes be a stranger in his/her own country. In this context, it may be noted that the colonizer’s language has been appropriated and properly made use of by Fanon in such a way that when he speaks of
a new humanism, the traditional ideological content of that word has been redefined. As Zahar observes, in another context, “the necessity of expressing oneself in the colonial language turns out to be a virtue” especially in the case of Fanon (Zahar 47).

Most probably, it was on account of the undercurrent of the racist humanism that the European theorists could not diagnose colonialism’s impact on the respective societies in the right perspective, and in an effective manner. The emergence of Aime Cesaire in the Martiniqan socio-political and cultural field, and the publication of his seminal work on colonialism and its impacts, *Discourse on Colonialism* in 1950, paved the way for Fanon, the liberation theoretician. Though Fanon has been inspired by Sartrean existentialism and the works of thinkers like Hegel, Nietzsche, and a host of European philosophers and psychologists, and political theoreticians like Marx, Engels, Che Guevara and the like, he had no forerunners as far his theory of authentic decolonization is concerned. Quite unlike the recent postcolonial theorists, whose major task has been academic, Fanon’s theory of emancipation analyses almost all the aspects of human life, be it political, economic, racial, psychological, or matters related to literature, fine arts, painting or culture in general. All the same, Fanon’s theory can be viewed as “the counter-narrative of the colonized” against the colonizer’s “seductive narrative of power”, as Leela Gandhi’s terminologies qualify the textualities of the colonized and the colonizers respectively. An
analysis of the works of Fanon substantiates the argument of Leela Gandhi that “postcoloniality derives its genealogy from both the narratives” (Postcolonial Theory 22). Fanon’s theory, in fact, subverts all Eurocentric master narratives, but it does not repudiate Marxism. Moreover, as Adolfo Gilly observes, Fanon was “approaching Marxism” (Introduction. Studies in a Dying Colonialism 2).

The term ‘postcoloniality’, one can argue, is the most apt term for the Third and the Fourth World socio-political, literary and cultural scenario at present. In this context, the question of applying the term ‘postcolonial’ indiscriminately to both Second and Third World textualities is very pertinent. For, as Stephen Siemon observes, “the experience of colonialism is not the same in, say, Canada as it is in the West Indies” (“Unsettling the Empire: Resistance Theory for the Second World” in Padmini Mongia 72-83). Really, the appropriate intellectual inheritance of postcolonialism can be traced back to Fanonism. In fact, the ‘principal catalyst and reference point for postcolonial theory’, to borrow the words of Leela Gandhi, is not Edward Said’s Orientalism. Moreover, even before the emergence and popularity of postmodernism and poststructuralism, through the writings of Fanon, postcolonialism had shown its particular inception. Hence the claim of a “poststructuralist parentage” (Leela Gandhi 25-6) to postcolonial theory is not at all tenable.

Even while dealing with the issue of the Franco-British involvement in the ‘Orient’, (Orientalism 3), Edward Said does not
make even a passing reference to Fanon, whose condemnation of colonization in general, and French colonialism in particular, in quite pungent and unmistakable terms had gained wide currency all over the world. It may be borne in mind that Said in his *Orientalism* by and large speaks about the British and French cultural enterprises. Moreover it is quite surprising that, Said, who has examined “generous number of books and authors” (Said 4), does not make an analysis of Fanon’s works, especially, his *Wretched of the Earth* which has been described as a classic of anti-colonialism by Sartre. Sartre’s Preface to *The Wretched of the Earth*, perhaps the greatest encomium, one of the reputed western intellectuals has showered on the foremost anti-colonial revolutionary thinker of the World, itself is more than enough to question why Said did include Fanon in the list of “a much larger number” of books and authors” that he “had to leave out” (Said 4). Besides, *The Wretched of the Earth, Studies in a Dying Colonialism*, and *Toward the African Revolution* reveal that Fanon has given a first-hand, and a very concrete description of the Algerian people creating their own history. Whereas, even while claiming that the Islamic Orient for him was the centre of attention, Said willfully ignores Fanon, whose life was dedicated to the cause of the wretched of the Near East (especially, the Algerians), in particular, and to the under-privileged of the world in general. Yet another stark reality is that, Said in his *Orientalism* makes only a passing reference to the French occupation of Algeria (Said 124). In other words, Said in his
book under reference, tries to portray the wretchedness of Islam only under British and French imperialism, which too is painted with a broad brush of affection for Islam. What Said has actually done in *Orientalism* is a description of “a particular system of ideas”, and it is quite noteworthy that he does not propose a new system or concept to “displace the system” as such (Said 325). Curiously enough, in the ‘Afterword’ to the 1995 edition of the *Orientalism*, Said emphatically says that there is nothing seriously anti-Western in his book. For, he says, he is trying in his best to overcome “the book’s alleged anti-Westernism” (Said 330). His claim in the ‘Afterword’ that the book is a “kind of testimonial to subaltern status – the wretched of the earth talking back” is out and out fraud (Said 336). *Orientalism* indeed is not a multicultural critique of power. Said becomes all the more cynical and pessimistic in his outlook on the socio-political scenario of the Third World countries, when he speaks with his tongue in the cheek about the “charismatic leaders who undertook decolonization and independence”, without pinpointing any of these leaders (Said 348). As both Fanon and Said are now no more, a person who makes a study of these two authors has to depend entirely on their primary works for authenticity. And, I have tried my best to be impartial to both of them while making my observations.

Postcolonial writers like Edward Said, Gayatri Spivak, Homi K. Bhabha and Leela Gandhi wrote and popularized their theories enjoying the luxury and surplus pleasure provided by the Anglo-
American, French and Australian Academies. For, it is in the U.S.A., Britain, France, and Australia most of the postcolonial intellectuals live and do their theorizing. Critics like Arif Dirlik even refuse to consider certain masters of postcoloniality as ‘postcolonial critics’. For, Dirlik observes: “It is also misleading in my opinion to classify as postcolonial critics and intellectuals as widely different as Edward Said, Aijaz Ahmed, Homi Bhabha, Gyan Prakash, Gayatri Spivak, and Lata Mani” (“The Postcolonial Aura” in Padmini Mongia 294-320). Another prominent postcolonial critic, Ella Shohat, levels a very serious allegation against the postcolonial critics who theorize on the oppressed of the world sitting in the Western Academies. Shohat’s allegation is that these theorists “leave no space” for the liberation struggles of the aboriginals of Australia and the indigenous peoples of the Americas and elsewhere in the world (“Notes on the Postcolonial” Social Text 31/32(1992)99-113).

One is bound to argue that an authentic diagnosis of colonialism and its aftermath could be given only by persons who have undergone the disastrous impacts of colonization. Herein lies the importance of anti-colonial revolutionary thinkers like Fanon, Albert Memmi, and Elridge Cleaver, the Afro-American intellectual and the author of Soul on Ice. Fanon’s theory of authentic decolonization as detailed in The Wretched of the Earth itself is postcolonial political theory, and his observations on the role of the writer in society is the beginning of postcolonial literary theory. His concepts on the Third
World and its political leaders and writers are no longer the imaginative observations of an arm-chair revolutionary intellectual. Fanon's theory is indeed born out of the revolutionary battlefield of Algeria. For, he was a person who felt the harmful effect of colonization in his blood, and along his heart. It may be noted that Fanon being the fifth child of his parents, and the blackest of the boys, suffered quite a lot on account of his maternal rejection. (Fanon's mother was a totally assimilated middleclass woman, who expected her son to behave and act like a white boy).

Fanon's fight was not against the mere "epistemological violence of the colonial encounter" (once again, to borrow an expression from Leela Gandhi 63), but, by and large, against the socio-political and economic pillage of the colonizers against the colonized. What is more, instead of speaking for a "very limited constituency" (Leela Gandhi 63), Fanon speaks for the oppressed of the world at large. When one bears in mind the socio-political and economic dimensions of The Wretched of the Earth, one could describe the book as one of the foremost classics of postcolonial political and literary theory. So, in every aspect, Fanon is the exponent of the first phase of postcolonial theory, and not Edward Said, as Leela Gandhi claims (Leela Gandhi 64). It must be borne in mind that Fanon had unmasked the ideological disguises of imperialism in his The Wretched of the Earth, two decades before Said's publication of Orientalism, in all pungency, in the language which he had appropriated from the colonizer.
What, in fact, the radical exponents of postcolonial theory such as Fanon and Albert Memmi had done was the dismantling of the European intellectual tradition. In this context Aime Cesaire can be looked upon as the forerunner of radical postcolonial theory. For, Cesaire's *Discourse on Colonialism*, first published in 1950, anticipates the postcolonial theories of Fanon and Memmi. Cesaire in his *Discourse* makes a very close study of colonialism and its dangerous impacts on the colonized and the colonizer. In his view, besides being 'thingifying' the colonized, colonialism decivilizes the colonizer too. This situation has been described by Cesaire as the "boomerang effect of colonialism" (*Discourse* 41). Cesaire further observes that Western humanism, which justifies slavery, colonialism and genocide, is in reality, pseudo-humanism. In this sense, Cesaire believes, there is a direct link between colonialism and the rise of fascism. In other words, colonialism and fascism are blood relatives of slavery and imperialism. Hence the colonial mission of civilizing the 'primitive' is just a smoke-screen. All the same, Cesaire never advocates a return to pre-colonial Africa, though he knows that "there has been beautiful and important black civilizations" (*An interview with Aime Cesaire* in *Discourse* 92). Even Cesaire's concept of 'negritude' is future-oriented and modern. Cesaire envisages "a new society rich with all the productive power of modern times, warm with all the fraternity of olden days" (*Discourse* 52). Cesaire's study of colonialism reveals that in reality we now live in a semi-postcolonial
moment. Though the colonizer has been removed from the corridors of power, all the vital aspects of the 'liberated' people of the former colonies are still managed on the lines of traditions set by the colonizer. For, as Robin D. G. Kelley observes, "the official apparatus might have been removed, but the political, economic, and cultural links established by colonial domination still remain with some alterations" ("A Poetics of Anticolonialism". Introduction. Discourse 27).

One need not go to Martinique or Algeria to drive home the fact that the preceding observations are out and out true. Our own India is a good case in point. To cite a few examples, the Indian Police Act which even now guides and formulates the policies of our police force, was enacted in 1861. The administration of the Indian criminal law is governed by the Indian Penal Code and the Indian Criminal Procedure Code, which were passed in 1860 and 1898 respectively. The much acclaimed Indian Evidence Act was promulgated in 1885. Therefore, as S. S. Gill observes, "The fact that India is still governed by a legal system conceived and formulated in the colonial era, and most of it in the nineteenth century, shows that this country is even today ruled by the colonial ethos of that period" (Dynasty 72).

Both Cesaire and Fanon believed that the Marxist analysis of the society, and the world at large ignored the racist aspect of colonization. Both of them shared the view that Marx and Marxism would not be competent enough to find a lasting solution to the
problems faced by the wretched of the earth. Both of them believed that neoimperialism posed a formidable threat to the total liberation of the marginalized and underprivileged people of the world. Cesaire's observations on American imperialism are as prophetic as the observations of Fanon and Sartre. For, Cesaire observes: "American domination is the only domination from which one never recovers. I mean from which one never recovers unscarred" (Discourse 77). The observation made by Eldridge Cleaver in 1968 is perhaps highly prophetic than the analysis of all these writers, when one takes into account the authority which America wields today in the name of neoliberal globalization. It is quite noteworthy to recollect Eldridge Cleaver's views on American domination, three and a half decades after his prediction. For, he wrote:

The United States has the yes-or-no power of decision over all colonialism in the world today. There is not a colonial regime on the face of the earth today that could survive six months if the U.S. opposed it; and in many cases, without the active military and economic support of the U.S., the exploiting murderous regimes would be dashed to bits by the exploited people themselves. (Soul on Ice 116)

In short, by appropriating the imperial language and abrogating its power, not only Fanon, but the other militant anticolonial thinkers and revolutionaries have been successful enough to mould a 'voice-
consciousness’ for the subaltern to speak. Fanon has also shown in unequivocal terms how the ‘gendered subaltern’ also could express themselves in a very concrete way, through the glorification of their role in the Algerian Revolution in *Studies in a Dying Colonialism*.

Fanon’s observations on the various spheres of human life do not rule out features like hybridity and syncreticity in the formation of the new culture of the decolonized society. "Syncretism", as the authors of *The Empire Writes Back* defines, "is the process by which previously distinct linguistic categories, and, by extension, cultural formations merge into a single new form" (Ashcroft 2002, 16). In Fanon’s case, syncreticity is all the more conspicuous whenever he speaks of the national culture of the decolonized society. For, after the struggle for liberation of the colonized, Fanon believed, the reciprocal relationship of both the culture of the colonized and the colonizer would result in a remarkable change for the better, in the newly evolved culture. As authentic decolonization will result in the disappearance of the colonized as well as the colonizer, the emerging new society will be courting the new culture envisaged by Fanon. Hybridity and syncreticity are the decisive factors in the moulding of national consciousness, and in the exceptionally rich new culture which it will generate. All the revolutionary postcolonial thinkers, who could be called ideal world citizens, have directly or indirectly driven home the importance of the role of hybridity and syncreticity in the evolution of a genuinely true culture. Kwame Nkrumah, the former
president of Ghana, and Fidel Castro, the Cuban president have expressed the view that the multiplication of all the cultures will help mould a much better culture. Hence the assertion of the writers of *The Empire Writes Back* that “cultural syncreticity is a valuable as well as an inescapable and characteristic feature of all post-colonial societies”, is quite true (Ashcroft 2002, 29). Ella Shohat also acknowledges the mutual relationship between different cultures, with a certain degree of reservation. For, she observes: “The foregrounding of hybridity and syncreticity in post-colonial studies calls attention to the mutual imbrication of ‘central’ and ‘peripheral’ cultures” (“Notes on the Post-colonial”. *Social Text* 31/32[1992] 99-113). Her reservation is obvious in the warning that “the defacto acceptance of hybridity as a product of colonial conquest and post-independence dislocations, as well as the recognition of the impossibility of going back to the authentic past do not mean that the politico-cultural movements of various racial-ethnic communities should stop researching and recycling their post-colonial languages and cultures” (“Notes on the Post-colonial”). Helen Tiffin is yet another critic who stresses the hybrid nature of postcolonial society and culture. For, according to Tiffin, “post-colonial cultures are inevitably hybridized, involving a dialectical relationship between European ontology and epistemology, and the impulse to create independent local identity” (“Post-colonial Literature and Counter-discourse” in Ashcroft et al 1995, 95). Amilcar Cabral also, while endorsing the reciprocal
relationship between history and culture, says that the hybridized nature of postcolonial culture is strength rather than a weakness. Cabral further observes that “culture is an essential element of the history of a people. Culture is, perhaps, the product of this history just as the flower is the product of a plant” (qtd in Ashcroft 1995, 160 from Return to Sources: Selected Speeches 42). All these observations on the reciprocal relationship between different cultures once again highlight Fanon’s concept of a new humanism, and the role the newly liberated people have to play in moulding an egalitarian society.

The analysis of Fanon’s contribution to postcolonial theory would be incomplete, if one leaves un-discussed his concepts of ‘nationness’ and ‘nationalism’. If ‘nationness’ and ‘nationalism’ are European concepts, as Leela Gandhi claims, (Leela Gandhi 113), what Fanon has done is the rewriting of the European notions of these two terms. What the critics of anticolonial nationalism have to remember is that the Europeans have no right to ‘patent’ the concepts of ‘nation’ and ‘nationalism’. There is nothing ‘surreptitious’ and ‘unlawful’ about Fanon’s concept of anticolonial nationalism. What Fanon has done is the wresting of the power of the imperial (French) language, to make use of it to mould his own theory of anticolonial nationalism.

According to Fanon the prime task of the governments of the newly liberated nations must be to educate the people politically. Political education becomes a reality only when the new government “expresses its desire to govern with the people and for the people” (WE
In order to uplift the people, the government must develop the brains of the people filling them with ideas so that the people will become real human beings. It is the duty of the leaders of the newly liberated nation to exhort the people that, for the progress of the nation it is imperative that the masses be educated politically. Political education must aim at opening the minds of the people to realize that everything depends on them, and that if they stagnate, their country too will stagnate. In this context Fanon stresses the need for the reciprocal relationship between the people and their government. For, as he observes, "A government or a party gets the people it deserves and sooner or later a people gets the government it deserves" (WE 160). Fanon further says that if only the new government and the people succeed in rapidly developing a political and social consciousness out of national consciousness, the country will attain real progress in all walks of life. For the political and social freedom of the people, a well defined economic programme governing the division of wealth and social relations is a must. If the people are offered nationalism alone as food, the masses will fail in their mission, and get caught up in "a whole series or mishaps" (WE 165). If nationalism fails to transform itself to humanism, that is, if it does not cater to the social and political needs of the people, it will lead up to a "blind alley" as Fanon puts it (WE 165). What Fanon ultimately envisaged was a government which acts according to the popular will of the people, a government which gives back "their dignity to all citizens" (WE 165).
Fanon's concept of nationalism has in it a cosmopolitan outlook as he has a broader vision of the liberation of the oppressed of the whole world.

Fanon's observations on the different stages of the development of the native intellectual show his keen insight into the psyche of the native writer. The psychopathology which the native intellectual undergoes during that phase of his consciousness which is in the process of being liberated from the influence of the Western culture and aestheticism (which he had imbibed from the colonial university), is quite disturbing. At this stage the native intellectual writes in a harsh style, full of images which give expression to his scattered consciousness. The vigorous style, the rhythm bursting with life, and the violence in colour at this stage, according to Fanon, "reveals the need that man has to liberate himself from a part of his being which already contained the seeds of decay" (WE 177). Fanon calls this phase in the native intellectual's life "a banal search for exoticism" (WE 178). This trend, Fanon says, is all the more discernible in the poetry of the native writer at this phase. This quite apparent change in the outlook of the native intellectual shocks the colonialists who have been under the impression that the native intellectual is a totally assimilated person.

Fanon is of the view that one can trace three stages of development in the works of the native intellectuals. In the first of these phases, the native intellectual almost apes the culture of the
occupying forces. In the works of this phase, the native intellectual gives expression to more or less the similar themes, styles, and narrative techniques of the colonizer, as he has been inspired by European models. Fanon calls this phase "the period of unqualified assimilation" (WE 179). The works of this period show point by point imitation of European symbolist and surrealist trends.

The native intellectual gets disturbed in the second phase of his/her development. Recollection of childhood memories and ancient native legends will be reinterpreted in a borrowed aesthetics suited to European environment, during this phase. Fanon calls the writings of this phase as the "literature of just-before-the-battle" which is dominated by a kind of disgusting humour and allegory (WE 179).

It is in the third stage of the development, in the "fighting phase" that the native intellectual succeeds in "shaking" his people. In this phase, through his fighting literature, revolutionary literature, the native writer awakens his/her people. The writer, in fact, becomes "the mouthpiece of a new reality in action" (WE 179). In the initial stage of this 'fighting phase', the native writer unconsciously makes use of the techniques and language which are borrowed from the colonizer. But, gradually, the native writer succeeds in evolving a new aesthetics suited to his/her fast liberating country. The new writer turns his/her back on the foreigner's culture, and sets out to look for a true national culture. Fanon admonishes the liberated native intellectual to pursue his/her motive until he/she has found "the
seething pot out of which the learning of the future will emerge” (WE 181). He further exhorts the liberated native intellectuals and artists to take up arms on the people’s side to bring about authentic decolonization.

The native intellectual who formerly used to produce his works to be enjoyed exclusively by the oppressor, now acquires the habit of addressing his own people. It is only from this moment, according to Fanon, “we can speak of a national literature”. Fanon calls this literature, “a literature of combat”. It is this literature which helps mould the national consciousness. “It is a literature of combat”, Fanon adds, “because it is the will to liberty expressed in terms of time and space” (WE 193). The revival of epic poetry in Algeria, and the poetry of revolt in the African countries and elsewhere in the world after the liberation struggles, endorse Fanon’s contention. Fanon quotes profusely from the Guinean poet Keita Fobeda’s poem African Dawn to illustrate how best the native writer can interpret the rhythmic images of his country from a revolutionary stand-point. The refrain of the poem, “Dawn was breaking”, in fact, heralded the new day which was at hand as far as the African people were concerned.

The reflection of this newly acquired vigour could be seen in the fields of handicrafts, wood work, ceramics and pottery. Abandoning of formalism and using vivid colours are the most important features of the new ceramics and pottery making. As for Jazz, it was no longer the expression of the “despairing broken down nostalgia of an old Negro
who is trapped between five glasses of whisky . . ." (WE 195). Quite contrary to the concept of Jazz as "an expression of niggerhood" (WE 196), it acquired a new dimension; it became the music of the liberated Negro. In dancing and singing too the native began to rebuild his/her perceptions through a newly acquired dynamism. All these changes, according to Fanon, are brought about on account of "the state of maturity of the national consciousness" consequent on authentic decolonization (WE 196). All the factors discussed hitherto substantiate my earlier contention that the beginning of genuine postcolonial theory can be traced back to Fanon. Moreover, my analysis of Fanon's works has proved that his writings are not at all 'prematurely postcolonial", as Benita Parry claims ("Resistance theory/theorizing resistance or three cheers for nativism". in Francis Barker et al ed. Colonial discourse/ Postcolonial theory 172-196).