Swarthmore College
Works

Senior Theses, Projects, and Awards | Student Scholarship

Spring 2021

The Fundamental Jolt: The Native's Untethering from the Character of the Colonized Subject Through the Inherent Dialectics of Colonial Violence

Maleyah Peterson , '21

Follow this and additional works at: https://works.swarthmore.edu/theses

 Part of the Africana Studies Commons

Recommended Citation

Peterson, Maleyah , '21, "The Fundamental Jolt: The Native's Untethering from the Character of the Colonized Subject Through the Inherent Dialectics of Colonial Violence" (2021). *Senior Theses, Projects, and Awards*. 816.
https://works.swarthmore.edu/theses/816

Please note: the theses in this collection are undergraduate senior theses completed by senior undergraduate students who have received a bachelor's degree.
This work is brought to you for free by Swarthmore College Libraries' Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Senior Theses, Projects, and Awards by an authorized administrator of Works. For more information, please contact myworks@swarthmore.edu.

The Fundamental Jolt:

The Native's Untethering from the Character of the Colonized Subject Through the Inherent Dialectics of Colonial Violence

Maleyah M. Peterson

Undergraduate Senior Thesis in Black Studies

Advised by Lorin K. Jackson

May 2021

Table of Contents

Introduction: The First Mention

> The colonized subject thus discovers that his life, his breathing and his heartbeats are the same as the colonist's. He discovers that the skin of the colonist is not worth more than the 'natives.' In other words, his world receives a fundamental jolt. The colonized's revolutionary new assurance stems from this. If in fact, my life is worth as much as the colonist's, his look can no longer strike fear into me or nail me to the spot and his voice can no longer petrify me. I am no longer uneasy in his presence. In reality, to hell with him. Not only does his presence no longer bother me, but I am already preparing to waylay him in such a way that soon he will have no other solution but to flee.
>
> Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*

Frantz Fanon's (1961) *The Wretched of the Earth* has a permanent home within my imagination. I found the words of Frantz Fanon (1961) when I needed them most, and from that moment, I have been unable to let the text go. To me, *The Wretched of the Earth* is everything—the value of Fanon's (1961) elucidation of the totalizing nature of the colonial state on top of a riveting psychoanalysis of the conscience of the colonized through the process of revolution is indeterminable. Truthfully, it would not be an understatement to say that I can spend the rest of my life reading and rereading this text—after every read, I discover yet another truth that Frantz Fanon (1961) has hidden between the pages. From electoral politics to the violence of colonial propaganda to the role of the artist within revolutionary struggle, there is much to be unpacked within Frantz Fanon's (1961) *The Wretched of the Earth*.

"In other words, [their][1] world receives a fundamental jolt," (Fanon, 1961, p.10). As I reread these words found only on page ten, they resonate within me. The fundamental jolt

[1] Firstly, I completely acknowledge that within *The Wretched of the Earth*, Fanon (1961) completely lacks a gendered analysis. The gendered nature of the colonized subject—the colonized as a man— can only be veiled misogyny. Central to colonialism is the forced imposition of gender binaries (explored within Chapter 1). Fanon's rhetoric falls short here. I reject the notion of gender and I reject the idea the colonized is a man. Rather than making this change within each and every quotation, I do it for the passage of the fundamental jolt because it is of utmost significance. However, I only use genderless pronouns to refer to the native in my own writing.

were the first words of Frantz Fanon (1961) that truly etched themselves in my memory. These words instantly send off alarms in my mind—the magnitude of this moment felt like it was begging to be engaged with. Very quickly though, I came to realize these alarms sounded for a variety of reasons, the first being a central truth that this entire thesis rests itself upon: The fundamental jolt is not abstract. The moment that which Fanon is describing has to be real because colonialism was real. The entirety of Fanon's scholarly contributions before *The Wretched of the Earth* were rooted in the very real nature of the colonial state, and this passage is no exception. The moment I accepted this truth, I abruptly grasped the reason I had hung on so tightly to Fanon's words on page ten: I saw myself within them. I am writing this thesis from the positionality of someone who knows, in the depths of my spirit, that I have experienced the fundamental jolt. Looking back, I did not realize I was in it till it was over. My fundamental jolt occurred during my time abroad in South Africa—I left for South Africa one person and came back another. Despite my knowing this, I cannot remember it. My maternal grandfather passed away during my time abroad, and because of this I cannot see my fundamental jolt clearly.

As I continued to engage with *The Wretched of the Earth* in a variety of contexts—other classes, my own work, casual conversation, revolutionary writings—I began to realize that my entire understanding of *The Wretched of the Earth* had begun to take shape against the background of the fundamental jolt. The fundamental jolt was already concept to me. I began bringing it up in conversations and seeing traces of it in the writings of other Black scholars and activists. It is for this reason that I chose to embark on this exploration—Fanon (1961) moved on from the fundamental jolt, but I did not. The fundamental jolt pulled me in and I leaned into the space that Fanon's (1961) words left for critical exploration.

Exploring the Fundamental Jolt

Fanon (1961) makes no other mention of the fundamental jolt beyond page ten of *The Wretched of the Earth*. Despite this, before we can even move the fundamental jolt beyond the context of Fanon (1961), we must critically explore the fundamental jolt in the context from with it emerges: *The Wretched of the Earth* by Frantz Fanon (1961). This text is the primary source material in which this definition/ thesis is based. By natural extension, even though this is not my intended purpose, this thesis can also be taken to be a close-reading of *The Wretched of the Earth* (Fanon, 1961). The entirety of this thesis exploration is meant to answer the question of: What is the fundamental jolt? This work endeavors to curate a definition of the fundamental jolt and by the end of this exploration, this mission is successful. Concretely defined, **the fundamental jolt is the moment at which native permanently untethers themselves from the character of the colonized subject through the reclamation of their own personhood and the development of revolutionary assurance.** Keeping this definition in mind, the chapters are organized to instill within you, as the reader, all of the understandings you need to also arrive at this definition. By the moment you arrive at this connection, it should first, and foremost, feel natural. If it does not, then I have done something wrong. Truth is central to the fundamental jolt, and it guides this work as well. I endeavor to be truthful in my exploration of the fundamental jolt. I no longer want to be lied to, and I refuse to lie either.

In Chapter 1: Defining Colonialism Through Violence, I break down the behemoth that is colonialism along the line of colonial violence. While *The Wretched of The Earth* in its entirety is a psychoanalysis of the colonized subject through liberation, Fanon (1961) also clearly shows us how in the colonial world, violence is a tool of security that is used to secure the colonial order

and support the colonist's desire for a perpetual colony. However, this function undergirds all acts of colonial violence. Rather exploring the totality of colonial violence at once, I break down colonial violence into 4 dimensions: 1) the language of (physical) violence that is used to construct and maintain the colonial world; 2) the forced imposition of binaries, hierarchies, and colonial values that is accompanied by the destruction of native ways of knowing and being; 3) the spatial violence and exploitation that is inherent to the geographical layout of the colony; and 4) the psychological/spiritual violence inherent to the fabrication of the colonized subject. Dimensions one through three are elucidated within this chapter as I demonstrate the way in which violence as a tool of security works within each one.

In Chapter 2: The Perpetual Continuation of the Colonial Order Through the Psychological /Spiritual Construction of the Colonized Subject, I focus on the fourth dimension of colonial violence: the psychological/spiritual violence inherent to the fabrication of the colonized subject. Rather than using the language of the colonized subject, for purposes of the fundamental jolt, it is far more useful to understand the colonized subject as a character. The colonized subject is a complex part of the colonial state, and rather than shying away from this complexity, the fundamental jolt requires us to lean into it. To understand and view the colonized subject as a character means to: 1) Understand the magnitude of psychological/spiritual violence endemic to the colonist and his agent's role as the fabricator of the colonized subject; 2) Hold space for parts of the native spirit that remain intact post construction—the native and the colonized subject are *not* the same person; and 3) Recognize the nascent beginnings of the Fundamental Jolt in relation to the dialectical nature of colonial violence—the fundamental jolt has always existed as a possibility. However, in continuation of

chapter 1, I only focus on exploring the first part. The construction of the colonized subject too, is all about security, and through the psychological/spiritual violence of socialization, the colonist fabricates the colonized subject to complete the colonial order.

In Chapter 3: The Dialectical Nature of Colonial Violence and the Possibility of the Fundamental Jolt the definition slowly begins to take some shape. In this chapter, I focus on exploring the final two functions of the language of character that were first uplifted in Chapter 2. However, with our understandings of the history of colonialism—the history of colonial violence—I offer Marx's theory of dialectical materialism as a method through which we can push beyond thinking about colonial violence as a tool of security, but colonial violence and its interactions with the fundamental jolt. Marxist dialectics create space for us to see the dialectical nature of colonial violence—as the colonizer mobilizes violence to secure the colonial order and keep the idea of a perpetual colony a possibility, this same violence creates contradictions between the native, the colonial order, and the colonist's desire for perpetuity. These contradictions are the possibility of the fundamental jolt. The dialectical nature of colonial violence allows us to see this.

In Chapter 4: The Definition of the Fundamental Jolt, I finally define the fundamental jolt. The process through which this definition is curated is two-fold. Firstly, being that *The Wretched of the Earth* is the primary source material, I first define the fundamental jolt based on the passage in which it was first mentioned. Chapters 1 through 3 truly lay the foundation for this definition to take shape. After defining the fundamental jolt from everything we get from Fanon (1961), we have a base-line definition. Then, I put this base-line definition in conversation with the possibility of the fundamental jolt and the dialectical nature of colonial

violence to extend the limits of this definition. In the end, we come to define the fundamental jolt as it is written above.

In its entirety, this is the arc of my thesis, from start to finish. The fundamental jolt, as I have come to know it, is printed on the following pages.

A Few Notes on Language

On Descriptors.

I want to preface this entire thesis by stating that my reading of Fanon is inherently raced. The native has always been Black and the colonizer has always been white. When I first read *The Wretched of the Earth*, I saw myself within the colonized. I saw my family and friends within the colonized. The native that I speak of is also Black. I chose to maintain (and somewhat extend) the language of colonized, colonist, colonizer, native, colonized, colonized subject, etc. that Fanon (1961) utilized within *The Wretched of the Earth* because I recognize the way in which it holds space for global application. The language that Fanon (1961) used within *The Wretched of the Earth* forces him to be incredibly specific within his psychoanalysis of the colonized subject. *The Wretched of the Earth,* in line with Fanon's (1961) other work, is informed by his work as a psychiatrist in a hospital in colonial Algeria. However, *The Wretched of the Earth* possesses the capability for universal application. Fanon (1961) adeptly captures the behavior of the colonist/colonial lie/colonial order/colonial world in a way that allows us to see the innerworkings of colonialism itself. The colony is not a singular phenomenon— it is not a phenomena at all. Rather, in analyzing the process through which the colony was constructed, we can clearly see how it can be destroyed. The language that Fanon (1961) uses within *The Wretched of the Earth* leaves space for the reader to recognize that this is true of every colony. All of this is to say, I use Fanon's (1961) language for these reasons as well. The colonist is inherently illogical, they are motivated by avarice. But the colonizer is not imaginative either, rather, they are predictable and this language allows this truth to reverberate globally.

On Tense.

The Wretched of the Earth (Fanon, 1961) is written in present tense from start to finish. Ultimately, this shapes the readers experience of the text. Fanon's (1961) use of present tense pulled me in, and while I knew this decision was one that I wanted to mirror, I wanted to concretize my rationale beyond that. In reading, I came across these words written in the Foreword of *The Wretched of the Earth* written by Homi K. Bhaba. He writes,

> I want to turn now to Fanon's exploration of the psychoaffective realm, which is neither subjective nor objective, but a place of social and psychic mediation, and—if I may quote Fanon out of context—'the glowing focal point where citizen and individual develop and grow...' It is Fanon's great contribution to our understanding of ethical judgement and political experience to insistently frame his reflections on violence, decolonization, national consciousness, and humanism in terms of the psycho-affective realm—the body, dreams, psychic inversions and displacements, phantasmic political identifications. A psycho-affective relation or response has the semblance of universality and timelessness because it involves the emotions, the imagination or psychic life, but it is only ever mobilized into social meaning and historical effect through an embodied and embedded action, an engagement with (or resistance to) a given reality, or a performance of agency in the present tense. (Fanon, 1961,p. *xix*)

Essentially, Bhaba writes, that Fanon's (1961) use of the present tense affirms its value as a site of "social and psychic mediation". The word mediation signals the presence of a third party and I cannot help but wonder if Bhaba's words suggest that Fanon (1961) himself or *The Wretched of the Earth* is meant to be a mediator between the reader, and their conscience. Regardless, the use of present tense to speak about the violence of colonialism breaks the barrier of

temporality. Fanon (1961) essentially forces the reader to read about colonialism and decolonization in the present tense, and this allows colonialism to transcend itself beyond historically rigid understandings of colonialism.

On top of this, in my continued study of Frantz Fanon I have come to learn of Fanon's interactions with the philosophical study of phenomenology. Fanon's style of writing heavily draws on the philosophical teachings of phenomenology as the study of the structures of experience and consciousness. Calling on the influences of Jean-Paul Sarte, Fanon's use of the abstracted present tense when talking about the mental/psychological effects of makes his writing feel true. Within passages like that of the fundamental jolt, Fanon’s use of I, is not meant to refer to him alone, but any native.

Chapter 1: Defining Colonialism Through Violence

> The colonist makes history and he knows it. And because he refers constantly to the history of his metropolis, he plainly indicates that here he is the extension of this metropolis. The history he writes is therefore not the history of the country he is despoiling, but the history of his own nation's looting, raping, and starving to death. The immobility to which the colonized subject is condemned can be challenged only if; he decides to put an end to the history of colonization and the history of despoliation in order to bring to life the history of the nation, the history of decolonization.
>
> Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*

Trying to capture the entirety of colonialism as an economic, social, psychological, and national process is a daunting text, but as always, I call on the spirit of Frantz Fanon (1961) to guide me. *The Wretched of the Earth* in its entirety is an in-depth psychoanalysis of the colonized on the path towards and during revolution. Fanon (1961) writes *The Wretched of the Earth* against the background of/ in-service of decolonization[2] and in doing so, he also offers us an in-depth history of colonialism[3]. However, through Fanon's own words, we come to learn that to know the truth about colonialism is to know the history of the colonist's violence. Ultimately, this history gives shape to the fundamental jolt. Thus, while the purpose of this

[2] Fanon position decolonization as an inevitable possibility and this informs each and every single dynamic that he speaks of within *The Wretched of the Earth*. Fanon believed in decolonization and all of his works are demonstrative of this commitment. On top of this, Fanon's belief in the inevitability of decolonization informs the manner in which he approached his psychiatric/psychological work. Decolonization shapes Fanon's explanations of colonial violence and colonialism as a project. By extension, decolonization also shapes my understandings of colonialism as well.

work is not to recount the history of colonialism, it is necessary to understand what the fundamental jolt is in response to.

The colonial state is a behemoth in the way that it is totalizing, but violence is the entry point Fanon (1961) provides us into colonial history. Fanon (1961) starts with violence because the colony begins with violence. Fanon (1961) writes,

> Decolonization is the encounter between two congenitally antagonistic forces that in fact owe their singularity to the kind of reification secreted and nurtured by the colonial situation. Their first confrontation was colored by violence and their cohabitation—or rather the exploitation of the colonized by the colonizer—continued at the point of the bayonet under canon fire. (p. 2)

Before the colonized became the colonized subject, they were the native, and the colonist was a foreigner. The first interaction between the native and the foreigner was not one of mutual respect but one of imposition. The foreigner did not see the native as human and thus, the native's culture and land was not one to be respected. The foreigner turned colonist is an exploiter and has always been. The only relationship between the colonist and native is one of domination: the colonist is a selfish individual. Violence is wielded by the colonist as a means to ensure their successful implantation and once that position is secured, the violence must continue in order for them to remain.

My broad usage of the word violence above is not meant to obscure the specific ways that violence manifests in the colonial state, but to highlight violence as a totalizing apparatus of security that protects the power and domination of the colonist. Violence, of all forms, is the only language that the colonizer speaks. Violence in the colonial world takes countless forms,

but *The Wretched of the Earth* positions us to see colonial violence is tool of security within the colonial world to keep the colonist's dream—a perpetual colony in the realm of possibility. However, this truth, rather than being the *sole* function, undergirds each and every mobilization of the colonist's violence. *The Wretched of the Earth* (Fanon, 1961) very quickly reveals to us that while this chief function exists, all instances of colonial violence do not look the same. Nonetheless in reading (and rereading) *The Wretched of the Earth* (Fanon, 1961) engaging with the Fundamental Jolt, I have naturally come to understand the larger scope of colonial violence in four dimensions. Each dimension represents a different form or kind of colonial violence. However, while the mobilization of violence may vary, at the heart of each dimension—each and every mobilization of colonial violence—is the colonist's security. The first dimension is the language of (physical) violence that is used to construct and maintain the colonial world. The second dimension is the imposition of binaries, hierarchies, and colonial values that is accompanied by the destruction of native ways of knowing and being. The third dimension is the spatial violence and exploitation that is inherent to the geographical layout of the colony. For a long time, these were the only three dimensions I concretely understood; but through Fanon's (1961) psychoanalysis of the colonized, I began to recognize that the violence does not and *cannot* stop there. Violence is a tool of security within the colonial state: the colonist and his agents mobilize various forms of violence to reinforce the colonial sector at all points. Consequently, the colonist makes it so that no part of native life is remiss from the impacts of colonialism and this includes the native themself. The final dimension of colonial violence is the psychological/spiritual violence inherent to the fabrication of the colonized subject.

Language of (Physical) Violence

The colonial world is constructed through the language of violence. In the colony, the foreigner forces themselves unto native land and people using cannons and machines (Fanon, 1961). Exploitation, looting, and genocide are the first manifestations of violence we see within colonial implantation and it only spirals from that point on (Fanon, 1961). Violence creates space for the colonizer dominate and conquer without stopping to consider being and agency of the people who are native to the land they seek to control. Central to their use of violence is a disregard for native life. After all, violence is simply a means to an end—the end, being a perpetual colony in the case of the colonist. It would be naïve to say that the native blood that is shed in the process of the construction is simply in the periphery of the colonist's mind because it is not (Césaire, 1972). The complete construction and perpetual continuation of the colonial state is the only thing the colonist moves and lives in service of—the native is invisible throughout the entire process.

Once the colonial state is constructed, the colonist calls on violence to maintain what has been constructed. The difference is that this time, the colonist is not alone. While dominant discourses of colonialism obscure partners of the colonist, it is important to recognize that the colonial state itself has multiple apparatuses—all of which are fluent in this language of violence. Frantz Fanon (1961) writes,

> The colonized world is a world divided in two. The dividing line, the border, is represented by the barracks and the police stations. In the colonies, the official, legitimate agent, the spokesperson for the colonizer and the regime of oppression, is the police officer or the soldier. (p. 3)

The police officer or the soldier are agents of the colonial state. While the West would have you believe that the principal agents of the colonial mission are the Christian missionaries who are called to bring religion to the native's people or nomads looking to settle, Fanon (1961) does not mislead us. The police officer and the soldier are the "spokesperson of the colonizer"(Fanon, 1961, p. 2). They are most fluent in the language of violence and the colonist revels in that fact. Without the police and the military, the colonial state loses its footing. Military barracks and police stations separate the colonist's sector and the native sector—two sectors that I will dedicate time to explaining later—and delineate to whom and where this violence is directed. The colonist is never the subject of the violence of the police and the military—why would the colonial state enact violence upon itself?

In *The Wretched of the* Earth, Frantz Fanon (1961), in his account of colonialism, immediately asserts that the police and military are an apparatus of the colonial state. Fanon (1961) spends no time in trying to convince the reader of this fact, but rather lets the actions of the colonist/colonial state speak for themselves. In doing so, our understanding of violence as a tool of security strengthens itself. Displays of violence are demonstrative of the insecurity of the colonist—violence is no longer mobilized to construct, but to maintain the colony. Without violence, the colonist has no power within the colonial state. Fanon (1961) affirms this fact when he writes, "The colonist is an exhibitionist. His safety concerns lead him to remind the colonized out loud: 'Here I am the master.' The colonist keeps the colonized in a state of rage, which he prevents from boiling over," (Fanon, 1961, p. 17). In its usage of violence, the colonist/colonial state utilizes display as a method of power and control. Recognizing the exhibitionism of the colonist not only makes the acts of violence all the more sinister, but it

demonstrates the colonist's knowing that their position within the world that *they* constructed is unstable. The colonial state is truly fragile and the frequent mobilizations of violence are proof of this. These displays often register to us as symbolic of their power, but through Fanon's words we are able to see them for what they truly are— desperate displays of insecurity. The colonist is concerned for his safety—for the safety of the colonial world—and the volatility of state violence is relational to the level of insecurity they feel. The more they fear that the colonial situation is losing its hold, the more violence that we see. The language of colonial violence post-imposition no longer serves the purpose of construction, but maintenance. The colonial world secures itself through the language of violence spoken by the colonist himself, the police, and the military.

Imposition of Binaries and Hierarchies/ Cultural Destruction

As we shift from discussing physical violence, I want to first and foremost acknowledge that binaries and hierarchies are a form of violence. I want to hold space for the countless number of Black lives we have lost through the imposition of binaries and hierarchies and to recognize the violence caused by the people who have deemed themselves to be executors and enforcers of these binaries. The violence and construction of the colonial sector is not complete without the dichotomies it imposes within the world and this must be understood (Fanon, 1961). In line with this thinking, it is important that in your reading of this work, you must avoid any and all impulses to hierarchize the violence of the colonial world. No violence is more violent than the other; that sort of thinking only distorts our ability to see the larger picture of colonial violence as a tool of security that ensures the perpetuation of the colonial order. I need you, as a reader, to hold all of this as we move forward.

In understanding the imposition of colonial binaries and hierarchies, it is worth breaking down this imposition even further. Firstly, I will focus on elucidating the way binaries and hierarchies function as a medium through which colonial violence consciously operates. The way in which this cultural imposition works is not unintentional—it is yet another tool that the colonist calculatedly determines to be effective insurance for their perpetual existence within the native's land. Second, while Fanon (1961) does not get specific about the actual binaries and hierarchies in *The Wretched of the Earth*, I will. In an effort to address the elephant in the room—the question of the temporal relevance of colonialism—I want to get specific about the exact dichotomies that exist as a result of colonialism. On top of all this, our thinking about colonialism must be specific for the very reason I outlined above—colonial violence was specific. I acknowledge that Fanon (1961) explicitly wrote about and during the colonial situation in Algeria because I am not writing during the time of colonialism, I must continually push the limits of specificity to ensure understanding.

The binaries and hierarchies that exist within the colonial world serve the purpose of reordering. This reordering, while it sounds simple in written language, is a violent and complex process that is accompanied by cultural destruction and imposition. Before the colonist arrived, there was indigenous culture and life. The reality of this is not up for debate—where there is people, there is culture. They, as a people, had already built a system of social, cultural, natural, and economic relations that honored themselves, their ways of being, and their values. Before the colonist, there were no impressions of native culture as inferior or primitive because there were no hierarchies established that required domination of that nature to function. In order for the colonial world to construct a structure and society that had some sort of longevity, the

colonist recognizes they cannot simply *just* coexist. It is not about simply finding a place to settle, and thus it does not work if the colonist just attempts to superimpose their values, beliefs, and ways of superiority onto the existing native culture. In order for the colonist to transform the colony into a living, breathing reality, they need to completely disorganize native culture and society.

This disorganization—the forced imposition of colonial culture, ideals, and values—traces back to security. Fanon writes,

> The violence which governed the ordering of the colonial world, which tirelessly punctuated the destruction of the indigenous, social fabric, and demolished unchecked the systems of reference of the country's economy, lifestyles, and modes of dress, the same violence will be vindicated and appropriated when, taking history into their own hands, the colonized swarm into the forbidden cities… (Fanon, 1961, p. 5)

In order for the natives to believe in the supremacy of the colonial culture, there must be no room for doubt. The mere existence of any other culture than that of the colonist is a threat. For how could colonial culture be supreme *and* right if natives can both remember and access a culture that allows them to move, be, and think differently? In thinking of colonial cultural imposition in this way, the link between colonial violence and security renders itself hyper visible. Indigenous ways of life did not simply "disappear" (Césaire, 1972). This discourse is mobilized retroactively to justify the violence of the colonist. The colonist would rather have you believe that native culture naturally vanished as a result of its inability to sustain itself, as a supposed proof of its primitiveness. The fact that colonial culture "survives" beyond the construction of the colony is proof of its superiority (Fanon, 1961). It is superior because it lasts.

It is right because it lasts. This is the dominant narrative that we are taught and socialized to believe in, but Frantz Fanon (1961) reveals to us the truth. Colonial culture is only able to take hold and "last" because of the intentional systemic cultural destruction of indigenous ways of being.

The hierarchies and binaries forced onto indigenous people during colonial implantation are completely entangled with who the colonist, themselves, are. It is with this thought that I want to briefly step away from Fanon (1961) and call on scholars of the global South to guide me from here on out. I primarily call on the work of Ramón Grosfoguel (2011) to shed light on the specific binaries and hierarchies that are completely entangled within colonial imposition. It is important to recognize during the era of colonialism, the colonist very much looks the same throughout the Americas, the Caribbean, Latin America, and Africa[4]. Granted, the specifics of how the colonies themselves are constructed vary due to the geographical, economic, social, and political contexts of the indigenous land and culture that exist prior to the advent of the colony, but the colonist themself is predictable. The colonial project is always about domination and power. The way in which this power was secured is not innovative. The colonist moves in this way everywhere.

The Colonial Power Matrix

In Ramón Grosfoguel's "Decolonizing Post-Colonial Studies and Paradigms of Political Economy: Transmodernity, Decolonial Thinking, and Global Coloniality," Grosfoguel (2011) takes the time to explicitly outline the colonial power matrix—entangled hierarchies that were

[4] This is why Fanon's (1961) *The Wretched of the Earth* is such a staple text for this work—his words on the colonial situation are a mirror to colonialism as a global project.

central to the implantation of colonial culture and violence. When I talk about the reordering of native society and the destruction of native culture and ways of being, the colonial power matrix encapsulates what came after (Grosfoguel, 2011). Like Frantz Fanon (1961), Grosfoguel (2011) speaks from an understanding that the colonial state is total—no sphere is remiss from the impacts of colonialism. Thus, it is important for us to be incredibly critical in recognizing and discussing how colonialism shows up and makes itself known. Western/dominant narratives about colonialism lend themselves to a reductionist perspective; only discussing colonialism in terms of government and economic systems and processes produces a faulty and incomplete view of colonial violence—the government and economy are only two of the apparatuses mobilized by the colonizer in service of the colonial project (Grosfoguel, 2011). Rather than thinking about colonialism from the West, Grosfoguel (2011) encourages us to shift our geo-politics of knowledge to the global south[3] to think through colonialism and to capture the totality of the colonial state and its interactions with indigenous culture. He writes,

> What arrived in the Americas was a broader and wider entangled power structure that an economic reductionist perspective of the world-system is unable to account for. From the structural location of an Indigenous woman in the Americas, what arrived was a more complex world-system than what political economy paradigms and world-system analysis portrait. A European/capitalist/military/Christian/patriarchal/white/heterosexual/male arrived in the Americas and established simultaneously in time and space several entangled global hierarchies… (Grosfoguel, 2011)

Grosfoguel makes a fundamental link—colonial cultural imposition is not arbitrary. The colonist disorganizes native society and constructs the colonial world with and through their own values, beliefs, and ways of being. Colonialism, as a process, creates binaries that are first and foremost meant to control the native's body. While these hierarchies can very much be interpreted as ideologies that are embodied and uplifted within the colonial state, they are not just ideologies. For the colonizer to uplift an ideology within the colonial state ultimately means to construct norms. The norms of the colonial state are not for the colonist, as the colonist is the norm. Colonial norms are constructed to police—to be the authority on how native people and their bodies are *allowed* to show up within the colonial state post-arrival of the colonist. The colonial power matrix, too, boils down to a matter of security. Indigenous people living freely, moving freely, and embodying their native culture is and will always be a threat to construction and maintenance of the colonial state. The colonial state cannot be secure if native society is not policed—the colonial state requires the native to *not* show up fully and to stifle themselves—and *this* is the way colonial violence is incarnated within colonial binaries and hierarchies.

Grosfoguel (2011), with the help of other scholars, elucidates the colonial power matrix in its fullness. The following breakdown of colonial dichotomies should not be mistaken for disconnectedness, but rather complexity. These hierarchies are entangled—each one informs and reifies the next—and to break them down is to acknowledge this complexity in its fullness and to remove the intentional obscurity surrounding these dichotomies. Colonialism actively works to conceal itself in the way the colonial state reorders native society and positions these

dichotomies as the zero point—as the norm. This is the lens through which we need to understand the colonial power matrix. The colonial matrix can be untangled as follows.

1) a particular global class formation where a diversity of forms of labor (slavery, semi-serfdom, wage labor, petty-commodity production, etc.) are going to coexist and be organized by capital as a source of production of surplus value through the selling of commodities for a profit in the world market;

2) an international division of labor of core and periphery where capital organized labor in the periphery around coerced and authoritarian forms (Wallerstein 1974);

3) an inter-state system of politico-military organizations controlled by European males and institutionalized in colonial administrations (Wallerstein 1979);

4) a global racial/ethnic hierarchy that privileges European people over non-European people (Quijano 1993; 2000);

5) a global gender hierarchy that privileges males over females and European Judeo-Christian patriarchy over other forms of gender relations (Spivak 1988; Enloe 1990);

6) a sexual hierarchy that privileges heterosexuals over homosexuals and lesbians (it is important to remember that most indigenous peoples in the Americas did not consider sexuality among males a pathological behavior and had no homophobic ideology);

7) a spiritual hierarchy that privileges Christians over non-Christian/non-Western spiritualities institutionalized in the globalization of the Christian (Catholic and

later, Protestant) church;

8) an epistemic hierarchy that privileges Western knowledge and cosmology over non-Western knowledge and cosmologies, and institutionalized in the global university system (Mignolo 1995, 2000; Quijano 1991);

9) a linguistic hierarchy between European languages and non-European languages that privileges communication and knowledge/theoretical production in the former and subalternize the latter as sole producers of folklore or culture but not of knowledge/theory (Mignolo 2000);

10) an aesthetic hierarchy of high art vs. naïve or primitive art where the West is considered superior high art and the non-West is considered as producers of inferior expressions of art institutionalized in Museums, Art Galleries and global art markets;

11) a pedagogical hierarchy where the Cartesian western forms of pedagogy are considered superior over non-Westerm concepts and practices of pedagogy;

12) a media/informational hierarchy where the West has the control over the means of global media production and information technology while the non-West do not have the means to make their points of view enter the global media networks;

13) an age hierarchy where the Western conception of productive life (ages between 15 and 65 years old) making disposable people above 65 years old are considered superior over non-Western forms of age classification, where the older the person, the more authority and respect he/she receives from the

> community;
>
> 14) an ecological hierarchy where the Western conceptions of "nature" (as an object that is a means towards an end) with its destruction of life (human and nonhuman) is privileged and considered superior over non-Western conceptions of the "ecology" such as Pachamama, Tawhid, or Tao (ecology or cosmos as subject that is an end in itself), which considers in its rationality the reproduction of life;
>
> 15) a spatial hierarchy that privileges the urban over the rural with the consequent destruction of rural communities, peasants and agrarian production at the world scale. (Grosfoguel, 2011)

Within this list, it is clear that colonial dichotomies work to strengthen each other—they are entangled because without the existence of each other they cannot stand. For example, the colonizer recognizes that it is impossible to police sexuality and gender without mobilizing religion as a policing apparatus and vice versa. Shifting focus to explicating the manner in which these hierarchies' police, I will begin to re-tangle the parts of the colonial power matrix that are most salient to this work. The purpose of this re-tangling is not only to uplift how these binaries are inextricably bound to one another, but to recognize that while the colonial power matrix polices, it too, is doing the work of security.

The first three parts of the colonial power matrix—in essence, global capitalism, global labor market and a global military apparatus—speak to the way in which the colonial state gives shape to the global economy and organizes capital. It recognizes the idea of primitive accumulation, the Marxist ideology that pre-capitalist forms of production—i.e. chattel slavery—have slowly transformed into capitalist modes of productions. Within the colonial

power matrix, the violence of forced labor as a means for the West and Europe to acquire capital—for the colonist to obtain their wealth—is the norm. Being that colonialism is a global project, it is important to recognize that the colony is constructed to center extractive labor. Native society is a site of extraction and this informs the economic and political construction of the colony and thus, the rest of the world. Europe and the West are global colonizing powers and by extension, the colonial power matrix and its implications are global. Labor is systematically extracted from the colonies and capital is centralized in the metropol[5]. The police and the military, as global apparatuses, become the guarantors of this global exploitative system. To ensure that the global south remains a site of extractive labor and never one of profit within the global world system, the colonist calls on the military. A global politico-military system holds the same function and speaks the same language of violence as police within the colonial state. Through them, the colonial power matrix establishes global footing (Grosfoguel, 2011). Colonial dichotomies cement themselves as the global norm—the global world order—and structure the rest of the world within the image of the colonist. The violent reduction of natives to sources of labor *through* the colonial power matrix allows colony (and the colonist) to secure itself economically, but globally as well.

After categorizing native sectors as (perpetual) extractive pockets of labor, the colonist looks at himself and recognizes if the colonial power matrix is meant to secure, it must also encapsulate the superiority of his being. The colonial power matrix does the work of othering as it relates to race, gender, sexuality, and spirituality—parts four through seven. Pre-colonial

[5] This structure is the same global economic labor system we see today—"the third world" remains systematically underdeveloped because while labor occurs there, the product itself is stolen from the global South to profit and fuel the West (Grosfoguel, 2011).

societies were pluralistic (Césaire, 1972; Grosfoguel, 2011) and created space for numerous forms of living. The colonial power matrix only affords space to the white, European, cis, heterosexual male who recognizes the Christ of Christianity as the one-true God. Demonized is indigenous cultural conceptualizations of ethnicity or sexuality and revered is the colonist himself. Through cultural destruction, murder, and genocide, indigenous ways of life are snuffed out and the colonist's ways of being are given life through the enforcement of the colonial power matrix. In the colony, there are only two acceptable forms of life—to be the colonist or to be "other".

Shifting to parts eight through eleven of the colonial power matrix—epistemic, linguistic, aesthetic, pedagogical hierarchies—it is important to understand how these three hierarchies interact with each other and operate specifically to secure the image of the colonist as superior. By positioning European knowledge, language, art, and ways of learning as the norm, the colonist destabilizes the validity and worth of indigenous society to its very core. Relegating native culture and its contributions to the realm of culture and not knowledge is security work that the colonist deems necessary to construct a world in his image. To value the knowledge produced within indigenous society is a threat to the colonial state because it nullifies one of the core values of the colonial world: It is only the colonist who thinks and who knows. Through the colonial power matrix, the colonist becomes all-knowing and the native becomes a receptacle of colonial knowledge. Language and knowledge are central sites of destruction at the hands of the colonist—delegitimizing native culture, knowledge, language, and art is the final step to ensure this destruction continues into perpetuity.

Lastly, the media/informational hierarchy—part twelve of the colonial power matrix—that centers the West and Europe is the voice of the colonial state. The colony speaks to the colony and the world through the media. The media, as an apparatus of the colonial state, is an irrefutable embodiment of violence as security in the way that it spreads the will of the colonist. The colony mobilizes its apparatuses to protect itself and neutralize any threats to its stability and a large part of this work is done through the media. The media has the ability to control and discourse and narratives, but its location within the West/Europe—within the colony—distorts any potential for neutrality. The media that is located in the imperial core—that speaks from the imperial core outwards and silences the voices located in its periphery i.e. the global South—can only do the bidding of colonialism. This, coupled with the intentional cultural destruction of indigenous culture, genocide of indigenous peoples/superimposition of colonial culture vehemently work to ensure that only one story can be told and spread—the story of the colonist. The media works to ensure that no narrative, discourse, and stories are told, spread, and/or legitimized that threatens the perpetuity of the colonial state and the security of the colonist.

Spatial Violence and Exploitation

It must not be forgotten that the colony itself is confined to a place. The colony did not exist abstractly within the air, it manifests itself spatially. Our understanding of colonialism must include a layered understanding of spatial layout, architecture, and geographical tangibleness of the colonial state. The colonial state, as Fanon (1961) says above, is characterized through the dichotomies it imposes within the world, and part of this dichotomy is expressly visible in the literal construction and layout of the colonial state. The colonial sector

exists in a state of extravagance—not a natural extravagance, but an extravagance that is sourced through exploitative violence. Within *The Wretched of the Earth*, Frantz Fanon (1961) makes a pivotal statement.

> The colonial world is a compartmentalized world. It is obviously as superfluous to recall the existence of 'native' towns and European towns, of schools for 'natives' and schools for Europeans, as it is to recall apartheid in South Africa. Yet if we penetrate inside this compartmentalization we shall at least bring to light some of its key aspects. By penetrating its geographical configuration and classification we shall be able to delineate the backbone on which decolonized society is reorganized. (p. 3)

In the colonial world, the geographical construction of the colony occurs through spatial violence. While I write of the colonial world as a singular entity, through geography and space, dual realities are constructed as part of the formal experience of the colony. The colonial world that is occupied by the colons[6] and colonized subjects is not the same world—they are two completely different sectors. Fanon (1961) affirms this understanding when he writes, " The colonized world is a world divided in two. The dividing line, the border, is represented by the barracks and the police stations," (p. 3)[7]. Within the geographical landscape of the colony, the primary function of police is to police the movement of the colonized subject and protect the colons and their sector from invasion. Again, violence secures—the police and military mobilize to keep the colonized subject within the confines of their assigned geographical space.

[6] Colons is the plural form of the word colonist that is used within *The Wretched of the Earth* (Fanon, 1961)
[7] This quote was first mentioned in this work in a discussion of the police and military as apparatuses of the colonial state that make use of violence to construct and maintain the position of the colonist (Fanon, 1961). The police and military, again, serve this same purpose.

During the construction of the colonial sector, the colonist's sector and the native's sector are built in direct opposition to each another. Fanon's (1961) conceptualizations of the colonist's sector versus the native's sector speak very clearly to the marked differences within the colonial world and directly link spatial violence and the grandeur of the colonial sector to the colonial conquest. Spatial violence is mobilized as yet another way to cement the colony and the colonist's presence, wealth, status, etc. into perpetuity. The colonist takes their violence—their security— a step further as they construct the geographical makeup of the colony. The colonist is the colonist—everything is about power, even within architecture. Fanon (1961) writes,

> The colonist's sector is a sector built to last, all stone and steel. It's a sector of lights and paved roads, where the trash cans constantly overflow with strange and wonderful garbage, undreamed-of leftovers. The colonist's feet can never be glimpsed, except perhaps in the sea, but then you can never get close enough. They are protected by solid shoes in a sector where the streets are clean and smooth, without a pothole, without a stone. The colonist's sector is a sated, sluggish sector, its belly is permanently full of good things. The colonist's sector is a sector is a white folks' sector, a sector of foreigners. (p. 4)

The colonist's sector is built to last and this is the primary desire of the colonist, of the colony: to last. The colonist's sector is built to accommodate the colonist for as long as he desires to stay. What does this mean for the native? It means that the native lives in perpetual discomfort; after all, the colons relationship to the native is one of exploitation. Space, in the colonized world, is a luxury that is hoarded so that only the colonist can have it. The space

within the colonial sector is stolen space. The colonist's sector does not exist without theft—without the exploitation and destruction of native land and peoples (Fanon, 1961). The money and wealth that the colons live off of within the colonial sector is not theirs—the colons do not even build the colony themselves! However, the colonist positions himself as the supreme being within the colony and thus, violently re-positions himself to reap the benefits of the colony for him and himself alone. What does it mean for the foreigner to live better than the native in their own land? In the colonial sector, the wealth of the colonist is hyper visible, but one must ask, truly, what is the colonist's wealth? What has the colonist earned? The colonist has not earned anything—the colonist does not have money. The colonist is wealthy because they steal. The colonist is wealthy because they exploit. The colonist's sector is built on stolen land, with stolen money, only to be inhabited by a group of people who intend of surviving off of their ability to perpetually exploit and extract resources and value from the natives and their land. This is how and where the colonist *lives*.

The colonist, along with the military and police, are the geographical organizers of the colony. Through use of violence and force, the colonist secures space for himself first and whatever remains (and they ensure that there is little) goes to the colonized. While the native's sector is not located within the colonist's sector, it is located within the colonial world and thus, it does not belong to them. Fanon (1961) writes,

> The colonized's sector is, or at the least the 'native' quarters, the shanty town, the Medina, the reservation, is a disreputable place inhabited by disreputable people. You are born anywhere, anyhow. You die anywhere, from anything. It's a world with no space, people are piled up one on top of the other, the shacks squeezed tightly

> together. The colonized's sector is a famished sector, hungry for bread, meat, shoes, coal, and light. The colonized sector is a sector that crouches and cowers, a sector on its knees, a sector that is prostrate. It's a sector of niggers, a sector of towelheads. (Fanon, 1961, pp. 5-6)

Fanon (1961) first distinguishes the native's living space as a 'quarter' rather than a sector to acknowledge that the native sleeps here. The native cannot live in their sector all day because life in the colony is centered around the colonist and *their* sector. The colony conducts itself within the colonist's sector and thus, the native and the colonist's sector are always in close contact. The native's sector is first and foremost spaceless. The natives are sequestered in their own land and this is not unintentional. What does the native sector have space for? Through Fanon's (1961) words we see that the native's sector makes more space for death more than it does life. The colonial state does not care for the comfort of the natives because to the colonist, they are not people—the native is a source of labor. Fanon (1961) speaks of the native in his quarters as starving, needing light, and nourishment and it is important to reckon that these things cannot be found in the native's sector—not because they do not exist, but because they exist in a state of excessiveness within the colonist's sector. The colonial sector has what the native's need and desire, and it is all the more violent once one is able to recognize that the native no longer has, so the colonist can have in excess. The architectural and spatial design of the colony models itself after a relationship of perpetual dependence—the native's sector exists in a severe state of lack to keep the natives in contact with the colonial sector. The colonist's sector needs the native to function—the colons do not work.

Chapter 2: The Perpetuation of the Colonial Order through the Psychological/Spiritual Construction of the Colonized Subject

> The most powerful weapon in the hands of the oppressor is the mind of the oppressed.
>
> Steve Biko, *I Write What I Like*

> The colonist and the colonized are old acquaintances. And consequently, the colonist is right when he says he 'knows' them. It is the colonist who *fabricated* and *continues to fabricate* the colonized subject. The colonist derives his validity, i.e., his wealth from the colonial system.
>
> Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*

The security of the colonist and their dream of a perpetual colony shapes each and every act of colonial violence. This longing is the reason why violence cannot be decoupled from the colonial context. Violence is deeply embedded within the structural, ideological, and material foundation of the colonial state because the colony can only perpetuate itself through violence. It is for this reason, that the violence of the colony does not stop where we left off in Chapter 1. The violence of the colony does not only penetrate the external—culture, architecture, the external native body, the land, etc.—but the internal. The colonized subject, as a constructed character, is the missing piece to the colonial order. The colony is in the process of establishing itself—the military and police creates space for a forceful implantation, the colonial power matrix completely disorganizes native society and organizes colonial society, and the exploitation of native society shapes architectural layout of the colony. However, the colonizer deems that more security measures are necessary—more violence must be mobilized— to tie up the loose ends of the colonial order.

The construction of the colonized subject is complex, hence, conceptualizing the colonized subject as a character allows space for this complexity to be both understood and connected back to the undergirding function of colonial violence: security. The language of "character" is not native to *The Wretched of the Earth*, but rather, it is conceptualization of my own that is first influenced by my understanding of the fundamental jolt, the words of Aimé Césaire (1972) and Frantz Fanon (1961).

The Language of Character

In *The Wretched of the Earth*, Fanon (1961) speaks of the "native" turned "colonized subject". This language signals that the colonized subject does not exist before the arrival of the colonist and for this reason, we must critically interrogate the role of the colonized subject in the colony. The colonized subject as a character is the result of this critical interrogation. To understand and view the colonized subject as a character means to:

1. Understand the magnitude of psychological/spiritual violence endemic to the colonist and his agent's role as the fabricator of the colonized subject;
2. Hold space for parts of the native spirit that remain intact post construction—the native and the colonized subject are *not* the same person;
3. Recognize the nascent beginnings of the Fundamental Jolt in relation to the dialectical nature of colonial violence—the fundamental jolt has always existed as a possibility.

While the colonized subject is being constructed, each of these truths exist at the same time. Continuing with the elucidation of the dimensions of colonial violence and exposing the manner in which violence is a tool of security in the colonial world, I will only focus on number one

within this chapter. Parts two and three will be explored in the following chapter—it is necessary for us to understand the full scope of colonial violence before reintroducing complexity.

The Colonizer as Fabricator and The Security of the Colony

The colonizer, and by extension, the military and police must take on the role of fabricator because the continued existence of the colony is tethered to colonized subject (Fanon, 1961, p. 2). In this way, the fabrication of the colonized subject is entirely about security.

From the vantage point of the colonist, the colonial order and the colonial lie are incomplete without the construction of the colonized subject. Firstly, the colonial order is incomplete because the colony requires exploitation and domination to function—i.e. the colonist needs a mass of people to exploit and dominate. Secondly, the colonial lie, tells the world that the colony is the natural order of things, but this naturalness has yet to be established. In the colonial world, these are security issues and the manner in which the colonizer mobilizes the violence of socialization affirms this very fact.

The construction of the colonized subject has everything to do with naturalness. The native in their fullness is a threat to the security of colonial order and so the colonist and his agents seek to destroy the native's spirit and transform the native from person to colonized subject. Césaire (1972) defines colonization to be "a bridgehead in a campaign to civilize barbarism, from which there may emerge at any moment the negation of civilization, pure and simple," (Césaire, 1972, p. 40) Colonialism, in the eyes of the colonist and his agents, is a civilizing mission. Through the construction of the colonized subject, the presence of the

colonist is re-framed as necessary to bring order and respectability to the native's land and people. It is not enough to destroy native land and culture and forcibly reorder an already existing society—the colonist must always go further. Their violence, unchecked, leads them to say that it is not enough to say the colonist is superior and the native inferior. Socialization works to convince the colonized subject and the rest of the world that the lie of colonialism is natural and true—the colonist is *inherently* superior, and the colonized subject is *inherently* inferior.

Psychological/Spiritual Violence and The Colonized Subject

The creation of the colonized subject is behemoth task—it requires large-scale violence to come into fruition. The colonized subject is constructed through psychological/spiritual violence—in the form of socialization— that targets the native's spirit. More specifically, it manifests within the rhetoric of "thingification", pathologization, beastification, and acts of psychological manipulation (Césaire, 1972, p. 42). The volatility of this violence is directly linked to the fact that the colonist's dream of perpetuity becomes even more of a possibility if they can *actually* kill the native's spirit.

"Thingification"

The relationship between the colonizer and the colonized subject fundamentally requires psychological/spiritual violence and hence, from the very beginning, the colonist is working to kill the native's natural spirit. The colonist's worth is inherently tied to the colonized's lack of and this dynamic is at the heart of any interaction between the two (Fanon, 1961). In order for the colonizer to dominate, the colonized subject must be created because domination and submission do not exist within native society, only within the colonized world.

The only acceptable disposition of the colonized subject within the colonial world is unnatural to the native and so they, as a group, must be fabricated. Aimé Césaire (1972), colonial scholar, activist, as well as friend and mentor to Frantz Fanon (1961), writes eloquently,

> But let us speak about the colonized…I look around and wherever there are colonizers and colonized face to face, I see force, brutality, cruelty, sadism, conflict, … I spoke of contact. Between colonizer and colonized there is room for only forced labor, intimidation, pressure, the police, taxation, theft, rape, compulsory crops, contempt, mistrust, arrogance, self-complacency, swinishness, brainless elites, degraded masses. No human contact, but relations of domination and submission which turn the colonizing man into a classroom monitor, an army sergeant, a prison guard, a slave driver, and the indigenous man into an instrument of production. My turn to state an equation: colonization = 'thingification.' I hear the storm. They talk to me about progress, about 'achievements,' diseases cured, improved standards of living. I am talking about societies drained of their essence, cultures, trampled underfoot, institutions undermined, lands confiscated, religions smashed, magnificent artistic creations destroyed, extraordinary *possibilitie*s wiped out… (Césaire, 1972, pp. 42-43).

The colonizer is a violent force within the world of the colonized subject and this is all their relationship has space for—the colonized speaks the language of violence directly into the spirit of the native. These acts of violence strategically rip the native from their cultural and societal context and force them into the character of the colonized subject. As the native becomes the colonized subject, they begin to leave the realm of human and enter the realm of thing. This is "thingification," (Césaire, 1972). The only human that is recognized within the colonial context

is the colonist. The colonized's life and livelihood are not considered within the colonial context because objects are not living—the colonial context socializes the colonized subject to be a source of labor, nothing more and nothing less. While dimensions one through three are not of focus of this chapter, they too, play a role in the construction of the colonized subject. As the colony lives on, the colonial power matrix, spatial violence of the colonial world, and physical violence work together to socialize the colonized subject into buying into, and consequently validate, this labor-based worth system. The work of the colonial power matrix is especially salient here. The colonial power matrix as the norm to live by supports the idea that the colonized subject is be worthless because after all, they are not the colonist. All worth and value in the colonial context is embodied by and reserved for the colonist himself.

Pathologization

The colonist controls the fabrication of the colonized subject and within this, we again see that the violence of the colonist lacks limits. The colony must be secured, thereby, nothing is too far when it comes to demonizing the native and fabricating the colonized subject. The colonist truly does fabricate—they must falsify in order for the colonized subject to come together as a character. The colonist lies as the pathologization of the native targets native culture in order to *create* the inherent-ness of native inferiority[8]. Fanon (1961) writes,

> The colonist is not content with physically limiting the space of the colonized, i.e., with the help of his agents of law and order. As if to illustrate the totalitarian nature of the

[8]While the colonized subject is precisely of a fabrication of the colonizer's own volition, it is important to recognize that the colonial situation affords this fabrication power because it creates the space for the violent rhetoric about the native to cement itself into the colonial state. On top of this, the previously outlined dimensions of colonial violence resurface here as well. Fanon's words, again, make reference to the total. The interconnected violence of the colonial state that has been previously outlined circles back to do more work—the colonial power matrix affords the colonist to lie without external inquiry.

> colonial exploitation, the colonist turns the colonized into a kind of quintessence of evil. Colonized society is not merely portrayed as a society without values. The colonist is not content with stating that the colonized world has lost its values or worse never possessed any. The "native" is declared impervious to ethics, representing not only the absence of values but also the negation of values…In other words, absolute evil. A corrosive element, distorting everything which involves aesthetics or morals, an agent of malevolent powers, an unconscious and incurable instrument of blind forces…Values are, in fact, irreversibly poisoned and infected as soon as they come into contact with the colonized. The customs of the colonized, their traditions, their myths, especially their myths, are the very mark of indigence and innate depravity…((p. 6-7).

The colonist violently distorts native culture and by extension, the native themselves, by positioning them as antithetical to values. The colonized subject is value-less and this gives the colonist worth. The colonized subject is represented as the epitome of evil to erase any doubt that the colonial situation is all that could, should, and must be (Cesaire, 1972; Fanon, 1961). The colonial lie and the colonial order are securing itself—the colonial context then becomes, in the eyes of the colonist, a savior against the depravity of the colonized subject. This is pathologization at work. The colonial context to the colonist is not about forced imposition, but rather an endeavor that contains and protects the rest of society—the rest of the colony—from being infected by the immorality of the native. The colonized subject as a character is inherently wicked—the absolute antithesis of everything good—and thus, there is no other position for them than where they are: subjugated and dominated in the colonial state (Fanon, 1961).

Beastification

The beastification of the native is a natural extension of the pathologization and thingification of the native. The colonist operates within the good and evil dichotomy, but as always, in the spirit of security and in service of perpetuity, the colonist decides cementing this dichotomy into the colonial world is not enough. Yet again, the colonist's violence goes unchecked (Césaire, 1972)[9]. The native is further dehumanized—the colonized subject is forced out of the realm of human and pushed into the realm of animal. The colonized subject has already been thingified—an object that is only worth as much as their capacity to be exploited for labor—but the colonist, fixed in his sector, continues within the spiral of violence that he created. Erasing their being, their humanness is central to the security of the colonial state. Fanon (1961) writes,

> Sometimes this Manichaenism reaches its logical conclusion and dehumanizes the colonized subject. In plain talk, he is reduced to the state of an animal. And consequently, when the colonist speaks of the colonized, he uses zoological terms. Allusion is made to the slithery movements of the yellow race, the odors from the "native" quarters, to the hordes, the stink, the swarming, the seething, and the gesticulations. In his endeavors at description and finding the right word, the colonist refers constantly to the bestiary. (pg. 7)

The colonized subject is an animal—this is what the colonist says and so it must be. This is the logic of beastification—the colony is made of up of humans i.e. the colons and objects/ animals

[9] Again, we see that colonial violence is interconnected. The establishment of the colonial power matrix within the colonial state affords the colonist the authority to assert who is and is not human and act on said designation.

i.e. the colonized subject. The colonist is necessary for society to function because after all, it is only humans that can lead and rule. The beastification of the colonized subject also informs the manner in which the colonized is treated in the colonial world. The violence that is inflicted towards the colonized subject does not register—the colonist fundamentally believes and organizes an entire society around the idea that the native is not and will never be human. The colonized subject is not a person, and thus, violence is mobilized towards them without impunity.

Psychological Manipulation

Psychological manipulation speaks to the interaction between the physical violence of the military and police from Chapter 1 and the construction of the colonized subject. The acts of psychological manipulation that occur within the colony directly target the native's spirit. However, the effects of this manipulation are embodied—they inform how the colonized subject moves through the colonial world. Colonialism seeps into the body of the native through its construction of the colonized subject. Displays of violence double as displays of power—each display works to socialize the native into embodying a physical disposition of obedience. The nature of the colonial sector is meant to instill fear within the colonized subject through its frequent mobilizations of violence—the colonist needs the colonized subject to kneel and tremble in their presence (Césaire, 1972).

> In colonial regions, however, the proximity and frequent, direct intervention by the police and military ensure the colonized are kept under close scrutiny, and contained by rifle butts and napalm. We have seen how the government's agent uses a language of pure violence. The agent does not alleviate oppression or mask domination. He displays

> and demonstrates them with the clear conscience of the law enforcer, and brings violence into the homes and minds of the colonized subject. (Fanon, 1961, p. 4)

The role of military and police, as mentioned before, is to ensure the security of the colonist and the colony. Containing the colonized subject through frequent mobilizations of violence is part of this security work. The colonized subject must remain within their limits (determined by the colonizer)—to step outside of these limits warrants punishment. The native is constantly the target of colonial violence, and the presence of the police and military, with their agenda of domination hyper visible, takes a toll on the native's psyche and spirit. Repeated instances of violence slowly but surely make space for the colonized subject to take hold within the native—the colonist, in reality, brutalizes them into submission (Fanon, 1961).

The Colonized Subject

The spiritual violence of socialization—thingification, pathologization, beastification, and psychological manipulation—are meant to turn the native into the colonized subject. The native is not allowed to act and move for themselves—violence works on various levels to ensure the colonized subject remains within their limits. Any movement of the colonized subject and that is outside of the list of colonizer-approved behaviors instantly registers as a threat in the eyes of the colonial state. To say the colonist is obsessed with the security of the colonial sector is an understatement; every single component of the colonial sector needs to be reinforced because one weak point threatens the perpetuity of the colonial order—threatens their fabricated superiority. The hyper-focus on the colonized subject, too, affirms this. The native is not native to the colonial order and so, the colonist must expend all of their effort into the legitimizing the world they created. The colonizer backs the native into a corner, strips

them of their humanity and hurls violence at them from every direction. The violence will not stop until each and every native becomes the colonized subject, believes in the colonial lie and accepts that the colonial order is natural and supreme—that the world that existed before the arrival of the colonist is fundamentally defective and thus, the colonist must remain to ensure there is no return (Fanon, 1961).

Chapter 3: The Dialectical Nature of Colonial Violence and the Possibility of the Fundamental Jolt

> The symbols of society such as the police force, bugle calls in the barracks, military parades, and the flag flying aloft, serve not only as inhibitors but also as stimulants. They do not signify: "Stay where you are." But rather, "Get ready to do the right thing." And in fact, if ever the colonized subject begins to doze off or forget, the colonist's arrogance and preoccupation with testing the solidarity of the colonial system will remind him on so many occasions that the great showdown cannot be postponed indefinitely. This impulse to take the colonist's place maintains a constant muscular tonus. It is a known fact that under certain emotional circumstances an obstacle actually escalates action.
>
> Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*

The history of colonial construction quells any doubts that violence in the colonial world is a tool of security that is frequently mobilized in service of the colonist's deep longing for a perpetual colony. However, our understanding of colonial violence, begins to complicate itself at this very moment. Now, we make the shift from speaking about (the history of) colonial violence in relation to the colonist's security to talking about the material effects of colonial violence on the native's spirit in relation to their existence in the colonial state. This is where the fundamental jolt enters the conversation. However, before we make this shift, we must finish exploring the rationale behind conceptualizing the colonized subject as a character.

As previously written, the language of the colonized subject as a character is multifunctional, but it is necessary to hold space for the complexities that naturally exist alongside the construction of the colonized subject. While I have explored the first function of "character" separately, I have grouped the exploration of functions two and three together

because together, they help move us beyond talking about colonial violence in relation to the colonist's desire for a perpetual colony. On top of this interconnection, as you continue to read, it will become evident that functions two and three are central to the curation of the definition of the fundamental jolt. Holding space for parts of the native's spirit that remain intact post construction and the possibility of the fundamental jolt take shape against not only, the psychological/spiritual violence necessary to construct the colonized subject, but the other dimensions of colonial violence (Chapter 1), as well. For this reason, the dimensions of colonial violence have to be elucidated separately before we move forward. As previously written, to understand and view the colonized subject as a character also means to:

2. Hold space for parts of the native spirit that remain intact post construction—the native and the colonized subject are *not* the same person;
3. Recognize the nascent beginnings of the Fundamental Jolt in relation to the dialectical nature of colonial violence—the fundamental jolt has always existed as a possibility.

Evidently, as the title suggests, the possibility of the fundamental jolt is the focus of this chapter. However, this possibility exists in relation the conclusion contained within the second function.

The Colonized Subject is *Not* the Native

The language of character accurately captures an ideological tenet that is central to my exploration of the fundamental jolt: The colonized subject is *not* the native. Colonialism, as told from the point of the view of the colonist, would have you believe the native is no longer—post-construction of the colony, the colonist aspires for this to be true. The colonized subject is

a character constructed through psychological/spiritual violence targeted towards the native's psyche in an effort to force them into embodying the dispositions of submission and obedience endemic to the nature of the colonized subject. Holding this understanding, we can recognize that Fanon (1961) alludes to this conclusion—the native is *not* the colonized subject—within *The Wretched of the Earth* himself.

Within *The Wretched of the Earth*, Fanon (1961) uses the language of colonized subject, colonized, and native to speak of colonized peoples. While I am unaware if his usage of the terms follows a certain pattern or set of rules, in engaging with the Fundamental Jolt, the question of usage is an important one. Fanon (1961) does not answer this question, and so rather than simply moving forward, I look back to all dimensions of colonial violence outlined before. In doing so, we can recognize that Fanon (1961) indeed offers us a semblance of clarity within the construction of the colonized subject. He writes, "It is the colonist who fabricated and continues to fabricate the colonized subject." Fabrication, the word itself, is our clue. Inherent to the task of fabrication is lying—we see how the colonist lies and exaggerates both unprovoked and without fail. The colonized subject that the colonist speaks of is not the native—the disposition of the colonized subject is created through violence.

To speak of the colonized subject as a character holds the necessary space for any and all parts of the native spirit that remain intact post-construction of the colonized subject[10]. While Fanon's (1961) words lightly affirm this logic, this conclusion ultimately cements itself

[10] As Fanon (1961) writes, the colonizer "continues to fabricate," (p. 2). Technically speaking, this means that the construction of the colonized subject is never finished because this disposition must be maintained. Our understanding of colonial violence as a tool of security affirms this as well. Within Chapters 1 and 2, we can see that the colony is always in need of the security. The colonist and his agents incessantly mobilize violence beyond the period of construction because as we know, the colonist moves in service of perpetuity.

through the words of Aimé Césaire (1972). In an interview with Haitian poet and militant, René Depestre, Césaire (1972) talks of the impact of his surrealist learnings on his own life, says,

> Surrealism interested me to the extent that it was a liberating factor…And my thinking followed these lines: Well then, if I apply the surrealist approach to my particular situation, then I can summon up these unconscious forces. This, for me, was a call to Africa. I said to myself: it's true that superficially we are French, we bear the marks of French customs; we have been branded by Cartesian philosophy, by French rhetoric; but if we break with all that, if we plumb the depths, then what we will find is fundamentally black. (Cesaire, 1972, p. 83-84)

The construction of the colonized subject occurs through the psychological/spiritual violence of socialization and Césaires' (1972) words recognize that underneath each and every layer of socialization, the native is still there. Despite the forced internalization of the colonial order, norms, hierarchies, values and culture—despite the violent rhetoric and discourse espoused by the colonizer about the native and their culture—the native's spirit is still there. The colonizer's power has limits, and it is in the construction of colonized subject that we begin to see this[11].

As we move forward, this space—the space between the native's spirit/conscience and the character of the colonized subject—must not be forgotten as it will soon resurface.

The Possibility of the Fundamental Jolt

[11] It is important to state that the colonized subject as a character should not be interpreted to mean the native (and their land) was never colonized—the native is indeed a colonized person, but the colonized *subject* only comes into being through violence. The language of colonized person, to me, always carries space for the personhood and agency of said person. This is antithetical to the language of colonized subject—to be a subject, means to remove the agency of a person and place them in a zone of non-being (Sharpe, 2016).

Now that we have established the former conclusion, the groundwork has been laid for complexity to be introduced. Rather than delving headfirst into the possibility of the fundamental jolt, I want to offer a framework through which we can critically understand said possibility. The method through which we can understand everything that comes next can be found within Marx and Engels' (1967) philosophy of dialectical materialism.

The Laws of Dialectical Materialism

Dialectical materialism is a Marxist philosophy that exists at the intersection of history, science, and nature. Generally, it holds incredible significance, but dialectical materialism holds weight in this work because as a theory, it is a method through which we can understand the connection between material reality and consciousness. More specifically, in line with Marxist teachings, it examines this connection in relation to class, labor, capital, and class struggle/emancipation of the proletariat. Marxist dialectics hold that reality is not static, but rather an ongoing social process (Marx and Engels, 1967). This completely shifts our understanding of class struggle/emancipation. If reality is constantly changing, then *all* parts of the social world—proletariat included—are constantly developing because reality encapsulates the total. For this reason, the philosophy of dialectical materialism recognizes that as the social world/structure develops and moves, our relationship to the social world/structure changes, and we, ourselves, also develop (Marx and Engels, 1967). Nothing is static—our world is an amalgamation of developments/changes caused by the perpetual interaction between the material and consciousness. Holding this conclusion, we pivot to the concept that dialectical materialism's understanding of development bases itself in—the negation of negation.

The introduction of this concept is a critical point within this thesis— the negation of negation is central to not only understanding the possibility of the fundamental jolt, but the definition of the fundamental jolt itself. For this reason, rather than immediately applying the concept to our understanding of colonial violence, I will first briefly explain its role within Marxist conversations about dialectical materialism, class struggle, and proletarian revolution. Then, only after the logic of the concept has been made clear, I will bring back/extend the concept to where we are—colonial violence.

Negation of Negation. Broadly speaking, Negation of negation is refers to the manner in which structures produce their own opposites. In Volume 1 of Marx and Engels (1967) *Capital*, Marx (1967) writes explicitly of the dynamic that negation of negation plays within his analysis of class struggle and capitalism. While the following quotation is lengthy, Marx's words truly create the path through which we can put dialectical materialism in conversation with colonial violence. He writes,

> …as soon as the capitalist mode of production stands on its own feet, then the further socialisation of labour and further transformation of the land and other means of production into socially exploited and, therefore, common means of production, as well as the further expropriation of private proprietors, takes a new form. That which is now to be expropriated is no longer the labourer working for himself, but the capitalist exploiting many labourers. This expropriation is accomplished by the action of the immanent laws of capitalistic production itself, by the centralisation of capital. One capitalist always kills many. Hand in hand with this centralisation, or this expropriation of many capitalists by few, develop, on an ever-extending scale, the cooperative form of

the labour process, the conscious technical application of science, the methodical cultivation of the soil, the transformation of the instruments of labour into instruments of labour only usable in common, the economising of all means of production by their use as means of production of combined, socialised labour, the entanglement of all peoples in the net of the world market, and with this, the international character of the capitalistic regime. Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital, who usurp and monopolise all advantages of this process of transformation, grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; but with this too grows the revolt of the working class, a class always increasing in numbers, and disciplined, united, organised by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself. The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with, and under it. Centralisation of the means of production and socialisation of labour at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated.

The capitalist mode of appropriation, the result of the capitalist mode of production, produces capitalist private property. This is the first negation of individual private property, as founded on the labour of the proprietor. But capitalist production begets, with the inexorability of a law of Nature, its own negation. It is the negation of negation. This does not re-establish private property for the producer, but gives him individual property based on the acquisition of the capitalist era: *i.e*., on cooperation and the possession in common of the land and of the means of production.

> The transformation of scattered private property, arising from individual labour, into capitalist private property is, naturally, a process, incomparably more protracted, violent, and difficult, than the transformation of capitalistic private property, already practically resting on socialised production, into socialised property. In the former case, we had the expropriation of the mass of the people by a few usurpers; in the latter, we have the expropriation of a few usurpers by the mass of the people. (Marx and Engels, 1967)

Marx (1967), in these words, speaks of the expropriation of the expropriators by the working class, but rather than focusing on the specifics of how this occurs, we must shift our focus to the logic *behind* this expropriation. This logic, as Marx (1967) shows us, is the negation of the negation. Against the background of his words, the negation of negation in Marxist's dialectical materialism explains the fact that *naturally*, capitalism creates the contradictions and conditions for its own destruction. The nature of capitalist exploitation—the privatization of property and the hoarding of wealth by the ruling class—inherently creates contradictions in the everyday life of the working class. However, these contradictions do not simply just exist. If our world, by nature, is in a continual process of making and remaking, then these contradictions must *also* develop and remake into something new. In accordance with the dialectical laws of nature, these contradictions are the foundations for revolt—for the destruction of capitalism itself.

It must be understood that Marx's (1967) explanation is not based in proving that the expropriation of the expropriators is a societal necessity. On the contrary, it is based in the dialectical materialism as a law of nature. Through a historical analysis of the nature of

capitalism, Marx (1967) demonstrates that this expropriation begins before it actually does because capitalism inherently contains the contradictions that catalyze working class's revolt. The drive of the capitalist and the drive of the laborer inherently oppose each other. The innate existence of these contradictions in our constantly developing world means that naturally, these contradictions must, at one point or another, develop further. The proletarian revolution naturally emerges from the material conditions of capitalism (Marx and Engels, 1967).

The Dialectical Nature of Colonial Violence

Marx's understandings of the dialectical nature of capitalism can be extended to our understandings of colonialism, and more specifically, colonial violence. Dialectical materialism holds that revolution is historical in that it responds to the material needs/reality of the working class. Fanon (1961) in *The Wretched of the Earth*, makes the same claim of decolonization. Decolonization is a process of total transformation that must ground itself within history because it responds to the material conditions of colonialism and the material needs of the colonized (Fanon, 1961). In addition, Fanon (1961) positions decolonization—the obliteration of the colonial sector—as inevitable. Being that dialectical materialism is positioned as a law of nature, the extension of this logic is also connected through the common thread of inevitability/naturalness of revolution. Based on these two significant commonalities, I bring the laws of dialectical materialism to our conversation of colonial violence.

In accordance with the laws of dialectical materialism, colonialism inherently creates/contains the contradictions and conditions for its own destruction (Fanon (1961) already acknowledges this as well). However, being that our focus on colonialism within this thesis has centered itself around colonial violence, we must get more specific—now, we must

put colonial violence in conversation with the fundamental jolt. Up until this point, my focus has been on explicitly breaking down the history/nature/totality of colonialism through the lens of violence as a tool of security. Marxist's dialectics, however, forces us to push our understanding of colonial violence beyond what we have already established by providing the language to characterize the unquestionable link between the fundamental jolt and colonial violence: The logic of colonial violence naturally creates the contradictions and conditions for the fundamental jolt.

As we move forward, this conclusion must not be forgotten; the rest of this thesis takes shape against our ability to recognize the dialectical nature of colonial violence. As we move closer to defining fundamental jolt, it is clear that Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 lay the foundational work for the dialectical nature of colonial violence to be explored. The logic/nature of colonial violence must be understood before we can speak of dialectics; before we can unpack the manner in which colonial violence negates itself, we must know the primary/initial purpose of colonial violence. In line with dialectic understandings of development, the colonist's desire for perpetuity developed into colonial violence as a tool of security—this is what Chapters one and two tell us. To understand the manner in which colonial violence creates the contradictions that develop into the fundamental jolt, is the work that comes next. This brings us back to the possibility of the fundamental jolt.

The Possibility of the Fundamental Jolt

Circling back to the rationale behind language of the colonized subject as character, we are now equipped with the understandings to explore the third function. The language of character allows space for us to recognize the nascent beginnings of the fundamental jolt in

relation to the dialectical nature of colonial violence—the fundamental jolt has always existed as a possibility. As opposed to directly delving into the fundamental jolt as naturally emerging from the context of colonial violence, Marx's (1967) words referenced above, signal to us that possibility is where we must start. At the core of Marx's (1967) explanation dialectical laws of nature, is naturalness. The expropriation of the expropriators essentially begins before it actually happens—contradictions are innate to the nature of capitalism. This is true of the fundamental jolt as well. The fundamental jolt is underway before the actual moment itself occurs—the contradictions that exist as a result of colonial violence between the native and the colonizer are innate to the nature of colonialism. These contradictions *are* the possibility of the fundamental jolt[12].

Colonial violence, as we have established, works to secure. However, it does not work as simply as this. The colonizer cannot see the innerworkings of the native's conscience, and the constant deployments of violence affirm this. Had the colonizer been confident in the perpetuity of the colonial order, would violence continue to be mobilized towards the native ceaselessly? Regardless of the answer to that question, *The Wretched of the Earth* (Fanon, 1961) allows us to see beyond the character of the colonized subject—underneath, if you will—and into the depths of the native's spirit/conscience. Now that we are here, beyond colonist's gaze, armed with the laws of dialectical materialism, we can see that while colonial violence is mobilized to secure, there are contradictions that naturally emerge from the incessant interactions between the native and colonial violence.

[12] If we think of the possibility of the fundamental jolt as the contradictions that natural emerge from the interaction between colonial violence and the native, the dialectical nature of colonial violence and its connection to the fundamental jolt will be abundantly clear.

The Wretched of the Earth (Fanon, 1961) is rich in its documentation of the contradictions that naturally emerge from the context of colonialism. *The Wretched of the Earth* is a psychological analysis of the native, the contradictions that Fanon (1961) uplifts are written about as internal dialogue within native's spirit/conscience. Through a brief analysis of the native's inner thoughts, we are able to see the natural contradictions between the native, the colonial world, and the colonist's desire for perpetuity. The space that we have intentionally left with the language of character—the second function— resurfaces here. We are only able to see these contradictions because there is space between the native's spirit and the character of the colonized subject. The lack of contradictions would signal to us that there is no tension between the colonist's dream of the perpetual colony—the colonized subject would be the native, because it is only the colonized subject that submits into the colonial state. The natural presence of contradictions, however, signals to us, that the space between the native's spirit/conscience and the colonized subject *also* exists naturally. This space, in essence, is the space where the possibility of the fundamental jolt develops—by nature, there is space for contradiction to take hold.

Through Fanon's (1961) description of the inner thoughts of the native, the contradictions that exist between the native, the colonial world, and the the colonist's dream of a perpetual colony are apparent. To speak more tangibly, the colonist's dream of a perpetual colony looks like the ceaseless perpetuation of the colonial order and the native's eternal belief in the colonial lie. While the perpetual colony has yet to materialize, colonial violence is mobilized in an effort to carry the colonist's dream from the realm of possibility into the realm of reality. Violence is a tool through which the colonial order and the colonial lie are secured—

without their security, perpetuity is not possible. Still and all, the dialectical nature of colonial violence allows us to recognize that while colonial violence is mobilized to secure, it is doing other work in the depths of the native's conscience. Colonial violence, by its nature, creates contradictions that are a direct threat to the very drive and desire of the colonist. At various moments within *The Wretched of the Earth*, Fanon (1961) highlights the very pressing contradictions between the native and the colonial world. For example, Fanon (1961) writes,

> The gaze that the colonized subject casts at the colonist's sector is a look of lust, a look of envy. Dreams of possession. Every type of possession: of sitting at the colonist's table and sleeping in his bed, preferably with his wife. The colonized man is an envious man. The colonist is aware of this as he catches the furtive glance, and constantly on his guard, realizes bitterly that: 'They want to take our place." And it's true there is not one colonized subject who at least once a day does not dream of taking the place of the colonist. (pg. 5)

> Confronted with the colonial order the colonized is in a permanent state of tension. The colonist's world is a hostile world, a world which excludes yet at the same time incites envy. We have seen how the colonized always dreams of taking the colonist's place. Not of becoming a colonist, but of replacing him. This hostile, oppressive and aggressive world, bulldozing the colonized masses, represents not only the hell they would like to escape as quickly as possible but a paradise within arm's reach guarded by ferocious watchdogs. (p. 16)

> For a colonized people, the most essential value…is first and foremost the land: the land, which must provide…naturally, dignity. But this dignity, has nothing to do with 'human' dignity. The colonized subject has never heard of such an idea. All he has ever seen on his land, is that he can be arrested, beaten, starved with impunity; and no sermonizer on morals, no priest has ever stepped in to bear the blows in his place or share his bread. For the colonized, to be a moralist quite plainly means silencing the arrogance of the colonizer, breaking his spiral of violence, in a word, ejecting him outright from the picture. (p. 9)

Within each excerpt, the contradiction between the native, the colonial world, and the colonist's desire grows stronger. The native dreams of taking the colonist's place. The native casts lustful looks towards the colonist's possessions—the native wants what the colonist has. The violence of the colonial world creates tension within the native—the colonized world is one that which they desire to and dream of escaping. The dialectical nature of colonial violence is creating contradictions—not only do these contradictions exist, but they do not exist in singularity. Each and every one of the native's desires inherently contradict the driving force of the colonist and the colonist's violence. Not one of the native's desires exist in a world that allows the colonist's dream of a perpetual colony to materialize—the native desires to rid themselves of the colonist completely. By the laws of dialectical materialism, the presence of these contradictions is not arbitrary, nor can they be ignored. The existence of these contradictions is the natural development of the interaction between the material and the consciousness—the possibility of the fundamental jolt is result of the interaction between colonial violence and the native's conscience. The contradictions produced by the dialectical

nature of violence exist within the colonial world—they are a part of the material reality of colonialism—and by the law of dialectics, these contradictions must develop. The possibility of the fundamental jolt, by nature, will transform itself into something more than a series of contradictions.

Chapter 4: The Definition of the Fundamental Jolt

> In answer to the lie of the colonial situation, the colonized subject responds with a lie. Behavior toward fellow nationalists is open and honest, but strained and indecipherable toward the colonists. Truth is what hastens the dislocation of the colonial regime.
>
> Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*

The dialectical nature of colonial violence offers us the language to understand that while the colonist calls on violence to secure, on the back end, colonial violence is also doing the work of undoing. The question of "What precisely is undone?" is an important one, and in following the development of the possibility of the fundamental jolt—the contradictions within the previous chapter—we now are able to answer this question. Here, in Chapter 4, we now have everything we need to define the fundamental jolt.

The First Mention Revisited

> The colonized subject thus discover's that [their] life, [their] breathing and [their] heartbeats are the same as the colonist's. [They discover] that the skin of a colonist is not worth more than the "native's". In other words, [their] world receives a fundamental jolt. The colonized's revolutionary new assurance stems from this. If in fact, my life is worth as much as the colonist's, his look can no longer strike fear into me or nail me to the spot and his voice can no longer petrify me. I am no longer uneasy in his presence. In reality, to hell with him. Not only does presence no longer bother me, but I am already preparing to waylay him in such a way soon that he will have no other solution but to flee. (Fanon, 1961, p.10)

We find ourselves where this thesis began. Be that as it may, holding onto the explication of the various yet interconnected dimensions of colonial violence, the construction of the character of the colonized subject, and the dialectical nature of colonial violence that engenders the

possibility of the fundamental jolt, we are returning to this passage at a completely different vantage point. Armed with a gamut of new understandings the definition of the fundamental jolt, in line with the laws of dialectical materialism, unfolds itself naturally. The process through which the definition of the fundamental jolt is curated is twofold. Firstly, the definition builds itself up from Fanon's (1961) first mention on page 10 of *The Wretched of the Earth*. In analyzing the primary fundamental jolt passage, we can understand both the principal moments within the fundamental jolt and the gravity of the fundamental jolt in relation to colonialism. This creates the baseline definition of the fundamental jolt. Secondly, I will put this baseline definition in conversation with the contradictions between the desires of the native's conscience/spirit, the colonial world, and the colonist's dream of perpetuity to answer the question of "What precisely is undone?"

The Fundamental Jolt Through the Words of Fanon

The passage in which Frantz Fanon (1961) mentions the fundamental jolt is overflowing with descriptive language that allows us to create a baseline definition of the fundamental jolt. In the context of the first mention, the fundamental jolt is the moment in which the native reclaims their personhood and aligns themselves with their freedom—the destruction of the colonial world. The gravity of the fundamental jolt is not only found in the native's discoveries, but in the implication of these discoveries on the native's view of the colonizer as well. The fundamental jolt reveals the truth about the colonizer: the colonist is mortal.

The Native's Reclamation of Personhood and Self-Worth

The humanity of the native is positioned at the center of the fundamental jolt. In the first line, Fanon writes, "The colonized subject thus discover's that [their] life, [their] breathing

and [their] heartbeats are the same as the colonist's," (Fanon, 1961, p. 10). The psychological/spiritual violence that the colonizer deems necessary for the construction of the colonized subject resurfaces here. The colonized subject is first and foremost to socialized to be an object— a thing (Césaire, 1972). What does it mean for the native to recognize that they are living? What does it mean for the native to say that they breathe? That their heart beats? These questions may seem rhetorical but they hold substantial weight in the context of the colonial order. The colonized subject, by the logic of "thingification" is not living—they do not breathe, their heart does not beat. What we see in Fanon's words though is not only a recognition of life within the spirit and body of the native, but a shift in the way the native thinks of their life in relation to the colonist. The language of "discovers" is indicative of said shift, but the gravity of this shift comes from the actual discovery itself: The native first, reclaims their humanity by rejecting "thingification" and equating their life to that of the colonist. Fanon continues, "[They discover] that the skin of a colonist is not worth more than the "native's," (Fanon, 1961, p.10). The native goes further—the skin of the colonist is no longer afforded more worth than their own. They are actively rejecting pathologization. The native, in their spirit, recognizes that not only are not infectious and diseased by nature, but that their skin, is like that of the colonist—just skin.

The Colonizer as Mortal. The clarity that the fundamental jolt brings the native is about the colonizer as well. Based on what we know and understand about the colonial context, this only makes sense. The character of the colonized subject is constructed in direct opposition to the colonist; the colonizer is because the colonized subject is not. At the moment that the native calls into question their own worth, it is only logical that the colonist's worth gets called into

question as well. The first few lines of the fundamental jolt passage can be reread as assertions of the colonizer's mortality. The underside of the native's assertion of their personhood is a disassociation between the colonizer and the idea that they exist above the realm of human. What does it mean for the native to say the skin of the colonist is the same as their own? What are the implications of this against the background of the native's newly re-discovered humanity? The native, in their spirit, is beginning to internalize that the colonizer is not a superior being, but a living, breathing, human *too* (Fanon, 1961). The colonist is not superhuman—the colonist is not forever. The colonist can be killed. In one moment, the native's world is shaken—through a spiritual affirmation of their own personhood, the native discovers the truth about the colonizer as well. The gravity of one discovery intensifies the gravity of the other—the amalgamation of this weight creates the driving force behind the native's following words. The fundamental jolt is underway.

The Native's Revolutionary Assurance

> In other words, [their world] receives a fundamental jolt. The colonized's revolutionary new assurance stems from this. If, in fact, my life is worth as much as the colonist's, his look can no longer strike fear into me or nail me to the spot and his voice can no longer petrify me. I am no longer uneasy in his presence. In reality to hell with him. Not only does his presence no longer bother me, but I am already preparing to waylay him in such a way that soon he will have no other solution but to flee. (Fanon, 1961, p.10)q

The fundamental jolt instills the native with a newfound revolutionary assurance. Upon recognizing the truth of about themselves *and* the colonist, the native chooses to invest in themselves. In *Voices of Liberation*, Zeileg (2014) in a discussion about *Black Skin White Masks*

(Fanon, 1952) uplifts a passage in which Fanon(1952) speaks of a moment that essentially mirrors the fundamental jolt. The text says,

> Because the slave accepts servitude for fear of death and is unwilling to die for freedom, the master is tyrannical and violent without limit. The slave's oppression intensifies until he discovers that his oppressor can be killed, and this discovery shakes his social and psychological world. Fanon explains how this discovery for the slave bursts the omnipotence of the oppressor, who becomes demystified. The slave is then psychologically ejected from the self, and his self-confidence is restored. The fear of physical death is replaced with a desire for social and historical life, even if the result is physical death. The slave [realizes] that there are many kinds of death, and in choosing physical life, he sacrifices social life. When he decides that it is social life and freedom that are more important, this ushers in revolutionary struggles and transformation. (Fanon, 2014, p. 13)

Zeileg's (2014) words affirm my conceptualizations of the fundamental jolt. Fanon (2014) positions the realization of the colonist's mortality as the trigger for the monumental shift within the native. The colonist's mortality has both micro- and macrocosmic implications within the colonial world. On a micro scale, the colonist as mortal means that the colonist is not eternal. By that logic, if the colonist cannot be forever, then the colony is cannot be forever. The macrocosmic implications of the colonist's mortality are a direct challenge the colonial state. The colonist has been demystified and the native recognizes that in the face of the colonial order—in the face of the colonizer— they *do* have power. Servitude is not a condition for their existence within the world, but rather a disposition that serves the colonist and his

desires. The native's "desire for social and historical life" is at the heart of this revolutionary assurance (Fanon, 2014, p. 13). For the native, to commit to revolution means to commit to their freedom. Fanon (1961) writes,

> The arrival of the colonist signified syncretically the death of indigenous society, cultural lethargy, and petrification of the individual. For the colonized, life can only materialize from the rotting cadaver of the colonist. Such then is the term-for-term correspondence between the two arguments. (p. 50)

The native recognizes that the colony requires their death, and with their newly affirmed humanness, the native pledges to continuously choose life even if it means that they die.

The Fundamental Jolt and the Dialectics of Colonial Violence

In Chapter 3, we ended our conversation about the dialectical nature of colonial violence with the understanding that naturally, the possibility of the fundamental jolt—the contradictions between the native's desires and the colonist's desire for perpetuity—will develop into something more. Now that we have established a base-line definition of the fundamental jolt, we can put this definition in conversation with our knowledge of the dialectical nature of colonial violence. In doing so, our understanding of the fundamental jolt reaches a new level of understanding. The fundamental jolt, by nature, is the moment in which the contradictions between the native, the colonial world, and the colonist's desire for perpetuity resolve themselves. The discovery of the colonist's mortality shatters the very belief that colonial violence has sought to secure—the colony is not forever. The native's newfound desire for freedom and the colonist's desire for a perpetual colony, are more at odds than ever, however, the colonist's mortality changes everything. The space that naturally exists between

the native's spirit and the character of the colonized subject (Chapter 3) is much larger than before—at the core of the fundamental jolt is a rejection of the disposition of the colonized subject. The fundamental jolt thus, is also the moment in which the native untethers themselves from the colonized subject.

The Native Untethers From the Colonized Subject

The dialectical nature of colonial violence is incredibly useful in understanding the complexity of the fundamental jolt. In understanding the possibility of the fundamental jolt as the amalgamation of contradictions, we are able to recognize the connection between the contradictions within Chapter 3 and the fundamental jolt as we have defined it so far. In content, the native's desire's pre-fundamental jolt—in the "era" that the fundamental jolt is simply a possibility—are oddly reminiscent of the native's thoughts during the moment of the fundamental jolt. As colonial violence is being hurled at the native, they dream of a variety of things that inherently contradict the native's desire for perpetuity. It is only natural to assume—and the laws of dialectical materialism support this assumption—that the native's dreams of taking the colonist's place, of obliterating the colonist's sector, and of killing the colonist have continued to develop and grow, so much so, that we end up at the fundamental jolt. The exact timing of this moment remains in question; however, being that the scope of this thesis is focused on crafting a definition of the fundamental jolt, this is a question for later exploration. Regardless of the when, the thread between the discoveries of the fundamental jolt and the contradictions of the possibility of the fundamental jolt cannot be denied—the fundamental jolt does not begin out of nowhere.

In that same vein, the discoveries that the native comes to by way of the fundamental jolt, also, do not exist abstractly. Based on our in-depth understanding of violence as a tool of security within the colonial world and the interconnected dimensions of the colonial violence, the discoveries that the native makes are antithetical to key aspects of security within the colonial state—most importantly, the construction of the colonized subject as a character. Within the development of the base-line definition, I raised questions as a way to allow us to hold the true weight of the fundamental jolt in relation to colonialism. Holding both the content and gravity of the native's discoveries within the fundamental jolt with our understandings of the dialectical nature of colonial violence allows us to clearly see the fundamental jolt as the native's untethering from the character of the colonized subject. The psychological/spiritual violence inherent to the construction of the colonized subject is a grand security endeavor taken up by the colonizer to position the colonized subject as naturally (and by the colonist's logic, perpetually) inferior and themselves as naturally superior. The construction of the colonized subject fosters security for the colonist and the colony. Through the process of fabrication, the native is brutalized into becoming the colonized subject and believing the colonial lie—the colonial order is natural, supreme, and by this very logic, forever. However, in the moment of the fundamental jolt, the colonist's security work falters; the native reclaims their personhood and consciously rejects everything the colonizer has told them about themselves and the colonial world. The native resolves the tension between their desires/deepest knowing and what the colonist tells them about themselves. It is a moment of reclamation of life for the native, by the native and this is important. This is not the work of the colonized subject—the native's thoughts in that moment legitimately cannot exist within the

character of the colonized subject. The colonist constant mobilizations of colonial violence are meant to ensure this remains true. The only acceptable disposition for the native is that of the colonized subject— a character who is only allows to submit and obey. As the native comes to develop their revolutionary assurance through, the native rejects both of these dispositions— submission and obedience are inherently antithetical to the nature of the fundamental jolt. The native refuses to accept perpetual domination and oppression as the conditions for their existence within the colonial world. The colonist can be killed and the colony can be destroyed, and the native has come to know that they must do it. They want to do it. Now, the space between the native's spirit and the character of the colonized subject is far too large for the character of the colonized subject to hold. The native has untethered themselves from the colonized subject. The native has experienced the fundamental jolt.

Conclusion: Moving Forward With the Fundamental Jolt

The fundamental jolt sits on page ten of Frantz Fanon's (1961) *The Wretched of the Earth* begging to be explored. The necessity of this thesis exploration links itself to the significance of the fundamental jolt as a concept. By definition, as we have seen, the fundamental jolt is layered with complexities and as a result, the gravity of this moment is unquestionable. There are countless reasons I can offer as to why the fundamental jolt needed to be explored, but the most powerful justifications come from Fanon (1961) himself.

First and foremost, the fundamental jolt cannot be ignored in name. The fundamental jolt is called the *fundamental* jolt for a reason. The moment your eyes pass over the words, Fanon (1961) has already signaled to us that it is important. The fundamental jolt, in this way, is significant by nature. However, Frantz Fanon (1961) establishes further importance by positioning the fundamental jolt in relation to revolution (the native's revolutionary assurance). Given that *The Wretched of the Earth* is a psychological analysis of the colonized on the path to liberation, it is only fitting to critically interrogate moments that are of central importance to decolonization. On top of this, the fundamental jolt holds even more weight in the context of Frantz Fanon's (1961) proximity to the colonial situation in Algeria. While *The Wretched of the Earth* was written within the last months of his life, like the rest of his work, Fanon's (1961) understandings of colonialism are inextricably linked to the fact that he has lived in, worked in, and experienced colonial life. His lived experience as a psychiatrist working in a hospital in colonial Algeria ultimately shapes his work and adds weight to Fanon's (1961) words about colonialism. Having never lived in a colonial state, who I am to question Frantz Fanon (1961)

label of importance? Rather, I choose to lean into it and I urge the rest of Black studies to do so as well.

At the very beginning of this work, I uplifted one of the most important things about this concept: the fundamental jolt is not abstract. The weight of the fundamental jolt—the weight of this thesis exploration—increases yet again. The colony was real. The colonizer is real. The native is real. The fundamental jolt is real. Throughout the course of my engagement with the fundamental jolt, I have come to realize that I need more time to understand the fundamental jolt and reflect on the very weighty implications of the fundamental jolt. As I mentioned previously, I was compelled to explore the fundamental jolt because I felt, in the depths of my spirit, that I had experienced the fundamental jolt. Grief, however, deeply impairs my ability to fully recall the process of my own fundamental jolt. To break from this lack of clarity requires deep and critical reflection and my thesis is a part of this process. With this definition, I, along with each and every colonized person, can truly take the time to reckon with the gravity of this moment within our respective lives and eventually, beyond that.

Through the discernment of the dialectical nature of colonial violence, we have come to define the fundamental jolt as the moment at which the native permanently untethers themselves from the character of the colonized subject through the reclamation of their own personhood and the development of revolutionary assurance. This definition is just the beginning. The fundamental jolt can only grow from here on out.

Acknowledgements

To Lorin,

Thank you for seeing me within my work. Eternally grateful for you and the space that you created for me to grow alongside this thesis.

To Professor Johnson, Professor Mayorga, Professor Foy, Professor Nelson, Professor Professor Cantave, Professor Padilioni and Professor Padillioni,

I am so thankful for having had the opportunity to sit in your classrooms. Thank you for being the professors that you are—for creating a classroom that leaves space for me to show up as my full self.

To June Jordan and Black Studies more broadly,

Words are not enough to accurately capture the value that Black Studies, as an undiscipline, has brough to my life. I have found a home in those who live to tell me the truth.

To David and Paul,

I could not have done this without you both. Our scholarly journeys have been tied to each other since the very beginning and it is only fitting the way in which we have grown to hold each other up. Y'all are the first people I ever shared this with. Every thought, every development—you both have truly been by my side.

To my family,

Thank you for supporting me for these four years. I hope I make you all proud. I love you all.

To Frantz Fanon,

Thank you. Thank you for your work, your life, your genius. I think through you—my entire world is processed first, through *The Wretched of the Earth*. It is not just a book. It has helped me find value in myself and in my life. I truly hope my work has done right by you.

Works Cited

Fanon, F. (1961). *The Wretched of the Earth.* New York: Grove Press

Fanon, F. (2008). *Black Skin, White Masks.* New York: Grove Press.

Fanon, F. (2014). *Voices of Liberation.* Chicago: Haymarket Books.

Grosfoguel, R. (2011). Decolonizing Post-Colonial Studies and Paradigms of Political-Economy: Transmodernity, Decolonial Thinking, and Global Coloniality. *TRANSMODERNITY: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, 1-38.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1967). *Capital: A critique of political economy*. New York: International Publishers.