



**NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF MODERN LANGUAGES
FACULTY OF LANGUAGES**

DISSERTATION AND DEFENSE APPROVAL FORM

The undersigned certify that they have read the following thesis, examined the defense, are satisfied with the overall exam performance, and recommend the thesis to the Faculty of Languages for acceptance:

Thesis Title: A Critique of Neo-Imperial Interpellation in Tariq Ali's Writings

Submitted by: Hammad Mushtaq

Registration #: 397—PhD/ELit/Fall 11

English Literature
Discipline

Nighat Ahmed, PhD
Supervisor

Prof. Dr. Muhammad Safeer Awan
Dean Faculty of Languages

Maj. Gen. Zia Uddin Najam HI (M) (R)
Rector

24.12.2018

CANDIDATE DECLARATION FORM

I, Hammad Mushtaq,

Son of Mushtaq Ahmed

Registration # 397—PhD/ELit/Fall 11

Discipline English Literature

Candidate of **Doctor of Philosophy** at the National University of Modern Languages do hereby declare that the dissertation **A Critique of Neo-Imperial Interpellation in Tariq Ali's Writings** submitted by me in partial fulfilment of PhD degree, is my original work, and has not been submitted or published earlier. I also solemnly declare that it shall not, in future, be submitted by me for obtaining any other degree from this or any other university or institution.

I also understand that if evidence of plagiarism is found in my thesis/dissertation at any stage, even after the award of a degree, the work may be cancelled and the degree revoked.

Hammad Mushtaq
24 December 2018

ABSTRACT

Thesis Title: A Critique of Neo-Imperial Interpellation in Tariq Ali's Writings

This dissertation critiques the neo-imperial interpellation in fictional and non-fictional writings of British-Pakistani author Tariq Ali while focusing on the creation of hailed subjects interpellated by neo-imperial Western powers, particularly the United States of America. The study also examines Tariq Ali's standing in relation to the Marxist and Postcolonial theories using the lens of Althusserian notions of Interpellation, Ideology, and Ideological State Apparatuses. The study analyzed three fictional and six non-fictional works of the author. Significance of this study lies in the fact that Tariq Ali's fictional and non-fictional works were previously not analyzed using the postcolonial-Althusserian notions of interpellation and ideology. The Althusserian notion of interpellation and ideology in context of Marxist and Gramscian notions of ideology has provided new insights into postcolonial discourse and added significant knowledge to the realm of contemporary postcolonial literary theorization.

The study has utilized qualitative textual analysis technique in order to reach to the answers it raised in the beginning. Content analysis technique, taken from the domain of textual analysis was applied which helped in analyzing huge amounts of textual content present in the nine books used for the study. A categorizing matrix was prepared, using the model proposed by Polit and Beck (2004), based on the themes and concepts present in the books, in line with the theoretical framework of the study. The text was then coded and analyzed while the analysis led to the findings of the study.

The study concludes that Tariq Ali's nonfiction necessarily positions him as a postcolonial critic who sees the contemporary imperialism of the West as violent, exploitative and interpellative. He sees the neo-imperial design and hegemonic nature of the US Empire and its ideological and interpellative impact on the world as one of the most significant issues that need to be defied by the forces of dissent. A dire need of subverting the neo-liberal, anti-social, and neo-imperial approach of the Western thought and politics is prevalent in his non-fiction. He establishes himself as a Marxist-Socialist critic whose view of Ideology is more in line with Gramsci as he criticizes the hegemonic designs of the neo-imperial America and Europe while believing in the Gramscian view of existence of multiple ideologies sees/encourages all forms

of dissent against the neo-colonialism in the contemporary world. His works subvert the interpellated and hailed images of the Muslims and Islam in an anti-colonial, subversive strain of thought. In the fictional works of the *Islam Quintet*, Tariq Ali has successfully disrupted the neo-colonial allegorical representations and Eurocentric versions of history by appropriating the neo-imperial allegory and using it to respond to the allegories of hegemony. The *Islam Quintet* is an attempt to replace the Eurocentric, monolithic cultural traditions with cross cultural pluralism. The erased or (mis)represented history of the Muslims and Islam through colonial and neo-colonial allegory and palimpsest has been subverted by Ali through presentation of certain vital historical moments of the Islamic history where followers of different religions lived with peace and cultural harmony. He subverts the colonizing gaze of the West by presenting grandeur of the Islamic culture during various historical epochs when Islam was the epitome of learning and cultural advancement. He persistently reverses the binary of civilized/barbaric to reveal the historic truth that there was a time when the Muslims were learned, scholarly and civilized while the Christians were barbaric, illiterate, barbaric and extremists. Ali uses the subversive strategies of appropriation, orality and disruption of allegorical images. Ali's post-coloniality in the fiction resides in his presentation of the Islamic version of history. He repetitively disrupts the myths and allegories of colonial hegemony by recovering the re-inscribed identities and representations in the cultures of Jerusalem and Moorish Spain at carefully and meaningfully chosen points of time in history.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DISSERTATION AND DEFENSE APPROVAL FORM	ii
CANDIDATE DECLARATION FORM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
TABLE OF CONTANTS	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	x
DEDICATION	xi
CHAPTER1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Context and the Background	5
1.2. Statement of the Problem	8
1.3. Objectives of the Research	9
1.4. Research Questions	9
1.5. Rationale of the Study	10
1.6. Tariq Ali: A Brief Biography	12
1.7. Empire, Control, and Exploitation	14
1.8. Althusser, Interpellation and Human Subjectivity	17
1.9. Significance of the Study	22
1.10. Delimitation	22
1.11. Chapter Breakdown	24
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	26
2.1. Introduction	26
2.2. Review of Tariq Ali’s Fiction and Non-Fiction	26
2.2.1. Fiction: <i>The Islam Quintet</i> (1999-2010)	33
2.2.2. Non-Fiction	35
2.2.2.1. <i>The Duel: Pakistan on the Flight Path of American Power</i> (2008)	35
2.2.2.2. <i>The Obama Syndrome: Surrender at Home, War Abroad</i> (2010)	38
2.2.2.3. <i>The Extreme Centre: A Warning</i> (2015)	39
2.3. Theoretical Perspective	40

2.3.1. Post-colonialism	40
2.3.2. Marxism and Althusser	42
2.3.3. Debates on Ideology and Interpellation	45
2.3.3.1. Interpellation and Ideological State Apparatuses	49
2.3.3.2. Interpellation and Subject Formation	53
2.3.3.3. Althusser and Foucault: Ideological Crossroads	59
2.3.3.4. Interpellation and Discourse	61
2.3.3.5. Interpellation and the Hailed Subjects	64
2.4. Debates on Colonialism, Imperialism and Neo-Imperial Interpellation	67
2.4.1. Colonialism and Neo-Colonialism	67
2.4.2. Interpellative Practices and the Empire	71
2.4.3. ISA of Media and Interpellative Fear	85
2.4.4. Imperial Wars and Interpellative Practices	88
2.4.5. Emergence of Contemporary Neo-Imperialism	93
2.4.6. Empire's Interpellative Deceptions	99
2.4.7. Neo-Imperial Dimension of the Global Empire	106
2.5. Conclusion	112
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	114
3.1. Introduction	114
3.2. Conceptual Framework	114
3.3. Suggested Model of Textual Analysis	116
3.3.1. Categorization Matrix	117
CHAPTER 4: A CRITIQUE OF NEO-IMPERIAL INTERPELLATION IN <i>THE EXTREME CENTRE</i> (2015) AND <i>ROUGH MUSIC</i> (2005)	119
4.1. Introduction	119
4.2. The Capitalist Lie: Interpellation of the Proletarians in <i>The Extreme Centre</i>	120
4.2.1. Capitalism, Militarism, and Neo-Imperialism: Ideological Intersections	128
4.2.2. Neo-imperial Ideology and Interpellation in <i>The Extreme Centre</i>	136
4.2.3. Forces of Dissent: Subversion of Neo-Imperial Interpellation	138
4.3. "The Grammar of Deceit": Interpellation and ISA of Media in <i>Rough Music</i>	140
4.3.1. ISA of Media: Hiding Repression, Interpellating Masses	143

4.3.2. Interpellative Propaganda of the Neo-Liberal Discourse	148
4.3.3. Subversion of Interpellation: Efforts and Hurdles	151
4.3.4. Interpellative Binaries and the Way Forward	157
4.4. Conclusion	160
CHAPTER 5: SUBVERSION OF NEO-IMPERIAL INTERPELLATION IN TARIQ ALI'S FICTION	163
5.1. Introduction	163
5.2. <i>The Islam Quintet</i> and the Need to Subvert Neo-Imperial Interpellation	164
5.3. Subversion of Neo-Imperial Interpellation in <i>A Sultan in Palermo</i> (2005)	168
5.3.1. Al-Idrisi's Cartography: A Disruptive Tool against Interpellation	175
5.3.2. Interpellation, Interculturality and Hybrid Space	177
5.4. Subversion of Interpellation in <i>The Book of Saladin</i> (1998)	183
5.5. <i>Shadows of the Pomegranate Tree</i> (1992): A Subversive Text	191
5.6. Subversion of Interpellation through Appropriation	199
5.3. Conclusion	204
CHAPTER 6: "DOMINATION BY CONSENT": NEO-IMPERIAL INTERPELLATION AND HEGEMONY IN <i>THE OBAMA SYNDROME</i> (2010) AND <i>THE DUEL</i> (2008)	206
6.1. Introduction	206
6.2. <i>The Obama Syndrome</i> (2010): Interpellative Designs of the Empire	209
6.2.1. Interpellative Strategies of the Global Empire	211
6.2.2. Contemporary Neo-Imperial Collaborations	218
6.2.3. Compliant or Subversive? Ambivalence in Ali's Writing	222
6.2.5. Obama's Speeches: Interpellation through ISA of Politics	227
6.3. <i>The Duel</i> (2008): Interpellation and the Comprador Class	231
6.3.1. Interpellation and the Ideological State Apparatuses in <i>The Duel</i>	234
6.3.2. Subversion of the Interpellated Subjects in <i>The Duel</i>	243
6.3.4. A Neo-Imperial, Interpellated Nation	250
6.4. Conclusion	256
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION	258
7.1. Tariq Ali's Position on Capitalism, Colonialism, and Neo-Imperialism	258

7.1.1. Impact of Imperial and Neo-Imperial Designs	259
7.2. Ideology, Interpellation and Empire: Marxist Inclinations in Ali's Writings	261
7.2.1. Fusion of Orthodox and Un-Orthodox Marxism in Ali's Non-Fiction	261
7.3. Tariq Ali's Critique of the Neo-Imperial Interpellation	267
7.3.1. Fiction	268
7.3.2. Non-Fiction	272
7.4. Contradictions in Tariq Ali's Critique of Neo-Imperial Interpellation	275
Appendices	
Appendix-1	297

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful Allah Almighty who gave me the strength and ability to complete the strenuous task of writing a PhD thesis.

I would like to thank my thesis supervisor Dr Nighat Ahmed who guided me on every stage of the thesis. I appreciate all her contributions of time and ideas that made my PhD experience productive and stimulating. I also acknowledge the great contribution made by my external supervisor Dr Anshuman Mondal of Brunel University London who provided valuable guidance during my six months' stay at Brunel. I am thankful to the Higher Education Commission of Pakistan for providing funding, through the prestigious IRCIP Scholarship, for my stay and supervision at Brunel University London.

I would like to acknowledge the Department of English at National University of Modern Languages. My PhD experience benefitted greatly from the courses I took, the opportunities I had under the guidelines provided by my honourable teachers Dr Munaza Yaqub, Dr Shaheena Ayub Bhatti, Dr Rubina Kamran, and Dr Nighat Ahmed. I am also grateful to the Dean of Social Sciences Dr Muhammad Safeer Awan and PhD Coordinator Dr Jamil Asghar Jami for their constant support and guidance.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge friends and family who supported me during my time here. First and foremost, I would like to thank my dear parents for their constant prayers, love and support. I am indebted to my friends Munim Iqbal Rana and Khurshid Ahmad who were always there to help find and organize scholarly resources. I owe a debt of gratitude to Afsheen, my wife, for her unconditional support through more than six years of my PhD studies.

Hammad Mushtaq

DEDICATED

To my dear parents

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Context and the Background

Tariq Ali has emerged on the stage of world intelligentsia as a political activist who not only dismantles the imperial discourse of the US but also strongly opposes America's militarism, brutality, political hypocrisy, and abuse of power (Campbell). His anti-imperialist and anti-war position against the imperial United States and its imperial friends including the European Union and the NATO countries is much evident in his fictional and non-fictional works. Ali's non-fictional treatises focus on the policies of America and its partners before and after the bombing of World Trade Centre in 2001 and the aftermath of the 9/11 which resulted in the assault on Iraq and Afghanistan and their occupation, motivated by the craving of the United States to control and suppress other nations. Tariq Ali is necessarily socialist thinker whose work clearly express his leftist tendency of being an anti-capitalist, socialist and a lover of dissent (Campbell). Ali represents the periphery and very keenly disrupts the imperial discourse of the centre, thus providing space for the current research to apply the postcolonial strands of thought on his fictional and non-fictional writings. The fictional works authored by Tariq Ali, particularly *The Islam Quintet*, a series of five novels that deal with the history of the Muslims and Islam, are an effort to rewrite the history of a lost civilization which needs to be revised through fictional re-enactment to disrupt the image of Islam internalized by the West. The five novels of the *Islam Quintet* deal with very some very crucial moments of Islamic history when Christianity, Islam and Judaism existed in a very harmonious way. They also deal with times

when this harmony was critically threatened due to the decline of the Muslim power or their impending defeat. Through his fictional works, Tariq Ali endeavours to recover the image of the Muslims which has been distorted by the Western media, politics and education.

The concept of Interpellation was first presented by French Marxist philosopher Louis Althusser (1918-90) who derived it from the theories of ideology presented by Karl Marx (1818-83) and Antonio Gramsci (1891-1937). A broader comprehension of the term interpellation, thus, encompasses the evaluation of ideology in Althusserian as well as Marxist and Gramscian terms. Marx and Gramsci though did not use the term interpellation, they discussed a great deal of human subjectivity or subject formation while debating the notion of ideology and hegemony. Thus, the term interpellation in the current study is used to examine the way in which people are made to think about ideas; that could be the way in which Antonio Gramsci describes it, the way in which Louis Althusser describes it or the way in which Karl Marx describes it. The issue is discussed in detail in chapter two of the thesis.

After establishing Tariq Ali's postcolonial and Marxist standing through a critique of his writings, the study critiques neo-imperialist interpellation in his works using mainly the Althusserian theoretical lens, which implies inclusion of debates on the notion of ideology in Marxist and Gramscian theoretical perspective as well. The study also seeks to apprehend whether Gramscian notion of ideology is more applicable to Tariq Ali's writings or the Althusserian one. The Gramscian notion of thinking beyond a single ideology is emphasised by Macherey "To know what an ideology means, to express this meaning, we must therefore go beyond and outside ideology; we must attack it from the outside in an effort to give form to that which is formless." (Macherey 132). Antonio Gramsci was the person who first really critiqued the Orthodox Marxist concept of Ideology. Gramsci believed that the whole idea of

“false-consciousness” or negative ideology is not appropriate for understanding identity of an interpellated subject as if it was true, then how could Marx himself know if the only ideology is the ideology of the ruling elites; how could he manage to see-through if that was the case; How can one be of critical position to Ideology, if the dominant ideology is the only one? Gramsci believed there is no such thing as negative ideology; there are only different ideologies that correspond to different social groups, so there is the ideology of the bourgeoisie or the aristocracy, the ideology of the proletariat, the ideology of the peasantry and so on. Gramsci proposed the prospect of existence or co-existence of multiple ideologies in a society at one time; he believed that the bourgeoisie class cannot always enforce its ideological thinking on the middle or the proletariat classes in entirety. Instead, the bourgeoisie create hegemony and reproduce it by the continuing social action which encompasses the strain and conflict between the rulers and those who are subjugated. The consent of other classes is “secured by the diffusion and popularization of the world view of the ruling class” (Bates 352).

The ruling elites endeavour to create and maintain an “ideological unity” that should exist amongst the classes that they rule upon so that their consensus on the dynamics of the bourgeoisie ideology is obtained and maintained (Gramsci 328). Gramsci defines hegemony quite broadly as he asserts, “everything that directly or indirectly influences or could influence public opinion belongs to it” (1996: 53). The variance between hegemony and ideology rests in the idea that hegemony is a process, not a frame of thought and being a process, it remains veiled and implicit.

Hegemony is “a realized complex of experiences, relationships, and activities” (Williams 1977: 112). Althusser in his modified version of Ideology theory also responded to Gramsci

because Althusser proclaimed that Ideology was not the relationship of men to their condition of existence rather it is an imaginary relation of an individual to his/her condition of existence – this was where he sounded more like Gramsci. He meant to say that if Proletariat's relation to their condition of existence was *X*, the bourgeoisie's relation to the condition of existence would be *Y*, and so on.

Althusser, though, implicitly accepted that there were possibly many ideologies because the proletariat's relation to the condition of existence is not the same as the bourgeoisie's relation to the condition of existence and, from that formation, there must be more than one ideology. But the problem with Althusser is that later in his debate, he completely negated this notion and continued as if there was only one ideology which was a problem of execution rather than conceptualization. Althusser's theory of Ideology considerably diverges from orthodox Marxist theory; he discards the idea of considering ideology to be "false consciousness" as Althusser interprets it as an oversimplification of the theory. He proposes that ideology cannot be called just a false-representation of reality by which the bourgeoisie take advantage of the proletarian class since false-consciousness clearly means that there must be a "true-consciousness" meaning that the subject who are under influence of a particular ideology can somehow resist or outdo ideology. He suggests a subject cannot possibly transcend ideology as all consciousness is essentially shaped and carved within the confines of ideology (Strickland 49).

Therefore, Ideology is unavoidable and what we are able to understand or conceptualize is nothing but a form of "false consciousness" or a limited and, mostly, an incomplete comprehension of the reality. Althusser did not explain his stand point well when maintained that interpellation is when the police officer says "hey, you there!" and someone responds to

this hailing. Althusser portends that Ideology works in a complicated way when it “‘recruits’ subjects among the individuals (it recruits them all), or ‘transforms’ the individuals into subjects (it transforms them all) by that very process which I have called interpellation or hailing” (Althusser 174).

The power of ideology and its apparatuses converts an individual into an interpellated subject. The problem also lies in the fact that Althusser does not provide any examples of how other social classes might interpellate. He only gives example of how the dominant institutions interpellate: What about non-state apparatuses? Are there ways in which social groups like trade unions, working classes interpellate? He does not elaborate on that. Even though his initial formulation opens up a logical space in which there must be more than one ideology, the rest of the argument proceeds as if there is only one ideology i.e. ideology of the ruling elites that interpellate subjectivity through institutions like education, religion, politics, and media. Thus, Karl Marx’s conceptualization of ideology is something from which Gramsci dissents, he challenges that concept and he establishes a rival tradition while thinking about the Marxist theory of ideology. Gramsci’s notion of ideology is linked with the questions about Hegemony, the idea that there are dominant, resistant, residual and emergent ideologies, that each social group has its own ideology. This is how Gramsci pluralizes the whole concept of ideology. Gramscian theory of hegemony offers a re-interpretation of the Marxist theory of ideology while focusing on how the ruling elites or the bourgeoisie fabricate and sustain the consent of the rest of the social classes in a society governed by the capitalist way of life (Hall 1992). The notion of ideology refers to a flow of power that is focused and uni-dimensional, whereas the notion of hegemony suggests that there is an intrinsic conflict involved in the

creation of power, thus referring to the presence of several ideologies in a society at the same time.

Althusser, because he is responding to Gramsci, somewhat incorporates Gramscian notions in his conceptualization of ideology but his fundamental inspiration comes from the false-consciousness traditions established by Marx. In light of these debates, the present study also focuses on the questions: what does Tariq Ali think about how ideology interpellates individuals? Is he Althusserian, does he have Orthodox Marxist concept of Ideology of false-consciousness? Or does he have a Gramscian view in which different social groups have their own ideologies? And he is critiquing the ideology of neo-imperial bourgeoisie or the ideologies of other social classes that constantly fight against what Gramsci calls hegemony. Hegemony is not, thus, a stable structure of dominance that Marx posits; it's a very fragile thing, it constantly needs to be recapitulated, re-asserted, and re-worked because it's constantly being challenged. Thus, Tariq Ali, being a Leftist, can be more of a Gramscian than an Althusserian. So, the focal question of the present investigation is: how does Tariq Ali see the way in which people in a neo-imperial world are made to think in certain ways (interpellated)? Is he more of a Gramscian in so far as it is about Hegemony, or Is he more of an Althusserian, in so far as it is more about interpellation in the Althusserian sense that institutions and power structures influence and modify the subjectivity of the people, particularly the working class, through instilling in their minds an ideology that benefits them. The world system theory, much like Gramsci, suggests that there is not just one ideology but at least two and it would be very simplistic to suggest that there is just one ideology. The problem with Althusser is that he believes that Subjects are "always already subjects" or interpellated beings (Althusser 1972, 172). He effectively negates any possibility of a counter-ideology. Althusser's idea can be

made more flexible by seeing the difference between always already being *formed* by an ideology and always already being *interpellated* by an ideology. Althusser's interpellation means formation of the subject in which ideology is almost totally dominant. Gramsci would also believe that individuals are born and socialized by Ideology as a child, they are socialized into patriarchal Ideology, they are socialized into class Ideology and so on. In this sense, individuals are formed by ideology but their formation is not complete and they can still resist the dominant ideology and recover from their interpellative self. They are already formed before they become really aware of it but they can still resist it. Gramscian notion of ideology, in this regard seems more applicable to Tariq Ali's works for the obvious reason that he is a known social activist and a leftist and there is always space outside Ideology for another ideology, as hegemony can never be fully achieved. However, it needs to be investigated through the course of this research as to where does Tariq Ali stand; whether he is more inclined towards Gramsci or Althusser.

Tariq Ali being a British-Pakistani writer, residing in the United Kingdom, represents Pakistani diasporic discourse in the United Kingdom. He is an established Socialist and Leftist and, in that capacity, a staunch critic of the neo-liberal, capitalist West. Ali is an important critic of the US imperial and neo-colonial designs and the present research endeavours to extract new interpretations of his writings regarding the imperial designs of America in the globalizing world, influenced deeply by the American economic and foreign policies and its far-reaching culture, applying the concept of ideology, ideological state apparatuses, and interpellation. Being a hybrid person who originates from a former colony, a present neo-colony so to say, but resides in the heart of a former colonial power, Ali's own subjectivity needs to be explored to answer the questions like: Is he a postcolonial Pakistani critic, a third world intellectual, on

a mission to disrupt the neo-imperial designs of the west through subversion of interpellation of the neo-colonial subjects or represents the neo-colonial west, endorsing its interpellative strategies? Where does he stand in the colonizer/colonized binary? If he expects a social revolution, does he expect it in terms of Orthodox Marxist theory, Leninist-Marxist theory, or the world systems theory? And, in the Marxist tradition of thought, is he inclined more towards Althusser or Gramsci?

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The current research focuses on the creation of hailed subjects interpellated by imperial or neo-imperial powers and subversion of the interpellated image of the Muslims in Tariq Ali's fictional and non-fictional writings. Tariq Ali's notion of human subjectivity and its formation in, terms of ideological and interpellative practices, is critically evaluated in a quest to comprehend his standing as a postcolonial writer, applying the postcolonial-Althusserian notion of Ideology, Ideological State Apparatuses and Interpellation, while connecting it to the Gramscian notion of hegemony. The study also appraises Ali's response, in his fictional and non-fictional writings, to the approaches adopted by imperial or neo-imperial powers for interpellating people, living in the domains directly or indirectly ruled by them, to exploit them in favour of political, capitalist, or neoliberal gains. A postcolonial critique of Tariq Ali's fictional and non-fictional works is expected to engender fresh insights into the complexities of contemporary neo-imperialism and the possibility of exploring new subversive strategies to dismantle the interpellation caused by the dominant neo-imperial ideological discourse.

1.3. Objectives of the Research

The objectives of the research are:

1. To decipher the formation of interpellated subjectivity of the neo-colonized people and to critique neo-imperial interpellation in Tariq Ali's fictional and non-fictional writings.
2. To understand where Tariq Ali's writings stand in relation to the Marxist and Postcolonial theories.
3. To critique Ali's fictional and non-fictional works using the theoretical lens of Althusser's notions of Interpellation, Ideology, and Ideological State Apparatuses.
4. To figure out whether Tariq Ali, in his fictional and non-fictional works, is more bent towards Althusser or Gramsci in terms of interpellation.

1.4. Research Questions

The study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. How does Tariq Ali, in his fictional and non-fictional works, critiques the neo-imperial interpellation practices that fix the identity of the colonized subjects?
2. What does Ali's critique of neo-imperial interpellation, in his fictional and non-fictional works, apprise us about his own subjectivity?
3. In terms of neo-imperial interpellation, is Tariq Ali more inclined towards Althusser or Gramsci?
4. What is Tariq Ali's position, in his writings, on the development and role of global Capitalism and Colonialism, and the place of Neo-imperialism within that development?

1.5. Rationale of the Study

The United States, in the recent past, has emerged as an Empire with strong intentions of dominating other nations and peoples of the world. Many European countries, particularly the UK and other NATO allies have been so close to the US that they cannot be seen separate from the Empire. On their mission of exploitation and plunder through a hegemonic discourse, they share the attributes of the US Empire. The contemporary imperialism is necessary neo-colonial or neo-imperial in nature as the Empire does not physically subjugate the weaker nations; it controls them from a distance through various political, economic, social and cultural means such as ideology and interpellation. The prevalence of this neo-imperial discourse necessitates an anti-imperialist discourse, a struggle for decolonization, a counter-discursive strategy to subvert the imperial discourse that interpellates and subjugates its subjects. Anti-imperialist discourse involves the implementation of discursive strategies that subvert the neo-imperial discourse and offer a chance to the interpellated people to have freedom of choice and action. Subversion, however, has not received its due importance in the postcolonial discourse.

It is important to decipher Tariq Ali's postcolonial, Marxist standing as a third world intellectual and to see how third world intellectuals have a different relationship or a different ideology than the first world intellectuals. Writings of contemporary authors like Tariq Ali provide a fair chance of exploring subversion of the neo-colonial discourse. Both fictional and nonfictional works authored by Ali contain a refreshing aura of dissent and a potential sight of subversion. A postcolonial assessment of Ali's fictional and nonfictional writings is expected to enhance the understanding of the complexities of contemporary neo-imperialism and the possibility of exploring new subversive strategies to dismantle the interpellation caused by the dominant discourse and authority. The US empire together with its European allies employs

all the traditional tools, that were employed by the imperial powers of the past, to ensure its dominance including the use of force, economic exploitation and cultural subjugation. Understanding the working of contemporary Ideology through Ideological State Apparatuses and the interpellative processes utilized by the neo-imperial hegemon is vital to the understanding of the neo-imperial intents and the possibility of initiating subversive strategies for effective decolonization. It is important to ascertain Tariq Ali's standing in the realm of postcolonialism and to determine what he has to say on human subjectivity.

The origin of the idea of empire, linked with the United States, goes back to the very launch of the United States. It was a time when the settlers from Europe, after taking control of many parts of North America, methodically started grabbing lands from the native Americans and pushed them to the barren lands, to live a life of isolation marred by hunger and lack of resources. The image of the United States as an Empire has unambiguously been asserted by intellectuals around the world. These intellectuals claim that America has emerged as an Empire with strong intentions of dominating other nations and peoples around the Globe. The emergence of the US, together with its allies including NATO, as a new imperial power and the overwhelming burden of its hegemonic discourse has increased the need for a new form of anti-capitalist and anti-imperial discourse and inception of an effort for decolonization, with the aim of engendering counter-discursive approaches that subvert the interpellative imperial discourse which tends to control the world through neo-imperial means interpellation. The decolonization practice encompasses the employment of the discursive approaches that subvert the prevailing imperial discourse and provide a chance to the people, subjugated mentally by the empire, to enjoy more self-determination and take decisions in their national life through freedom of choice and action. Subversion is a form of intrinsic or extrinsic confrontation that

has the power to disrupt the hegemonic control of the colonizer or neo-colonizer. The significance of subversion as a tool for decolonization has not been fully exploited in the existing postcolonial discourse. Tariq Ali is a contemporary scholar who has been fulfilling the task of subverting the colonial and neo-colonial discourse by criticizing the actions of the Global Empire through his non-fictional and fictional works. The current research expects to generate fresh, meaningful and profound insights into how the empire, or its new form called neo-empire, establishes its hegemonic control over various geographic denominations of the world. The study also aims to provide insight into the possibility of employing new subversive approaches to undo the imperial interpellation generated by the dominant ideology that remains biased in favour of the Empire. The American Empire employs both the ideological and coercive tools that were employed by the empires of the past. These tools of dominance and control include the use of military might, economic exploitation, ideological discourse, and cultural control. A better comprehension of the practise of imperial and neo-imperial interpellation is vital to the understanding of various dimensions of the power politics of the Empire; it is also important realization of the significance of subversive strategies that can be initiated for a successful installation of the decolonization practices.

1.6. Tariq Ali: A Brief Biography

Tariq Ali can be called a post-colonial intellectual from the Third World living in and confronting the First World by revealing evil faces of the Western ruling elites through his fictional and non-fictional writings (Campbell). A Leftist and Socialist in outlook, Ali's stance is anti-capitalist and anti-colonial when he critiques the Imperial designs of the United States and its allies, especially the United Kingdom. He reveals the real face of the Empire hidden behind the notions of democracy, freedom, enlightenment, civilization and humanism. Tariq

Ali has a good grip on history and development of the empire and its various dynamics which help him get to the roots of the problems faced by the mankind, especially the Muslims of the world. Tariq Ali's birthplace is Lahore where he was born in 1943, a few years before the birth of Pakistan. His family history provides important information about the philosophical bent of mind of the great scholar and explain how he bent towards Marxist, socialist ideology and attracted towards revolutionary idealism (Procter). His father, Mazhar Ali, was a journalist and son-in-law of the then leader of the Unionist Party Sikandar Hayat Khan. Mr. Khan was awarded the title of Sir by the colonist Britain and he was not in favour of making of Pakistan. Ali's parents were atheists and believed in communist ideology; he too got deep inspiration from his parents and became a communist and an atheist (Procter). This family background and his early inspirations have a far-reaching impact on his writings, whether fictional or non-fictional. Ali's political career began when as a budding youth, he actively participated in opposition of the military dictatorship in Pakistan and a close relative working in the military intelligence warned him of dire consequences of this opposition and the potential of being interrogated by the Army for his communist and anti-dictatorship activities. Ali's parents, considering it a serious threat, sent him to the United Kingdom for studies where he got admission in Oxford's Exeter College, majoring in Economics, Philosophy and Politics. During his stay at Exeter, he also presided over the Oxford Union of students in 1965 and in this capacity, he met Malcolm X, the greatest inspiration of his life. During the Vietnam war, Ali actively participated in anti-war debates and demonstration which introduced him to the public of England. Ali also visited Latin American countries, witnessed the communist struggle there and became associated with various Left-Wing groups (Campbell).

Tariq Ali's writings provide a critique of the imperial endeavours of America and its relationship with Pakistan. He is a staunch critic of the imperial designs of the United States around the globe and provides a counter argument for the invasions, occupation, and neo-imperial influence by the United States and its Western allies on mostly Muslim majority states of the Middle East and Asia. He is very sceptic about the intentions of the United States in the so-called war on terror which was imposed on the countries like Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan after the 9/11. In his fictional writings, particularly the *Islam Quintet*, he tries to subvert the images of the Muslim world carved by the West that interpellates Muslims as uncivilized, uneducated, savage terrorists who are liable to be murdered and plundered (Campbell; Procter). Ali reveals various moments of the history of the Muslim world when Muslims were the epitome of scientific progress, civilization, enlightenment and advancement for the whole world while the West was far behind them in terms of scientific progress and civilization. Ali struggles to revive the forgotten history for the knowledge of the Western public to disillusion them from the deceptive images of the Muslims and Islam provided by the ruling elites to justify war, plundering, torture and murders (Procter). He exposes the ways the imperial mind-set influences the subjectivity of the people around the globe by providing a deceptive paradigm. He exposes the ideological tools such as the media and politics that are used by the ruling elites in the Western world to provide a one-sided falsified view of their actions. Human subjectivity in this regard is of utmost important as study of subjectivity exposes various ways and means that are used to influence human thoughts, often in a seamless manner.

1.7. Empire, Control, and Exploitation

Lord Acton's (1887) proverbial saying "power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely" is applicable to individuals as well as organized social, political or governmental

bodies ruled by individuals having power over others. Human history reveals that whenever nations attain a position of power they use their power in a fashion that can be called corrupt or unjust. Powerful countries not only use their power against other nations but also against their own people. They subjugate other countries in an imperial fashion and use fair or unfair means to maintain their hegemony while at the same time they carve the subjectivity of their own countrymen through various propaganda tools like ideological state apparatuses of media, education, and religion to convince their own people that their adventures abroad and their policies at home are in the broader interest of everyone. They lie to their own people and the people of the countries they occupy in order to justify their violent and unjust actions that help them maintain their control over the resources of other nations.

In the contemporary world, mental slavery has emerged as a new form of slavery where the subjects are mostly not aware of their mental subjugation due to seamless ideological inflows of ideas that corrupt their minds in favour of the ruling elites (Cox; Haag; Hardt and Negri). The colonizers in the past and the neo-colonizers in the contemporary world have evolved their tactics of control and occupation and now they are able to control other nations even without geographical occupation; they have learnt to control minds and bodies either through supporting a comprador class or through neo-liberal economic tactics such as consumerism. Machiavellian philosophy is in the heart of the contemporary imperial agenda of controlling weaker nations for exploitation of their resources. They use metanarratives like humanism, liberty, equality, civilization and freedom to deceive people in their own countries and abroad while in reality under the guise of these metanarratives, these ideological paradigms, they loot, murder, torture and exploit weaker nations taking plea of fighting against terrorism or any other assumed actors that supposedly pose threat to the West (Hardt and Negri). Wearing masks of

humanitarian liberators, they shamelessly murder people quite indiscriminately and if, somehow, sometime later they are made to realize that their imperial adventures that have cost millions of lives were based on false assumptions, they simply apologize for their acts at a time when apology cannot bring back those millions of people that they kill or destroy.

The concept of Empire apparently sounds ancient but in its core the concept has not changed considerably through the pages of human history. Empires, much like the ancient empires of Rome and Persia, still exist and exert their power in the same way these ancient empires did. Despite a simulation of civilization in the West, powerful first world countries remain barbaric when it comes to establishing their hegemonic control over weaker nations. The Western civilization has made advancement not just in the arena of science and social life but also in the fields of crime and exploitation (Haag; Hardt and Negri). Ancient empires used to attack and exploit weaker nations openly while the contemporary empires do the same in stealth mode i.e. in guise of the sugar-coated notions of freedom, democracy, liberty, free trade and civilization. The ideological views, biased in favour of the ruling elites of the West, are spread through their client media to present a one-sided view of the reality, suppressing the voices that are raised in favour of the imperial barbarism, war, violence, torture and injustice (Hodges).

Though most European countries have an imperial outlook when it comes to exploitation of weaker nations, the United States appeared on the world stage as the greatest empire after the World Wars and more importantly after the Cold War period when it found itself to be the sole super power in the world. The destruction of the World Trade Centre, whether we agree with the conspiracy theorists or not, provided the greatest ever plea to the United States to fulfil its imperial goals of subjugating other nations, controlling their resources and exploiting them in favour of its expansion and progress (Hodges; Joya). The United States and its imperial

manoeuvres have affected the whole world while the most diverse impact is received by the Muslim world. Muslims are stereotyped, misrepresented and labelled as fanatics, fundamentalists, terrorists and barbarians who are liable to be plundered and murdered without remorse. The Imperial United States does it very systematically by launching full scale political, economic and military campaigns against the countries where they either install terrorists themselves or just accuse these countries for harbouring the terrorists (Hoge and Rose). Countries like Iraq and Afghanistan, Libya and Syria are attacked, looted and destroyed first and then a comprador ruling elite is imposed on them for continuation of neo-imperial rule in these countries. Other countries like Pakistan and Egypt are controlled through neo-colonial means. All the imperial campaigns are ideologically driven as the ideology of the empire is propagated through the client media machines that help the Empire in interpellating the Western publics so that they do not resist through anti-war campaigns (Johnson, 2000, 2004). This is how the one-sided, biased view point of the Empire is spread around the world as if that is the only paradigm that exists or that can benefit the globe. The counter view of the subjugated, suppressed people is something that is not given coverage in the media or politics, as if those millions of people whose habitats are destroyed, whose countries are plundered, do not exist (Kamran).

1.8. Althusser, Interpellation and Human Subjectivity

Subjectivity is a complex phenomenon which cannot be fully understood though some dimensions of subjectivity that have some kind of objective manifestation or means of expression can be revealed and understood while some other dimensions can be studied through the application of social and psychological theories. Even individuals cannot understand their own subjectivity as it is very difficult to reckon what is their own and what is

coming in from other sources (Weedon). Their opinions, emotions and perceptions that they think are manifestation of their subjectivity may not be their own as they take a great deal of inspiration from the society, culture, environment, parents, education and many other sources that influence their subjectivity or understanding of their selves and their world, in a variety of ways. There are certain organized ways of influencing, forming, and reshaping human subjectivity that are used to attain specific goals. The processes of forming and influencing human subjectivity are varied and multifarious; one such process is called interpellation which was postulated by the French Marxist-structuralist Luis Althusser (Weedon).

We can understand the term subjectivity through its antithesis namely objectivity. The objective view of things refers to the view point that relates to the outer world, looking at things as they are while a subjective view would also look at the world and its various phenomena but through the lens of an ideology, a belief, a perspective or an emotion; the inner human self is at work in subjective working of thought (Solomon). The impartial, scientific, investigative, or statistical processes that are void of emotions or uninfluenced by any belief system lead to objectivity while the workings of human mind that involve personal opinions, social and cultural concepts, religious or political beliefs, involves subjectivity. Subjective and objective worlds exist simultaneously, though in separate streams. The objective reality is governed by the laws of nature or physics that cannot be changed or controlled by human action in most cases; life and death, youth and age, present and past cannot be altered and a time once gone cannot be brought back. The subjective reality, however, depends on human imagination and fantasy, it can create a world of its own which runs quite contrary to the objective reality, one can grow old and become young again, one can oscillate between youth and age in a friction of seconds and one can create worlds of fantasy, sci-fi, and fairy tales; there are no boundaries

in the subjective reality. It is the world of ideals and utopias where nothing is impossible, where evil can become good and good evil (Solomon).

Althusser posits that individuals and even groups of people are interpellated through various ideological state apparatuses like media, education, religion and politics. Althusser explains the process of interpellation through a simple example of a policeman who hails an individual by yelling at him 'hey you there!' but there are many individuals in that direction and even an individual who is not hailed looks back, supposing that he is hailed. The instance of hailing makes that person conscious as he supposes that perhaps he has done something wrong for which he is being hailed. The example shows how a simple act of yelling by a policeman can influence human subjectivity. Interpellation, thus, even in its simplest form can influence human subjectivity both at individual and collective levels as many people from the crowd would turn back thinking that they are being yelled at. The reason why many people would turn back thinking that they are being yelled at is that everyone knows that the policeman is in a position of authority, given to him by law and he can punish them if they have done something wrong. This consciousness about the objective reality influences their subjectivity to some extent. When we take this phenomenon to a bigger level, the notion of ideology sets in and invokes Althusser to consider, further elaborate and problematize the Marxist notion of ideology (Weedon).

Karl Marx was one of the greatest influences on Althusserian thought and philosophy. Marx saw society on the basis of class structure and divided society into the upper, middle and lower classes while postulating that there is always a struggle among these classes to gain control of other classes or to get rid of the control of another classes. In the class structure the upper class controls the rest of the classes by controlling the resources, the middleclass rests in the middle

which willingly or unwillingly supports the upper class in maintaining its control and struggle to maintain its own control over the lower class. The classes exist in a society that is controlled by a state, having objective, physical power to control the people living in its geographical boundaries. The state asserts and executes its power through certain means that are denoted by Althusser as the State apparatuses that are further divided into Repressive and Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs and RSAs). RSAs exert power through coercive means to discipline, interpellate or punish the subjects of a state. The coercive means include State controlled institutions such as the Army, Judicial System, Police, Prison houses, Civil Administration and other Government run institutions. RSAs thus refer to disciplining the subjects in an objective way though subjectivity of the individuals is also influenced by these apparatuses. ISAs on the other hand refer to the indirect, social, psychological and more intricate means of control that are infused into individual minds or minds of the masses through ideological means (Weedon). The ideology, i.e. the world-view of the elite class in a society, is instilled in the minds of the subjects through institutions like politics, media, education, and religion. Ideology thus interpellates the subjects and by influencing their subjectivity makes them recognize their identity as defined by the elite class.

The current research has taken up the Ideological State Apparatuses to study how the powerful nations, acting like a state, influence and interpellate the publics of their own countries or the publics of the weaker countries they want to occupy through physical or mental control. The ISA of media, particularly, is frequently used to hail and interpellate certain groups of people that challenge the power and authority of the imperialist powers or pose a threat to their economic prosperity (Wolf, 2004). The ISAs are so assertively used by the elites of the world that their ideology becomes a hegemonic common-sense for the masses and they start

taking it as reality or the only version of truth that exists. There are certain moments in history when the weaker nations decide to resist the dominant ideology in order to come out of the mental subjugation but at such moments the imperial elites of the Globe take them back to their previous position of compliance through the means of repression such as imposition of economic sanctions or an all-out war which ends up in change of the non-compliant regime and installation of a comprador class (Wolf, 2004). The elites of the world, particularly, the European and American ruling elites always struggle to maintain their hegemony and control over the nations having rich resources and weak rulers, by eliminating the potential threats, no matter what it takes to do that.

Interpellation thus is not just a phenomenon at state level, it works equally well on international or global level. The world, like a state, can be visualised as having a class system like a society of a country. There are upper class bourgeoisie or the First World countries, middle class or the Second World countries, and the lower class or the Third World countries (Goss). The First World countries or the imperial nations impose their ideology both through repressive and ideological means; the Third World countries on the other hand have to work hard like the proletarians and get exploited under the repressive structure of capitalism. The imperial nations of Europe in alliance with the United States exert their power to manipulate minds of their publics and the publics of the world through interpellative means and maintain their hegemony using their economic and military might. They either colonize them or subjugate them through the neo-colonial means of controlling from a distance (Cox; Goss). The people of the neo-colonized countries, despite having rich resources in their countries, suffer from poverty, lack of resources and hunger as the wealth of their countries remains in

the hands of a few elitist individuals who surrender their will in front of the neo-colonial powers in return of the liberty to exploit their own people (Haag; Hodges).

1.9. Significance of the Study

The concept of interpellation proposed by Luis Althusser in context of Marxist and Gramscian notions of Ideology, provides new insight into postcolonial discourse. Despite being a vital and significant issue, the concept of interpellation has not received its due attention in the realm of contemporary postcolonial literary theorization. Theorists like Said, Fanon and Bhabha have discussed phenomena like representation, opposition, revolt and subversion yet the idea of interpellation, contextualized through the notions of Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses, has not been critically analysed to its full potential. The demand for recovering the true patterns of identity and dismantling the imperial representation of the colonized/neo-colonized people has been in the core of the decolonization project. Subversion as a postcolonial agency invokes opposition against various forms of oppressions and the (mis)use of power. Tariq Ali's writings have not been analysed from the postcolonial point of view as yet; thus, the application of postcolonial concepts such as Althusser's notions of interpellation and ideology and their neo-imperial implications will provide new dimensions to the interpretation of his fictional and non-fictional works.

1.10. Delimitation

I have analysed Tariq Ali's writings while delimiting my research to the study of three fictional and four non-fictional works. The three fictional works have been taken from the series of five novels known as *The Islam Quintet*. The non-fictional works are more in number due to two reasons. Firstly, some of these works are very brief i.e. below 200 pages (such as *Rough Music*); secondly, some works contain, at times, a long narration of historical events

that are either not relevant to this research or they contain lengthy details that need not to be discussed. The rationale behind the selection of three fictional works was that all the novels of *The Islam Quintet* series more or less offer an opportunity for a postcolonial critique since the author in these works endeavours to revive some vital, politically charged moments from the pages of the Islamic history with an objective to subvert the stereotypical image of Islam and the Muslims prevalent in the West. Thus, a sample of three novels out of five was representative enough to establish Tariq Ali's position as a postcolonial writer, tending to subvert neo-imperial interpellation.

Fiction

1. *Shadows of the Pomegranate Tree* (1992) – *Islam Quintet 1*
2. *The Book of Saladin* (1998) – *Islam Quintet 2*
3. *A Sultan in Palermo* (2005) – *Islam Quintet 4*

Non-fiction

1. *Rough Music* (2005)
2. *The Duel: Pakistan on the Flight Path of American Power* (2008)
3. *The Obama Syndrome* (2010)
4. *The Extreme Centre: A Warning* (2015)

The non-fictional works were much greater in number and had a variety of subject areas. It was, therefore, necessary to analyse more works to make the sample more representative. Apart from the thematic consideration, the non-fictional works are either very short or they contain

too much historical details that go beyond the scope of my research; certain political or historical details that occurred repeatedly in different texts, had to be ignored. Overall, most of the non-fictional works I have selected have themes that relate to my research questions. Apart from these six non-fictional works, some other works have also been discussed in my thesis wherever needed.

1.11. Chapter Breakdown

1. **Introduction:** This chapter introduces the topic of my thesis and puts it in context by discussing the background of the topic and establishing the problem statement. Apart from describing the significance of the study, the chapter also contains the objectives, the research questions and the delimitation of the study.
2. **Review of Related Literature:** The chapter reviews literature related to Tariq's Ali's writings and the theoretical perspective: postcolonialism and neo-colonialism, Marxism and Althusserian notions of ISAs and interpellation, debates on ideology, dynamics of subjectivity and the historical context of the study.
3. **Research Methodology:** The chapter delineates the methodological premise of the study and discusses the conceptual framework. Being a literary study, suggested model of textual analysis has also been discussed in this chapter. The content analysis technique used by the researcher is explained and the Thematic Categorization Matrix created and used for the research has been explained in this chapter. The Matrix is attached as Appendix-1, in the end of the thesis.
4. **A Critique of Neo-Imperial Interpellation in the *Extreme Centre* (2015) and *Rough Music* (2002):** In order to establish the post-coloniality of Tariq Ali together with his critique of the neo-imperial interpellation and neo-liberal designs of the

western ruling elites, a thorough analysis of Tariq Ali's two important non-fictional works has been carried out in this chapter.

5. **Subversion of Neo-Imperial Interpellation in Tariq Ali's Fiction:** Chapter five analyses three fictional works written by Tariq Ali in light of the post-colonial theory and more specifically the Althusserian notions of ideology and interpellation. The post-colonial notions of Allegory, palimpsest and appropriation have been explored to decipher Tariq Ali's subversive techniques that he utilizes to disrupt interpellation and recover the image of Islam and Muslims.
6. **“Domination by Consent”: Neo-Imperial Interpellation and Hegemony in *The Obama Syndrome: Surrender at Home, War Abroad* (2010) and *The Duel* (2008):** The chapter focuses on the construction of the interpellated neo-colonial subjectivity in two highly significant non-fictional works written by Tariq Ali. The Althusserian notion ideology and Gramscian notion of hegemony are put together to problematize the notion of interpellation in Ali's works.
7. **Conclusion:** The last chapter concludes the study by summing up the findings of the previous chapters and providing a synthesised view of the study.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

The chapter reviews literature related to Tariq's Ali's writings and the theoretical perspective: postcolonialism and neo-colonialism, Marxism and Althusserian notions of ISAs and interpellation, debates on ideology, dynamics of subjectivity. The third part of the chapter deals with the historical context of the study by discussing the contemporary studies that focus on the neo-imperial manoeuvres of the Western world including Europe and America.

2.2. Review of Tariq Ali's Fiction and Non-Fictions

Tariq Ali, writer, activist, journalist, and a filmmaker, was born in Lahore in 1943. His parents were members of the Communist party which definitely had a deep influence on his thoughts and personality. During early 1960s, while he was studying at a university in Lahore, he led students in protests against the dictatorship of General Ayub Khan and as a consequence he had to leave the country and settle in the United Kingdom (Karbiener 12). The shift of country provided him the opportunity of studying philosophy and politics in Exeter College, Oxford. At Exeter, he participated actively in left-wing student politics and participated in students' protests against the US led Vietnam War. He also excelled as a great debater being president of the Oxford Union debating society and earned fame through television discussions and debates. Ali had clear socialist and leftist tendencies in the outset of his writing career. While in Oxford, he wrote relentlessly in favour of anti-war and socialist causes, became editor

of a British magazine *Town*; after his graduation, as a full-time activist, he led the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign and the International Marxist Group (a group that was merged into the Labour Party later in 1981 (Karbiener 12)). Tariq Ali conceptualizes the United States as a Global Empire that, together with its allies, has established hegemony around the globe, which goes unchallenged. Ali is critical about the militarism of the US Empire and considers it unnecessary adventurism and sees his only hope in the socialist movements of South America and a possibility of a change within the United States.

The United States is generally recognized in the contemporary world as an imperial power that has challenged the sovereignty of many nation-states and has initiated a new form of dominance which operates both with and without occupancy of space or disruption of borders. Hardt and Negri (2000) assert that we live under the dominance of the US imperial power and the idea of nation-states and borders is losing its relevance. The shift in American foreign policy dynamics is rooted in the collapse of the former Soviet Union and Bill Clinton's foreign policy which has made the US emerge as a unilateral force and a new imperialist power (Mann). The new imperialism prefers to impose an indirect hegemony instead of permanently ruling over the foreign lands. Even if it has to occupy the lands physically, it restructures the political framework of the occupied states in its own favour and then leaves. Like colonial powers of the past, the American empire has also generated its others and has (mis)represented and interpellated them according to its hegemonic needs and political necessities.

In the wake of this new form of imperialism, Tariq Ali has emerged as a critic of the US imperial designs and its foreign policy in Latin America, the Caribbean, Asia, and the Middle East. In his non-fiction, he traces the after effects of the US military and economic imperialism in these extremely vital regions of the world. Tariq Ali is an anti-war activist and a socialist

writer, filmmaker, playwright, novelist, broadcaster, and speaker. Born in Lahore, Pakistan, Tariq Ali is now based in London where he is a board member and editor of the *New Left Review*. Ali has authored books on politics and history including an awarding winning series of novels known as *Islam Quintet*. His non-fictional writings *Clash of Fundamentalisms: Crusades, Jihads and Modernity* (2002) and *Bush in Babylon: The Reconstruction of Iraq* (2003) offer a critique of the US foreign policies and its imperial endeavours. Tariq Ali's political writings mainly present a critique of the US's imperial intents and demonstrate his left-wing anti-imperialist and anti-war agenda. Though a representative of the periphery, he does not represent any biased views about the centre and holds intellectual balance while discussing views of the two sides. He "still openly criticizes the Islamo-anarchists (as he prefers to call them), has repeatedly exposed the bankruptcy of their jihadi agenda" as he believes that the jihadis do not have any social vision (Fatah 280). He maintains that "today's Muslims are caught between the 'hammer' of American military adventurism and the 'anvil' of Islamist extremism" (319) and this is evident from what is happening today in Pakistan. Ali is a staunch critic of the US foreign policy towards the Muslim world and he "blames the United States for creating the condition in which he says these Islamo-anarchists have found strength" (323). Despite being a critic of US imperialism, Tariq Ali does not favour contemporary forms of Islamic anarchist movements. While addressing a British Islamist critic in *The Clash of Fundamentalisms*, Ali takes a clear stance against the contemporary examples of Islamic resistance: "Don't imagine that either Osama or Mullah Omar represent the future of Islam. It would be a major disaster for the culture we both share if that turned out to be the case". He sees salvation for countries like Pakistan in following the doctrines of social formation of 1970 in his work *Pakistan: Military Rule or People's Power* and proposed a peasants' and socialist

workers' republic in Pakistan. Again in 1989, he suggested a complete social transformation along with the disbandment of the mercenary army to be a solution to Pakistan's longstanding problems (Cohen 12).

During the 1980s he ran his own production company and produced programs for UK's channel 4, broadcasted on BBC Radio frequently. Ali contributes journalistic articles newspapers and magazines like *London Review of Books* and *The Guardian* and the London Review of Books. He is member of the board and editor of the magazine *New Left Review* and Verso publishers. Ali also met and befriended many famous and influential figures including Malcolm X, John Lenin, Stokely Carmichael, and Yoko Ono. Being a versatile and dynamic figure, Ali has contributed a lot to the realm of literature. *The Islam Quintet* is one of its kind literary work that delineates various eras of Islamic history and includes five novels:

1. *Shadows of the Pomegranate Tree* (1992)
2. *The Book of Saladin* (1999)
3. *The Stone Woman* (2000)
4. *A Sultan in Palermo* (2005)
5. *Night of the Golden Butterfly* (2010)

Apart from these novels, Ali wrote three plays in collaboration with Howard Brenton:

1. *Iranian Nights* (1989)
2. *Moscow Cold* (1990)
3. *Ugly Rumours* (1998)

His non-fictional works are significant due to their depth and the wide range of subjects covered. These include:

1. *Pakistan: Military Rule or People's Power* (1970).
2. *The Coming British Revolution* (1971).
3. *1968 and After: Inside the Revolution* (1978).
4. *Chile, Lessons of the Coup: Which Way to Workers Power* (1978)
5. *Trotsky for Beginners* (1980).
6. *Can Pakistan Survive: The Death of a State* (1983).
7. *Who's Afraid of Margaret Thatcher? In Praise of Socialism* (1984).
8. *The Stalinist Legacy: Its Impact on 20th-Century World Politics* (1984).
9. *An Indian Dynasty: The Story of the Nehru-Gandhi Family* (1985).
10. *Street Fighting Years: An Autobiography of the Sixties* (1987).
11. *Revolution from Above: Soviet Union Now* (1988).
12. *1968: Marching in the Streets* (1998).
13. *Masters of the Universe: NATO's Balkan Crusade* (2000).
14. *Clash of Fundamentalisms: Crusades, Jihads and Modernity* (2002).
15. *Bush in Babylon* (2003).
16. *Street-Fighting Years: An Autobiography of the Sixties* (2005).
17. *Speaking of Empire and Resistance: Conversations with Tariq Ali* (2005).
18. *Rough Music: Blair, Bombs, Baghdad, London, Terror* (2005).

19. *Conversations with Edward Said* (2005).
20. *The Leopard and the Fox* (2006).
21. *Pirates of the Caribbean: Axis of Hope* (2006, 2008)
22. *A Banker for All Seasons: Bank of Crooks and Cheats Incorporated* (2007).
23. *The assassination: Who Killed Indira G?* (2008)
24. *The Duel: Pakistan on the Flight Path of American Power* (2008).
25. *The Protocols of the Elders of Sodom: and other Essays* (2009).
26. *The Idea of Communism* (non-fiction) (2009).
27. *The Obama Syndrome: Surrender at Home, War Abroad* (2010)
28. *On History: Tariq Ali and Oliver Stone in Conversation* (2011)

In the outset, Tariq Ali's non-fiction mainly relate to his political thoughts and activities. He had to leave Pakistan because of a military rule his initial writing adventure *Pakistan: Military Rule or People's Power* (1970), therefore, relates to Pakistan and its military rule. Many other works that were written afterwards relate to either relate to communist thought or the politics of his new homeland: *1968 and After: Inside the Revolution* (1978), *Can Pakistan Survive? The Death of a State* (1983), *The Stalinist Legacy: Its Impact on 20th-Century World Politics* (1984), *Who's Afraid of Margaret Thatcher?* (1984), *Trotsky for Beginners* (1980), *Street Fighting Years: An Autobiography of the Sixties* (1987).

Tariq Ali's creative art started to emerge in his first play *Iranian Nights* (1989) which was co-authored by Howard Brenton and explored the aftermath of the Rushdie affair following publication of his controversial and notorious work of fiction. *Moscow Cold* (1990) was his

second collaborative work with Brenton followed which was a satirical dramatization of the Soviet Union's history starting from Lenin and concluding on the reign of Gorbachev. His third play *Ugly Rumours* (1998) was named after Tony Blair's former Rock Band, presenting a satire on the New Labour.

Ugly Rumours was closely followed by *Collateral Damage*, a work written in collaboration with Andy de la Tour in 1999. *Collateral Damage* seems to be part of Ali's anti-war narrative as it examines the NATO's Kosovo campaign and its impact on British liberals. Another satirical work of this kind was *The Illustrious Corpse* (2004), written by Ali alone, which satirises the compromises concerning the New Labour project. All the satirical plays written by Ali have an air of didacticism and somewhat remind the great satiric works of Brecht and Swift. The plays were not received very well by the critics and received mixed reviews. Ali and his collaborators, however, remained committed to their cause of promoting their interventional, purposeful and topical theatrical productions. To express their commitment, they issued their statement of intent 'The Stigma Manifesto' in 2000 stating that "In these times where the word 'post' has become a universal prefix, 'irony' a form of cultural oppression and any serious political commitment is deemed vile; we need new forms of resistance." The manifesto, which appeared as an appendix to the play *Snogging Ken* (2000) – a witless piece of satire on New Labour, openly states that the intent of their writings would be political "We're political and we're proud. Today, when, in the eyes of those who rule us, the whole of humanity have become customers, we need a dissident theatre more than we ever did in the past" (Ali, *Snogging Ken* 2000).

After realization of the decline of socialist thought somewhere around 1989, Ali abandoned activism and turned towards fictional writing starting with a trilogy on the theme of fall of

communism. *Redemption* (1990), the first novel of the trilogy, reflected Ali's thoughts on the meaning of the events related to the fall of communism for the political left by satirising the international Trotskyite movement through caricatures of certain real people. The central event of the plot is a conference called by Ezra Einstein, the veteran Trotskyite, to discuss issues related to future of the movement in the backdrop of the fall of communism. Ali comes up with a satirical but unconvincing solution as the conference resolves to penetrate the world's foremost religions. *Redemption* is also criticised for its heavy prose, feeble dialogue and an almost dull humour. *Fear of Mirrors* (1998), second part of the trilogy, was more successful than *Redemption*.

2.2.1. Fiction: *The Islam Quintet* (1999-2010)

Tariq Ali's *The Islam Quintet* is another set of didactic literatures in which he endeavours to investigate the deteriorated relation between Christianity and Islam while addressing the question, why Islam hasn't experienced a reformation yet. The first novel of the quintet *Shadow of the Pomegranate Tree* appeared in 1992. The novel relates the imaginatively reconstructed events related to the transition of rule in Granada from Muslims to Christians. The next novel of the series *The Book of Saladin* (1999) takes its readers back to the time of Crusades in the twelfth century when Salah al-din took Jerusalem back from Christians. The Crusaders in the book are depicted as rapacious, ruthless and intolerant. It was the only piece of fiction that was translated into Hebrew language and printed in Israel (Ahmed *Socialist Review*). *The Book of Saladin* is followed by *The Stone Woman* (2000). The story is set in the days when the Ottoman Empire had waned in the Island where the story is set. The novel highlights the value of pluralistic nature of Islam through its focus on the life of the central character, Iskandar Pasha, ambassador to Paris, and introduces a microcosm of characters including Jews and Greeks,

Turkish nationalists, Sufi Mystics, master and servants, gay and straight. The next novel in line is *A Sultan in Palermo* (2005) which is set in the twelfth-century Sicily, the novel contains elements of religious and cultural toleration and harmony. The last novel of the series *Night of the Golden Butterfly* (2010) is the only narrative which is set in the present instead of past. The novel narrates the story of how intellectual freedom is lost in the city of Lahore because of the mullahs. There is a small number of people such as intellectuals, workers and publishers who frequently and valiantly challenge the established order (Ross 2011).

Tariq Ali spent about two decades to create *Islam Quintet* which according to Creswell is an attempt to undercut the orthodoxies of both the Christian and the Muslim world. Ali developed interest in Islamic history mainly after western media focused on the Middle East during the first Gulf War in 1990 and started demonstrating a crude propaganda against the Arabs and the Muslims. The question Ali asked to himself was why Islam could not produce a movement like the Reformation. Talat Ahmed (late) suggests that Tariq Ali had realized that the media and western politicians were bent on spreading a distorted image of Islam having being populated with bearded terrorists; right wing authors such as Martin Amis were propagating that Islam was an evil religion. In *Islam Quintet*, Ali shatters the myth that Islam is not compatible with other religions of the West. Ali while talking about how he conceived the idea of writing the *Quintet* says, "I thought that the best way to recover that lost world was to depict its last years, its decline and fall". He wanted the European to know about the Muslims that lived in the past; the European knew only this much about the Muslims, through their school books, that the Muslims occupied Spain and then the Christians threw them out of Europe (Ahmed *Socialist Review*).

The Islam Quinter is not just a criticism on ignorance of the Western world about Islam and the contribution of the Muslims in the world but also a critique of Muslim pieties. The stereotypes evoked by the media, scholars and historians, showing Islam to be a religion of violence and ignorance, are broken by Ali by presenting some highly cosmopolitan eras of Islamic history when Muslims were the ones who taught civilization to the world (Crewell). All the stories of the Quintet remind the readers that Islam was never a monolithic culture and that it was not spread just by sword. Ali's inspiration is the ancient historiographer called Ibn Khaldun who does not appear as a character in any of the stories yet his ideas seem to have spread all over the stories of the Quintet. Ibn Khaldun believed that history should be seen as a manmade phenomenon and historical events can be explained better when looked at in a mundane way rather than in the light of a religious doctrine. Thus, Ali's novels can be considered an attempt to portray Islamic history in a secular fashion. In most of the novels, Ali takes its readers to a crucial turn in the history of Islam where a great multi-ethnic society established by the Muslims is at the verge of decline or about to face defeat by the Christians. The characters in these novels ask themselves the reason of this decline and they answer the always get is factionalism or a lack of group solidarity among the Muslims (Crewell). The sectarianism of the Muslims is mentioned again and again in the novels to be the chief reason of their decline whether it is Granada or Palermo or Jerusalem.

2.2.2. Non-Fiction

2.2.2.1. *The Duel: Pakistan on the Flight Path of American Power (2008).*

The Duel: Pakistan on the Flight Path of American Power (2008) presents an analysis of Pakistan's socio-political and religious circumstances with particular focus on its relationship with the US and its foreign policy. Ali asserts that Pakistani society contains only little segment

that tends to be extremist. According to the author extremists occupy only a small margin of Pakistani society. This marginal group received some salience in the society when the Americans and the later the Europeans responded to the 9/11 attacks with their military power against Afghanistan and Iraq, though Iraq did not have any connection with the 9/11 attacks. The attack on Afghanistan resulted in overthrowing of the Taliban and the destruction of a safe haven for Al Qaeda together with installation of a friendly government of the US and the Western world. Ali, however, criticises the US led coalition for not putting efforts for nation-building and reconstruction of Afghanistan. Use of excessive power, Ali believes, can lead to a prolonged conflict between the Christian West and the people who believe they truly represent Islam. The overall impact of the narrative can be summed up by saying that Ali's "incisive scholarship on Pakistan's inception and subsequent leadership is peppered with personal anecdotes, biting commentary, and forcefully opinionated prose" (Veronica 85). Tariq Ali investigates why Pakistani society is being linked with the forces of extremism, a society that was predominantly linked with Sufism and considered to be religiously tolerant, peaceful society. All those who have some knowledge of Pakistan's political history are aware about the peace and tolerance practiced in Pakistani society; "Ali provides evidence against some popular myths that policymakers, particularly in the United States, would do well to consider" (Rahman 227). Ideally, Pakistan should have the version of Islam which was practiced in Spain under the Muslim rule but this ideal could not materialized because of failure of its leadership. While investigating the causes of the problems faced by Pakistan society, Ali criticizes the civilian leadership by focusing particularly on Pakistan's former Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto for his questionable ways of acquiring power and then using it as Prime Minister. Ali's stance seems logical when he assumes that if Bhutto had ruled the country as a

true democratic leader while tolerating the opposition and promoting the welfare of the common people, Pakistan would have become better equipped with political and economic institutions.

Ali's account of Pakistan's condition provides hope in case the country is not compelled by the Western powers towards conditions that benefit the US and the West and lead Pakistani society into chaos. He is hopeful about the citizens of Pakistan and believes that they aspire to make Pakistan a modern country and wish to go along the world as upright and responsible citizens. They would not like to be looked at as others by being marginalised in the network of world economic and political systems.

Ali postulates that from the very inception of Pakistan, its survival is greatly based on a pliable and avaricious Pakistani politics and a very demanding and callous US foreign policy. Ali also rightly points out that "U.S. foreign policy in Pakistan has consistently and continuously impeded the organic development of democracy in the country" (Rahman 227). While reporting an anecdote related to a picnic where the first Governor General of Pakistan, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, and the then American ambassador were together and Jinnah offered his property as the future abode of the US diplomatic mission. Ali draws the morale from this anecdote that Pakistan, its land and people have been up for sale to every US administration since that time. Dictators like Ayub and Yahya and political administrators like Bhutto and Nawaz have been committing blunders in order to meet the US demands. He postulates that "dictators and democrats alike to be obsessed with the possibility of an Indian invasion, dedicated to the pursuit of nuclear weapons at the expense of a poverty-stricken population, and all too willing to enter into league with Muslim extremists to maintain their political footing" (Chesley 62). While criticising the major political figures in Pakistan, Ali appreciates

the actions of the chief justice of Pakistan Supreme Court, Mr. Iftikhar Muhammad Chaudhry for his ruling against the Musharraf regime and in favour of the then former Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif which resulted into his arrest after Mr. Musharraf decided to dissolve the Supreme Court and declare a state of emergency in the country. After Pakistan, Ali also expresses his views about contemporary history of Afghanistan and endeavours to establish that the Afghan government is fundamentally illegitimate.

2.2.2.2. The Obama Syndrome: Surrender at Home, War Abroad (2010)

The Obama Syndrome treats the US policies and their aftermath during the presidency of Barak Obama to be a syndrome that has to be treated or cured. Ali asserts that the colour of Obama's skin and his non-Anglo-Saxon name could not be a hurdle that could stop him from betraying the basic function of any US president "as the messenger-servant of the country's corporations, defending them against their critics and ensuring that no obstacles are placed in their way" and continuing the policies of his predecessors (McLemme). All the hopes attached with his personality regarding change remain unfulfilled as the policies regarding Guantanamo Bay detention centre, Iraq, Afghanistan and the Middle East have remained unchanged. The promise of health care reform at home remained unfulfilled too while the economic crisis was dealt with in an inappropriate manner as the very people of the Bush administration who created the crisis were asked to overcome it.

Tariq Ali rightly proposes that the fundamental value of American foreign policy is its continuity through changing administrations and its favours to the plutocracy that provides funding to various presidential candidates (McLemme). Obama, like other successful presidents was able to grab funding from big corporations, several influential law firms, and the Wall Street. Ali considers this inability to change to be a syndrome in Obama as he believes

that Obama has a strong impulse for reform but he is compelled to behave like any other US President due to the syndrome caused by those who ran his election campaigns; this scenario makes him incapable of generating thoughts like Martin Luther King Jr. Ali considers Obama to be another Chicago politician who is analogous to a windbag coming from the Windy City. Ali's views about Obama sound cynical in the outset yet these views cannot be considered a product of resigned passivity.

The elements of hope cannot be neglected when Ali maintains that “exceptional conjunctures in the past, where a combination of domestic crisis and radical demands from below push an administration in a reformist direction, but their frequency is limited.” (McLemme). Ali suggests that there are a number of people suffering from the Obama Syndrome as they are satisfied with Obama's performance on the basis of his objective demeanour that offers an understanding smile, a friendly expression, and sympathetic gestures. But Ali believes that Obama cannot offer more than these friendly gestures even if he could.

2.2.2.3. *The Extreme Centre: A Warning (2015)*

The Extreme Centre is a severe criticism on the politics and politicians of the United Kingdom and other western countries that are responsible for maintaining the status quo in the Western world. They are the dictators in essence and they have turned their political parties into the living dead (Taylor, *Socialist Review*). Focusing on Britain, Ali suggests that the Labour Party has needlessly focused on imperial wars and deregulated capitalism. Ali very harshly elaborates Britain's relations with the US as “a dog-like coital lock” wherein both the countries are working together to fulfil their imperial designs. There are chapters devoted for criticism on privatization of health facilities and the NHS, NATO's imperialism and the role of the media that has been made compliant to serve the purposes of the ruling elites. Tariq Ali

while criticizing the US imperial strategies around the world, postulates that optimism about the decline of the US hegemon is nothing more than wishful thinking as there is no serious threat to the US Empire from abroad. Even China, at this point of time, does not pose a serious military threat to the US neither there are any signs of China's desire to gain a proto-imperial status. The signs of a change from within are also not visible; thus, the decline of US Empire seems more of a myth than reality. The economic conditions both in Europe and America faced trouble during the 2008 crash, yet the breakdown in the capitalist system has not been irretrievable and the economic situation cannot be termed terminal though it is serious (Taylor).

The contradiction between the huge accumulation of capital among the elites and the needs of the general public is growing intense. Tariq Ali sees no solution coming from the top as the ruling elites are not capable of bringing change; the revolution may however come from below but for that mass mobilisations and creation of new parties and movements is essential. Ali sees the revolutions taking place in the South American countries through the movements of Bolivia, Ecuador and Venezuela as a ray of hope and links these patches of hope with what is happening in Scotland where the government had to administer a referendum to see whether people wanted to stay with the Great Britain or they want independence. But initiation of a socialist revolution in Europe would not be an easy task as the whole system of governments would hinder any such move (Taylor).

2.3. Theoretical Perspective

2.3.1. Post-colonialism

Post-colonialism analyses critically respond to the political, cultural or literary heritages of colonialism and bends upon exploring the consequences of occupying, controlling and exploiting countries and establishing/enforcing power through hegemonic means. Postcolonial

theorists, drawing mainly their theoretical perspectives from the fountain of postmodern theory, embark upon the journey of analysing the politics of distribution, control or even creation of knowledge by the former colonial powers. They explore the ways and means that enable the colonial or neo-colonial powers to sustain their political, cultural and academic hegemony over the colonized or formerly colonized people. The debates initiated by these theorists, through the past at least three decades, have transmogrified literary studies. The critical lens of postcolonial theory has provided multifarious methodologies for studying literature produced by colonial, anti-colonial or post-colonial discourses. By dissecting the literatures of former occupied lands in Asia, the Caribbean, Africa, the Pacific Islands, and the Americas, these theorists got engaged in debates concerning representation/misrepresentation, migration, knowledge production, decolonization, diaspora, hegemony, hybridity and racism etc. Certain scholars have an air of suspicion about the post-colonial theory. They believe, “post-colonialism is merely the bad faith effort of Western scholarship to atone for its sins of knowledge production in the service of imperialism. In another formulation, it could be considered the English Department’s way of understanding world history as it begins to recognize its crucial role in the domination of the globe” (Schwarz 6).

Postcolonial theory has received criticism over the years of its development due to its lack of consensus on its definition and at times because of lack of clarity (Slemon 100). Critics also believe that the theoretical language used by postcolonial theorists is not penetrable and at times subject to ambiguity (Young 67). One of the reasons of such lack of clarity could be the theory’s inherent ambivalence and the fluidity of the term postcolonial which keeps on shifting meaning due to rapidly changing social, cultural and political contexts in the contemporary world. One critical issue is the definition of the term postcolonial and its prefix “post” which

refers to two different meanings. The term post-colonial is viewed as inadequate and naïve (Moore 182).

2.3.2. Marxism and Althusser

Marxism is based on the thoughts propounded by German philosopher Carl Marx, author of the famous *Das Capital*. It would be very challenging to sum up the Marxist philosophy here keeping in mind the limited scope of the research. Marxism, in general is defined by its antithetical stance called Capitalism. However, within the scope of this research, certain core issues and thoughts, particularly those relevant to the Althusserian system of thought, will be delineated in the current research. Marxism is commonly known to be a philosophy that highlights the value and complexity of the class system that exists in every society and proposes that capitalism is responsible for exploitation of the working classes. It propagates an economic and social system that is based on social justice and an equal distribution of money as the distribution of money in the capitalist system cannot be just where the state “privileges certain strategies and actors over others”. (Gamble, Marsh, and Tant 156-7).

Marx propounds the existence and class division in human (capitalistic, to be more specific) societies, based on the powers controlling means of production. Economic activity, Marx believed, is the ground where class divisions are created and sustained. The Elite class, on top of the three-class system, owns and regulates the means of production. The second class in the ladder in the Marxist hierarchy of classes is Bourgeoisie or the middle class that includes the individuals that design or administer the means of production e.g. engineers, accountants, scientists, and the intelligentsia. Proletariat, working class, labour class, or the lower class is the third class in the class system of Marxist philosophy. The proletariats work under supervision of the other two classes and run the means of production to generate the economic

activity. The upper class retains the power system and controls the middle class using its hegemony over wealth and resources, the middle class on the other hand controls the proletariat through supervision, improving the output of the means of production in hand or devising novel means of production; the state thus is an “instrument in the hands of the ruling class” (Gamble, Marsh, and Tant 156). In the structure of this class system, the working class including the peasants remains under double control: firstly, under direct control of the middle class and secondly under indirect control of the upper class.

Marx believes that the exploitation of the lower class and the struggle ensuing from the class system makes it an unjust and exploitative system. The class struggle refers to the struggle of the upper class to maintain its position of power and struggle of the lower class to upgrade their position or class. While further elaborating the class system Marx posits that all the historical happenings result out of this class struggle as the classes consistently struggle to defeat the dominance of the elite class while on the other hand the upper class strives its best to maintain its hegemony over the other two classes. Majority of conflicts and struggles in the history of mankind also stem out of the institution of class struggle though historians claim many other reasons for such happenings. In the arena of social power struggle the state is a “nodal point” and “a key focus of Marxist attention” (Gamble, Marsh, and Tant 156). This happens because classes cannot remain stable for a long time as they remain subject to rise and fall. New class emerges when power or authority is grabbed through revolution while the class in power tries to cling to its hegemonic authority. Rise of Christian protestant class, for instance, presents an indication of growth of capitalism. This phenomenon is known as a material reading of history or historical materialism. The interpretation of history based on materiality is not limited just

to discussion of history but extends itself to many other facets of human life such as politics, ideology, state, or religion.

Taking up the Marxist paradigm, Louis Althusser built his own theories related to state, power and subjectivity. He suggests that state uses its authority and power for the benefit of the elite class: “The state is the means whereby the ruling class forcibly maintains its rule over the other classes.” (Althusser 137). Althusser’s views on human subjectivity and interpellation are also built on Marxist interpretation of human society. Marxist and Althusserian views on state thus are entirely different from the traditional views about state that consider state to be an authority that looks after the welfare of all its subjects. Marxism too believes that state’s role should be of a body that looks after the welfare of the subjects but it is only possible when the state eliminates class division and struggle by bringing all the means of production under joint ownership or declaring them to be public property. Till the time societies have the elements of class division and the ensuing class struggle, State cannot be anything else but a tool for subjugation of the working classes. Althusser, following the footsteps of Marx, has a similar concept of state and society.

Althusser’s interest in Marxist philosophy goes back to 1948 when he started teaching philosophy and studied materialism and its utility as a rational and scientific paradigm. During the Second World War, when he was captivated, Althusser got a chance to meet communists and peasants and developed a strong interest in Marxist-Leninist political thought. In the wake of crisis faced by the International Communist Movement and attacks on Marxism by bourgeois thought and humanist philosophy, Althusser decided to carry out an in-depth study of Marxism (Althusser 1976, 101-05). Althusser believes that Marxist theory is divisible into two parts i.e. Marxist science and Marxist philosophy. Marxist science, he believes, includes

historical materialism while Marxist philosophy refers to Dialectical materialism. Althusser emphasises the need for development of a subjective and revolutionary class instinct by the intellectuals. He took the Marxist paradigm so seriously that he wrote a full-length commentary of Karl Marx's ground-breaking work *Das Capital* in form of *Reading Capital*, summarizing the Marxist theory in his own unique way to protect the notion against the explanations brought forward by the bourgeois and the critical claims of the Humanists.

2.3.3. Debates on Ideology and Interpellation

The concepts of Ideology and interpellation, focused in this research, were introduced by Louis Althusser when they first appeared in his book chapter titled "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" which was part of his book *Lenin and Philosophy* (1971). Althusser's discussion of ideology gave a new strength to Marxist literary criticism among the thinkers of the West. Before Althusser's Ideology, the western literary critics focused mainly Hegelian conception that historical change is driven by ideas (whether expressed in literature or otherwise). Althusser rejected the concept of ideology as just false consciousness as he believes that there is no unmediated access to truth. Consciousness, he believed, is inscribed within and constituted by ideology. He postulates that social subjectivities are produced by ideology which mediates the subject's understanding and experience of reality. The theory contains significant seeds of revolutionary change considering ideology to be an extension of the repressive state apparatuses. To encourage emancipatory revolution, it is necessary to carry out a constant critique of ideology (Strickland 48). Easthope and McGowan consider ideology to be a masquerade that serves class interests of the ruling elites: "Ideology consists of ideas in the service of class interest" and "ideology is a gigantic masquerade" (34). They considered ideology to be something that generates hegemony and constructs human subjectivity. After

the twentieth century and the development of parliamentary democracy and the modern state systems the question of ideology as a false-consciousness became more important. Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci explored the concept of ideology by borrowing the term hegemony from Lenin. Meaning of hegemony can be understood through the slogan ‘peaceably if we can, forcibly if we must’ (Easthope and McGowan 35). Hegemony strives to win consent with the threat of force or without it. Althusser, under Gramsci’s influence, theorizes that ideology functions through state institutions or apparatuses to reproduce compliant subjects who ‘work by themselves’ and keep doing it unconsciously.

Since the decline of New Criticism as a dominant theoretical framework, Marxist evaluation of ideology has offered a significant position in the realm of literary studies. Word “Ideology” was coined in 1790s by French philosopher Destutt de Tracy to mean “science of ideas”. Ideology was later discussed in *The German Ideology* in the 1840s by Marx and Engels as a theory which did not relate to the courses of history. They used it in a negative sense considering it to be “false consciousness” and considered it to be a reason why oppressed working class could not rise in revolt against the upper class. Althusser’s notion of Ideology differs from traditional Marxist view as he rejects the interpretation of ideology to be “false consciousness” considering it to be oversimplification of the concept (Strickland 48-9). He suggests that ideology is not just a fabricated depiction of truth by which the elite class exploits the working class since false consciousness implies that there has to be a “true consciousness” meaning that subject can somehow outdo ideology. He believed that it is not possible for a subject to transcend ideology as all consciousness necessarily created and inscribed within the bounds of ideology (Strickland 49). Ideology therefore is inescapable and what we can have is nothing more than various forms of “false consciousness” or a limited and most of the times

incomplete understanding of the reality. Althusser's theoretical viewpoint also differs from traditional Marxist standpoint regarding interdependence of society's base (the economic organisation and material associations between production and consumption) and superstructure (state, ideology and social consciousness in general) where base inevitably determines superstructure. He imagines a superstructure that is relatively autonomous. Literature, in this regard, plays a productive instead of reflective role in formation of ideology and has a position of a material product in its ideological role (Strickland 49). Althusser necessarily makes distinction between specific ideologies and ideology in its general sense. Ideology in general refers to the framework of reality wherein subjects are interpellated or hailed while the second more particular sense of ideology refers to the forms of consciousness contained in some specific social groups. This particular sense of ideology corresponds to the idea of discourse brought forward by philosophers like Foucault and Bakhtin. It appears that Althusser's notion of subject formation leaves no space for agency or resistance. Althusser's notion of Ideology puts individual subject in a position where the subject finds it difficult to differentiate the ideological from the real and faces the problem of choosing ideologically better version of the real.

Althusser drew his opinion of human subjectively somewhat from Lacanian notion of the mirror stage where the subject misrecognises "I" in the mirror while looking at its mirror image. Althusser postulates that "all ideology has the function (which defines it) of constituting concrete individuals as subjects" (171). The concept of ideology disrupts the concepts of author, individual agent, or originator by replacing such concepts with the concept of a subject that is ideologically constituted and instead of having an original, autonomous or unique voice, speaks through a predominantly discursive subject position. Althusser's success lies in the fact

that he developed a radically anti-humanist and materialist theory and made its readers to think of ideology as not merely reflective but productive.

Althusser undertook the theory of ideology with an objective to understand how the working class and the rest of social classes relate themselves with society and economy in their imagination. He analysed the contradictory coexistence and functioning of various ideologies within any capitalist society and the role of apparatuses or institutions that enabled the operation of these ideologies. Addressing his critics, he emphatically revealed that his project was mainly governed by Marxist politics (1995, 253-267). He believed that a critique of these ideologies and their corresponding institutions (apparatuses) that support the class system in capitalistic societies would facilitate Marxist mediations in transmuting capitalist crises into transition to communism more successful (Althusser 1972, 130; Resnick and Wolff, 1987).

Althusser pointed out that the state institutions or apparatuses reproduce political and legal conditions in support of capitalist exploitation. He identified two sets of apparatuses: The Repressive State Apparatuses (RSAs) and the Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs). The RSAs comprised the state itself and various institutions that work under the state authority such as army, police, prisons, and other governmental authorities that ensure physical control of the state over its people. The RSAs hold monopoly over the means of power in capitalist society and support the class structures through that monopoly. RSAs and ISAs work parallel to each other in favour of sustenance of the class structures that exist in capitalist societies. The ideological state apparatuses include educational institutions, religious institutes and religions, the family and the mass media (Althusser 1972, 148). Unlike RSAs, ISAs do not function through physical power or politics. They make adults and children of capitalist societies to think and imagine in a specific way that determines their relationship with the society they live

in and become part of the social class system that supports capitalism (Althusser 1972, 146). RSAs appeared more unified and regulated to Althusser for serving the purpose of the capitalists while ISAs were subtle, varied and challenged areas where capitalists found it more difficult to safeguard their benefits.

2.3.3.1. Interpellation and Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs)

The Ideological State Apparatuses are the tools used by the ruling class to control the multitudes by fair or foul means; Tolstoy in his writings exposed and “laid bare the inner falsity of all those institutions by which modern society is maintained: the church, the law courts, militarism, ‘lawful’ wedlock, bourgeois science” (Macherey 316). Althusser believed that Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses function through medium of “interpellation”. Ideology ‘recruits’ its subjects and transforms them through interpellation. It recruits them all and transforms them all. Interpellation helps the capitalists to generate a subjectivity of their choice in their subjects by making the masses internalise the ideological thoughts without letting them notice what is happening. The gender roles, for instance, are not determined by children or adults by themselves but are inculcated through the ideological institutions of family and education. Capitalist society seamlessly guides its subjects to think or behave in a certain way. Althusser gives example of the religious ideology of Christianity which generates its subjects by telling them that God created all human beings, they should do what God wants them to do and live in this world the way He wants them to live, if they live life according to His laws, they will have their salvation (Krips 83). By giving this example, Althusser argues that the religious or any other ISA hails individuals in the name of either God or Freedom or country, or the President who in turn provides them a mirror image in which individuals see

their own image and enter into a mutual recognition with the hailed individuals and finally enables them to recognize him/herself (Althusser, 1971: 165-68).

Ideology functions “in such a way that it ‘recruits’ subjects among the individuals (it recruits them all), or ‘transforms’ the individuals into subjects (it transforms them all) by that very process which I have called interpellation or hailing” (1972, 174). Elaborating the process of subject formation, Althusser comes up with his famous example of an individual being hailed by a police officer, “Hey, you there.” Listening to this hailing, the hailed person turns back and “By this mere one-hundred-and-eighty-degree physical conversion, he becomes a subject. Why? Because he has recognised that the hail was ‘really’ addressed to him” (1972, 174). The power of ideology and its apparatuses converts an individual into an interpellated subject. The Marxist state sustains its rule through hegemonic repression by keeping the class system active to safeguard its own interests. The subjects misconceive the idea of ideology and owns it as a child of its own brain. The best and most favourable form of interpellation thus is the one that takes place without letting the individual know about its existence. Althusserian “subject does not develop according to its own wants, talents and desires, but exists for the system that needs it. Its only public reality is determined for it by the social apparatus that calls it into a certain kind of being” (Mansfield 53). Capitalistic state needs a certain kind of complying subjects that can fit into its needs and “larger political imperatives”; the state “requires us not only to behave in certain ways, but to be certain types of people” (Mansfield 53).

ISAs help constitute Ideology by influencing people through formulation of their interpellated identity. Carrying forward the Marxist notion of social formation, Althusser believed that a societal structure that would not replicate the circumstances for production while what it produces would not prevail for a long time. Reproduction of the conditions of

production, therefore, would be the crucial condition of production (Althusser 1972, 127). Just like RSAs, the ultimate goal of the ISAs is the “reproduction of the relations of production, i.e. of capitalist relations of exploitation”. ISAs use the supportive shield of the RSAs to naturalise the dominant ideology built by the elite or ruling class which is inculcated in all the members of the capitalist society. Each ISA accomplishes its function in its own peculiar way: the ISA of politics “by subjugating individuals to the political State ideology”; the ISA of communications “by cramming every ‘citizen’ with daily doses of nationalism, chauvinism, liberalism, moralism, etc. by means of press, the radio and television” (Althusser 1972, 154-55). Church used to be the dominant ISA before the Capitalist era while educational IRA dominates during the mature times of Capitalism.

Althusser believes that the structure of capitalist society or reproduction of relations in the society is maintained mainly through two practices: by keeping a consistent check on the economic conditions of the proletariat and by instilling in them the ideology and their choice through ISAs. The proletariat are given low wages for hard working hours while most part of their wages is taken back in form of house rents, and the prices they pay for the necessities of life. This is how working class is compelled to work consistently at mills, factories or any other production facilities. When they retire, they are replaced by workers like them and the wheel of exploitation keeps on moving. The working class is controlled both psychologically and physically through RSAs and ISAs. The ISAs, Althusser propounds, are “a certain number of realities which present themselves to the immediate observer in the form of distinct and specialized institutions. I propose an empirical list of these which will obviously have to be examined in detail, tested, corrected and re-organized” (1972, 143). Althusser’s proposal suggests that the number and nature of ISAs cannot be fixed as the list may be subject to change

and modification and we “can for the moment regard the following institutions as Ideological State Apparatuses (the order in which I have listed them has no particular significance): the religious ISA..., the educational ISA..., the family ISA, the legal ISA, the political ISA..., the trade-union ISA, the communications ISA..., the cultural ISA (Literature, the Arts, sports, etc.)” (Althusser 1972, 143)

The ISAs function as tools of manipulation that are used by the elite class to prolong and even perpetuate their hegemonic authority over the proletariat who are unknowingly become interpellated subjects by internalizing the ideology instilled in them through ISAs. They consider themselves to be individuals but they think alike and have a uniform way of living and thinking due to the ideology they share. The ISAs have different names but they all work towards a common objective i.e. sustenance of the power of the elite class. The Religious ISA promotes religious thoughts, Political ISA will promote political themes, and Educational ISA promote educational ideology while all these thoughts and themes serve the interests of the ruling elites. Educational institutions, for example, equip their students with all the knowledge and skill that is essential for running the places of material production owned by the upper class. The political ISA promotes an ideology that best suits the ruling class. Democracy, dictatorship, kingship or any other mix of these systems would be promoted if it suits the people in power or safeguard their interests. Media or the communications ISA is perhaps the most suitable tool for spreading a specific ideology in the contemporary world. The ruling elite of the USA strongly propagated the ideology concerning presence of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) in Iraq through media before invading the country. The ISAs and RSAs are interrelated and very often overlap as “All the State Apparatuses function both by repression and by ideology” (Althusser 1972, 149).

2.3.3.2. Interpellation and Subject Formation

The idea of interpellation is deeply rooted in the broader concept of ideology, which in turn related to other concepts that deal with human subjectivity, such as Foucault's notion of discourse, Gramsci's notion of hegemony, Lacan's notion of the gaze. It is therefore imperative to explore and problematize the notion of interpellation by putting it parallel to the notions of the hegemony, the gaze and the discourse. Stoddart in this regard has put together the concepts of ideology, hegemony and discourse to explore "why those who lack economic power consent to hierarchies of social and political power" (191). He postulates that social theorists "have used ideology, hegemony and discourse as key concepts to explain the intersections between the social production of knowledge and the perpetuation of power relations" (Stoddart 191).

The focus of theoretical debates over the idea of the subject, subjectivity and human identity relates to the discussion on the formation and function of the self or subject. What makes a person, an actor, an individual, what it is? Culler maintains that the modern theorists mainly focus on two focal questions "first, is *the self* something given or something made and, second, should it be conceived in individual or in social terms?" (108). These two focal points give birth to four streams of modern theorization. The stream of thought considers the self, or the subject to be something intrinsic and inner or something that an individual already has before it acts in a certain manner. The second stream of thought connects the social and the given and focuses on self both from the intrinsic and social aspects. The third stream defines a subject by stressing on the changing nature of the subject; meaning an individual becomes what it appears through specific acts that it performs. The fourth stream again connects the made and the social aspects of an individual and sees a subject in light of various positions that it takes in a social set up. If the thoughts of actions of the subjects are explained through certain systems that are

beyond the control of subjects, “the subject is decentred” meaning that subjects are the sources that can explain events (Culler 108-9). Marxist theorists proclaim that a subject is formulated on the basis of its position in the class system. The psychoanalytic theorists consider a subject to be a product of sexual, linguistic and psychic mechanisms. Feminists focus on the socially defined gender roles as a point of departure to understand the subject (109). The concept of human subjectivity is closely linked with identity formation in colonial and postcolonial discourses. The colonized subjects identify themselves through the ideological discourses of the colonizers and later learn to resist the colonial domination, subjugation, or subjection. Human subjectivity is based mainly upon the thinking processes and conscious and unconscious processes of human mind. The concept goes back to the theories of humanism, Enlightenment philosophy and Descartes’ assertion that we think therefore we are.

The philosophical assertions of humanism and Enlightenment placed human subject and its autonomous nature in the centre of the world view and parted human subject from the objectified world and separated outer reality from thought processes. The humanists saw human self as something autonomous instead of being influenced or shaped by the divine will or inexplicable cosmic powers. The Cartesian individualism saw “the autonomous human consciousness” to be the “source of action and meaning rather than their product” (Ashcroft *Key Concepts* 220). Later in the history of human thinking, nineteenth century European philosophers focused on subject-centred world views which culminated in philosophies of Nietzsche, Carl Marx and Sigmund Freud. Freud’s theory of human mind and its division into conscious, subconscious and unconscious portions brought revolutionary shift into thinking of human subjectivity as through his concept of unconscious mind he postulated that there are certain courses of individual’s formation that could not be accessed by thought which in turn mystified the

boundary of human object and subject. Carl Marx, on the other hand, conceived human subjectivity to be based on economic and social structures that divided the human societies into strata like working and elite classes. Contrary to Freud's concepts, he asserted that the social existence of people regulates their consciousness. Theoretical assertions of Freud and Marx put a question mark on the earlier philosophical assertions about the autonomy of human thought or action. The conception of human subjectivity thus problematizes the human relationships and the role of language among different humans or social groups. The concept of individual autonomy postulated by proponents of the Enlightenment is disrupted by the proponents of ideology, post-structuralism and psychoanalysis. Luis Althusser further developed the ideal of individual as a social-being brought forward by Carl Marx by further complicating the Marxist notions of ideology and ideological state apparatuses and by introducing the concept of interpellation. Marx's notion of ideology refers to a system of ideas that interprets the working of a society and social relations—predominately unequal—of the individuals living in it. The proletarians are ruled by the bourgeoisie and the ideological fabric of the society is controlled by the bourgeoisie who—having the power and tools to do so—produce/control the ideas that prevail in a society and as a result influence human subjectivity. The social identity thus constructed is a misrepresentation of social relations and social meanings which is considered 'false consciousness' in Marxist terms. The human subjects in a society are made to have a false view of their true social condition; this situation allows the ruling/elite class to have power over the proletarians.

Althusser further problematizes the notion of ideology by postulating that ideology not merely an issue of the elites imposing their thoughts over the lower classes; subjects are in fact born into ideology, their subjectivity is formed in line with the expectations of their parents,

teachers, religious leaders, politicians and the society in general; they approve the ideology promoted by the bourgeoisie as it gives them a sense of security and helps them acknowledge their identity. The social conditions generated by ideology also provide social meaning to the subjects. Ideology is made perpetual with the use of ideological state apparatuses—religion, education, and media—that provide the contexts and the conditions for creation of subjectivity. The apparatuses are used by the hegemonic elite class of a society to interpellate subjects and as the subjects obtain their subjectivity under the influence of the apparatuses. The subject, in Althusserian sense, is the consciousness constructed by the ideological state apparatuses. Human subjectivity created as a result of ideological process serves the purpose of the elitist classes as “Ideology consists of ideas in the service of class interest” though it is very hard to realize by the subjects that Ideology is in reality a “gigantic masquerade” or a great deception (Easthope and McGowan 34). The conceptions of ideology and interpellation are extremely helpful for understanding how human subjectivity is constructed by discursive and ideological discourses like colonialism and neo-colonialism.

The Marxist notion of ideology posits how the ideas and world view of the bourgeoisie or the ruling economic class are imposed and perpetuated among the rest of the social classes. To understand the notion of interpellation and human subjectivity so to say, understanding of the Marxist notion of ideology is an essential starting point. Ideology, however, is a problematic conception as the exponents ideology have taken it as a steady body of knowledge transmitted as a whole to the subaltern classes by the bourgeoisie. Gramsci’s notion of hegemony provides a reinterpretation or extension of the Marxist notion of ideology and focuses on how the state or the ruling class manufactures and maintains the consent to other classes of a capitalist society (Hall 1992). Ideology suggests a flow of power that is

unidirectional, whereas hegemony connotes that there is an inherent conflict involved in the construction of power, thus suggesting the prevalence of multiple ideologies at the same time. Discourse, ideology and hegemony are quite intertwined sister concepts but we cannot say clearly which concept comes first. Discourse post-structural in its roots but in it contains the concept of ideology in its essence because when discourse is utilized to support power, it becomes ideological. The model of ideology postulated by Marx and the Frankfurt School theorists appears to be “too unitary, too totalizing, and too abstracted from the everyday social interaction of individual actors” (Stoddart 200). The limitations of Marxist notion of ideology inspired Antonio Gramsci to introduce his concept of hegemony which turned out to be a further elucidation of the concept of ideology. The concept of hegemony refers mainly the distinction Gramsci made between the notions of coercion and consent that he considered to be the apparatuses of social power (Gramsci 1992, 137). Coercion is the state’s capability to inflict violence against the individuals who are not willing to contribute to relations of production generated by capitalism. The hegemonic power controls the means and relations of production by convincing the social classes to follow the norms and values of system that is inherently exploitative. Unlike the concept of the repressive state apparatuses, hegemony denotes a type of social power that depends less on the threat of punishment and more on participation and voluntarism.

Hegemony provides a world view that guides a society’s routine, everyday life through a “common sense” which is inherited from the past and accepted and absorbed without questioning. The hegemonic aura leads to “moral and political passivity” (Gramsci 1971, 333). Much like the notion of Ideological State Apparatuses in Althusser’s theory of Ideology, Gramsci believes that the governments use coercive power exclusively and sparingly as the

civil society including the mass media, religion, and family dynamics produce and propagate the hegemonic power, providing circumstances to the state. However, the state uses the coercive power in exceptional circumstances only. In capitalist societies, Gramsci considers the cultural superstructure to be more important as compared to Marx. In Gramscian sense, the economic base is not always reflected by the superstructure as the two strata have a considerable degree of autonomy. Unlike Althusser, Gramscian notion postulates the possibility of co-existence of more than one ideology at a time and in Gramsci's view the elitist class cannot always impose its ideas on other classes in totality. Rather, hegemony is created and reproduced by the ongoing social action which involves the tension and contestation between the rulers and the ruled. The ruling classes make sure that an "ideological unity" exists among the subaltern classes so that their consent in favour of the dominant ideology is secured and maintained (Gramsci 1971: 328). The difference between ideology and hegemony lies in the idea that hegemony is not a frame of thought, it is rather a process which remains unarticulated and hidden under the surface. It is "a realized complex of experiences, relationships, and activities" (Williams 1977: 112). Gramsci's definition of hegemony is quite broad in the sense that he believes that "everything that directly or indirectly influences or could influence public opinion belongs to it" (1996: 53). Gramsci asserts that hegemony is contingent historically and always remains unfinished and considers the revolutionary political parties, intellectuals, and the subaltern classes to be great agents for social transformation, in capitalist setups. However, he does not favour a revolutionary takeover of the means of production in order to bring about a social change. In a society dominated by hegemonic power instead of coercion, it is better to fight for position through a prolonged struggle with an aim to dismantle the hegemony of the ruling classes and generate a new hegemony in favour of the

subaltern classes (Femia 1975: 34). The struggle can be materialized, if the subaltern groups understand and subvert the common sense imposed by the hegemonic power and devise their own common sense by philosophising their own daily experiences.

While struggling to transform the Marxist notion of ideology, the Gramscian theory remains grounded in the notion of ideology postulated by the Marxist theory. The Marxist ideology and Gramscian hegemony have many common grounds including the capitalist mode of production, the division concerning the base and the superstructure, and the class categories. The difference between the two theories lies mainly in the fact that Gramsci takes hegemonic power to be a kind of unarticulated common sense that prevails in the society rather than an articulate body of thought (Stoddart 202). The consent of the subaltern classes is secured through routine activities related to education, family, religion, and work.

2.3.3.3 Althusser and Foucault: Ideological Crossroads

Though the discussion of ideology and other related themes goes back to Marxist theory, the idea has been problematized through the end of the twentieth century by the academia, structuralist and poststructuralist theorists. Althusser postulated that ideology has the power to recruit the subjects and transform them into its desirable subjects through interpellation. Ideology uses the tool of ISAs (communication networks, religion, education, politics, the trade unions, legal system, and the culture in general) and RSAs (police, army, courts, law enforcing agencies, and the government in general) to transform these individuals into complying, interpellated subjects. Individuals living in a capitalist society can never escape this interpellative framework as they are “always already subjects” (Althusser 1972, 172) and despite effort they can never escape this ideological realm of subjectivity.

Michel Foucault (1926-84), another French philosopher and theorist, has traces of Althusser's influence in his writing, particularly, his notion of subjectivity and subject formation seems to have some influence of Althusserian notions of ideology and interpellation. His major theoretical works *Discipline and Punish* (1975) and *The History of Sexuality* (Vol. I, 1976) deal with an intriguingly profound notion of subject formation and regulation through a system of power. Foucault did not say much directly about Marxist or Althusserian ideological debate yet his views on discourse and power or power-knowledge seem to perform the same function as ideology did in the Althusserian debate on ideology and ideological state apparatuses.

Discipline and Punish delineates Foucault's notion of subjection of the prisoners' bodies. Just like individuals transform into subjects under influence of Ideology and cannot escape their subjectivity in the Althusserian system of subject formation, there is a soul that inhabits a prisoner's body in the system of subject formation in Foucault's theory; "this soul is the effect and instrument of a political anatomy; the soul is the prison of the body" (Foucault, *DAP* 30). The Foucauldian soul like Althusserian ideology regulates and produces body of the prisoner. The soul in Foucault's sense of the word is produced through technology of power upon the body. The soul exists in the body due to working of power exercised over the prisoners, the colonized people, the school children and all those who are under supervision in one way or the other (*Discipline and Punish* 29). The subject formation of prisoners can be applied to other human conditions where power is responsible for producing and regulating the subjects. Foucault suggests that power may not be reducible to ideology and power unlike ideology cannot always be enforced from above. His conception appears broader than ideology as he even suggests that power emanates from below (*History of Sexuality* 94).

Althusser's views influence of ideology to be indirect since it operates through ISAs or RSAs whereas Foucault's power works in a micrological sense which produces and regulates its subjects at once. The term "hegemony", introduced by Antonio Gramsci, an Italian Marxist, also has the relevance to the discussion of ideology and the "soul". Hegemony perhaps has more relevance of Foucault's micrological power where class structure is linked with the power struggle. The important thing to consider here is the application of Althusser's ideological and Foucault's post-ideological notions of class, power, subjectivity and hegemony and the possibility of a counter-hegemonic or subversive strategy. If we assume that in capitalist society we are always already subjects, then it is important to discover a framework that is required to initiate resistance for subverting the ideological interpellation or the soul that is the prison of the body. The individual is an effect of power, and at the same time, or precisely to the extent to which it is that effect, it is the element of its articulation. The individual which power has constituted is at the same time its vehicle. (Foucault 1980, 98).

2.3.3.4. Interpellation and Discourse

Where Gramsci based his views in the Marxist tradition and focused more on production relations, Michel Foucault opted Nietzsche instead of Marx as his focal theorizer in order to theorize human subjectivity and interpellation. He took inspiration from Nietzsche's genealogy of morals and his philosophy of power, considering him to be "the philosopher of power...who managed to think of power without having to confine himself within a political theory" (Foucault 1980, 53). Foucault did not believe in a central scientific discourse and favoured the notion of local knowledge in an endeavour to conceptualize and theorize power, considering power to be something more significant than the truth. Power is inescapable by the man as every society is constituent of very complicated power relations. Foucault's concern was to

bring to light “power relations, locating their position, finding out point of applications and methods used” (Foucault 211). The most important and relevant question, for the present research, raised by Foucault was to decipher the way people are turned into subjects or interpellated through the complexities of power relations.

Foucault’s notion of power is not totalizing like the one held by Althusser who considered man to be a permanent interpellated subject of an ideology constructed by the ruling classes. Foucault on the other hand endeavours to trace the method through which man is objectified and transformed into a subject (Foucault, 208). Foucault figured out that there is a kind of power that dominates individuals’ everyday life by categorizing them, marking them by their individuality, attaching them to their identity, imposing on them a law of truth which they have to recognize and thus makes them the compliant subjects (Foucault, 212). Unlike Althusser, Foucault posits that the individual subjects may indulge in the struggle against the authority by initiating resistance.

Foucault’s theory of power suggests that man can break the objectifying representation of his own identity and struggle to become individual by becoming more conscious of the power relations. Foucault referred to three different kinds of struggle that can be seen historically i.e. the struggle against subjection, the struggle against exploitation, and the struggle against domination. Among these, struggle against subjection is more significant as it relates to the State, which is the pivotal source of power that can both individualize and totalize human beings through interpellative practices. The power held by the state can be exercised only by a deeper knowledge of the minds, souls and even the “innermost secrets” of the people (214). Foucault’s notion of discourse, in its essence, is not much different from Gramsci’s notion of Hegemony and Althusser’s notion of the ISA’s (Daldal 162).

In Foucault's theoretical perspective discourse resides in the centre. Discourse differs from the notion of interpellation as it is described by Foucault as a systematic thought which exists quite independent of what a particular speaker says. The speakers, however, make use of multiple discourses as resources that pre-exist in their minds, when they interact with others in a given social condition. Individuals shape their sense of the self and their subjectivity by engaging themselves in a variety of discourses that exist in the society (Stoddart 203). Foucault's departure from Althusserian conception of interpellation and his reliance on the discourse was not without reason. He found several problems with the conception of interpellation and ideology (Foucault 1980a; Foucault 1980b; Foucault 2000 [1994] b). One of the issues with the Marxist notion of Ideology seen by Foucault was that it considered ideology as fake which provided a sharp contrast to what is true knowledge. He considered ideology to be a negative element where in "the subject's relation to truth, or simply the knowledge relation, is clouded, obscured, violated by conditions of existence, social relations, or the political forms imposed on the subject of knowledge from the outside" (Foucault 2000 [1994] b: 15). Apart from that, ideology is seen by theorists as something that stems out of economic structures whereas Foucault re-configures the creation and emergence of truth in social relations instead of economic or social structures. Another problem Foucault saw in the notion of ideology is concerning the presupposition that individuals are made to adhere to the false claims of reality brought forward by the bourgeoisie. He claimed that the creation of labouring subjects cannot be the result of variations in the mode of production; rather, it stems out of social processes, having links with power and politics (Stoddart 204). Foucault's most significance contribution to the arena of knowledge is his re-defining of the idea of power which he presents through a model showing relationship between knowledge and power. He

considers power not just as something physical and coercive; rather, he sees power as something working at multiple levels instead of a tool used only by the bourgeoisie to repress other classes. The most significant idea in Foucault's notion of power is the idea of resistance; he suggests that whenever power comes into action, there are prospects for resistance. Both power and resistance operate side by side on the local sites. Power thus is not something that operates independently, it is more of a relational phenomenon which is applied by a group of people over another group of people (Foucault, 1978: 96, Foucault 2000 [1994] a: 337).

2.3.3.5. Interpellation and the Hailed Subjects

Louis Althusser's notion of subjectivity and subject formation stems out of his famous example of a policeman who interpellates individuals by shouting 'hey, you there!' Althusser believes that individuals become "knowing subjects" through a process of identification (Althusser 1971). An individual with a logical, unified and independent consciousness can be called a "knowing subject", who also necessarily has a control over language and meaning. A knowing subject apparently conceives meanings and thinks in terms of the "I". Subjectivity of Althusserian subject is constructed when s/he is hailed. The moment the hailed individual is turned around, s/he becomes a subject as "the one hailed always recognises that it is really him who is being hailed. It is strange phenomenon, one which cannot be explained solely by 'guilt feelings', despite the large numbers who 'have something on their consciences'" (Althusser 1971, 163).

Language and ideology thus construct the subjects through the hailing process. Althusserian process of identification takes individuals into the realm of ideology. Althusser postulated that individuals assume their identities and become subjects within the framework of an ideology through Ideological State Apparatuses of politics, culture, media, the law, the family, religion

and education. Identities are constructed when subjects are recruited under a specific ideology; gender and citizenship identities are assigned in the same way when social or cultural practices and state-owned institutions develop and propagate “the discourses within which gendered subjectivity and citizens are constituted”. Individuals are also made to identify themselves as citizens of a particular country when they are interpellated through ideological references, that strive for recruiting subjects, such as “National anthems, sung at official state occasions and at cultural and sports events” (Weedon 6). The meaning and interpretation of the social practice such as singing a national anthem may change within the framework of an ideology. Butler believes that the identities constructed through discourses and ideologies are internalized by the subjects which she calls ‘performativity’. She asserts that when identities are repeatedly assumed in day to day life of individuals, they become part of their subjectivity: “identity is performatively constituted by the very expressions that are said to be its results” (Butler 25). Butler’s proposition affirms Althusser’s notion of interpellated subjectivities when she dwells on the idea that various manifestations of feminine identity seen through dress, walking style, or behaviour do not construct femininity, rather, they are products of femininity. Both Butler and Althusser suggest that human subjectivity and identity, for example, of being feminine or masculine, is not a natural phenomenon, they are in fact acquired through repetition in the framework of a particular ideology or culture. Butler calls it “the reiterative and citational practice by which discourse produces the effects that it names” (Butler 2).

After repetitive use of the means of subjectivity that construct an individual’s identity, the individual starts recognizing them to be his/her second nature. Weedon proposes that in case the means and modes of subjectivity are not successfully internalized, they may form foundation for “counter-identification” wherein the individual may reject the hegemonic norms

of identity (7). Althusser, much like Lacan, contends that identification is pivotal to the process that makes individuals knowing subjects. The discourses of gender, race or class restrict certain identities to certain people belonging to a specific time period or class. Therefore, there are times when an individual faces non-identification which leads to lack of subjectivity or agency and the individual reverts back to an identity which is not denied to him/her.

Social class, identity and ideology are closely linked where class is a vital component in understanding of human identity and subjectivity. Various social theories assign different individuals to different classes but individuals do not always identify themselves with a particular class, though they have an idea which class they do not belong to. Weedon believes that the concept of class as an obvious tool for identity formation has died away yet for understanding of social relations and social injustice, the notion of class remains highly significant as “Ideas about class are an important aspect of common sense as well as social and political theory” (Weedon 11). Marxist theory considers individual to be a product of class relations and human subjectivity to be class subjectivity. Marx considers class to be an economic category that constructs social relationships and determines link to the mode of production. Althusserian subjects are also based in classes that are reproduced through ideological state apparatuses. The ideological apparatuses also play a role in reproducing capitalist relations and thus creating subjects through interpellation process. Individuals, for example are made subjects through repetition of the concepts of morality, nationalism, or liberalism brought forward by communications apparatus. Individuals internalize the specific meanings and immerse into the identity given to them ready-made by the institution or ideological apparatus in question. Althusser, being inspired by Jacques Lacan’s psychoanalytic theory, sees the ideological subject as a split subject. The speaking subject ‘I’ acts and speaks

in the bounds of an ideology and when the subject says ‘I think’, it is not “the same subject whose existence is assumed in the act of thought” (Weedon 12). Thus, there is always a gap between the subject who is spoken to and the subject who speaks and the subject continually remains in the struggle to cover over this gap; this suggests that the subject remains unable to control meaning. Language pre-exists the subject who generates meaning, identity and subjectivity. Language offers meanings and subjectivity to the individuals who assume and live with that subjectivity, considering it to be true. However, individual can access various shapes of subjectivity within the bounds of various discourses depending upon inclusion or exclusion through power relations (Weedon 13).

2.4. Debates on Colonialism, Imperialism and Neo-Imperial Interpellation

Nature of the present study entails a review of the debates on colonialism, imperialism, and neo-imperialism to decipher the workings of hegemonic powers in the world and their interpellative practices.

2.4.1. Colonialism and Neo-Colonialism

The term neo-colonialism has been in use for more than half a century now yet a general definition of the term could not be formulated nor could its origin be traced with certainty though some researchers attribute the coinage of the word to Sartre who use the word neo-colonialism for the first time in 1956. Leninism is also a strong candidate for coining the term which uses the term to portray a new form of dominance practiced in the ex-colonial independent states by the former colonizers (Haag 9). The term in Leninist understanding suggests that the gigantic capitalist economies of the West rely much on the raw materials, resources and manpower of the former colonies and in order to maintain the inflow of these resources, they kept the former colonies dependent even after their independence. Vajrushev

(1974) defined neo-colonialism as a policy designed by the imperialist powers to maintain ideological, economic, military and political dominance they use to have during the colonial era. The first formal definition of neo-colonialism was brought forward in 1961 by All-African Peoples Conference where it was postulated that neo-colonialism is continuation of the colonial hegemony regardless of the independence of the former colonized states “which become victims of an indirect and subtle form of domination by political, economic, social, military, or technical means” (Martin 191). The concept of Neo-colonialism was first assertively brought forward by Kwame Nkrumah who postulated that colonies through traditional colonization process could not be created in the contemporary world. Though colonies still exist in the world but new colonies would not be formed.

The powerful nations of the world subjugate weaker nations through economic hegemony which is a form of modern imperialism while neo-colonialism, believes Nkrumah, is the last stage of imperialism. Nkrumah argued that states are being neo-colonized in the contemporary world which means that the state apparently remains an independent country with a superficial sovereignty by deep inside the core of the country it remains economically or financially subjugated which in turn effects its interior and foreign policies. The external power upon whom the economy of the neo-colonial country depends, exploits the indirectly subjugated country by controlling its decision making by posing economic or at times military threats to the economically dependent, weaker country. Gladwin (1980) agrees with Nkrumah’s concept of neo-colonialism and further adds that the neo-colonial power asserts its hegemony through provision or stoppage of foreign economic aid and influence through multi-national corporations working in the neo-colonized country. The neo-colonial countries give aid on conditions that ultimately benefit them more than the country receiving aid. The multi-national

companies, for example, established by the neo-colonial country in the low-income countries, always send back the greater chunks of profits to their home countries and the low-income countries remain deprived. Leninists consider neo-colonialism to be a modified form of colonialism which exploits the newly decolonised countries with an aim to get cultural, political and mostly economic benefits (Haag 9). To maintain post-independence domination in the former colonized countries, the neo-colonial countries make use of various tactics which can be called neo-colonial mechanisms.

The neo-colonial hegemon can control the prices of goods it manufactures and can sell uncompetitive products to the neo-colonized nation. The neo-colonizers give aid to the weaker nations on strict terms and conditions including terms like monopoly over the transportation of goods, demanding removal of trade restrictions, asking the neo-colonized nations to utilize the aid money to buy certain goods from the donor country or favour its companies established in the neo-colonized country (Haag 10). The neo-colonial dominance entails influence on educational and cultural structures as well. Members of the elite class from the former colony are given education in the metropolis of the former colony with an aim to inject western thought and values into the people of former colony. The neo-colonial hegemony is more threatening and harmful for the countries being exploited because of its indirect and invisible nature; power is exerted without any need for the master to justify it and resources of the weaker countries are exploited without feeling any responsibility for the country's administration. The ruling elites of the neo-colonized country remain compliant subjects to the neo-colonial master rather than looking after the welfare of their own population (Haag 11). Balkanisation was also used as a strategy by the neo-colonial countries, which means formulation of very small states that do not have means to develop independently and thus remain dependent on the neo-colonial

power. Haag also argues that the concept of neo-colonialism was connected mainly to the former colonial powers such as England and France but later it found its way to describe the foreign strategies of the US, China and the Soviet Union (12). Apart from the state level neo-colonialism, there are certain but multinational corporations and companies that exploit the weaker nations more or less like an imperial or a neo-colonial power.

Hanson and Hentz (1999) maintain that the international monetary organizations like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank are utilized by powerful countries to exploit the low-income nations by providing them loans with very strict terms and conditions that do not allow these countries to spend the aid money according to their own will. Suckling and Stoneman (1987) suggest that the neo-colonial powers also exploit the low-income nations through overspecializing. Certain countries during the colonial days were made to specialize in production of a specific commodity; Cuba, for instance, was made to overspecialize in the production of sugar which was to be imported to Spain and the US. This phenomenon does not allow the subjugated nations to improve their industrial expertise beyond a single product; they are not even able to train their working class in production of multiple commodities and as a result these neo-colonized nations remain under-developed. The rules and regulations of the international trade and industrialization are also made to benefit the richer nations and the low-income nations remain stuck in the status of third world nations. Sartre (2001) highlights several problems faced by the neo-colonized nations that are keeping them dependent on the neo-colonizer countries. The problems are not just economic but are psychological, social, and political as well. The economic issues relate to feeding of millions of people living in these countries without getting aid from the rich nations. The social issues relate to improving the social services such as hospitals, schools and other social institutions for the publics of the poor

nations. The third world nations also have inferiority complex for not being developed like the neo-colonizers that keeps them psychologically under confident and keeps them from coming out of the hegemonic influence of the wealthy nations. The political problem relates to the avoidance of revolutionizing the country's development strategies which involves steps that would make the nation starve for a limited period of time; politicians cannot take this kind of steps as the voters will reject them if they have to starve under their leadership (Parenti 6).

2.4.2. Interpellative Practices and the Empire

The history of American imperialism, defined as the cultural, economic and military dominance of the US outside America, is spread over more than one hundred and fifty years. The US was first seen as an Empire when during the presidency of James Polk, the country decided to go on war with Mexico in 1846 and California and some other territories, as a result, were annexed by the US (Lends & Zinn). The US have been driven by its urge to expand its territorial influence at the expense of other nations since its inception as a nation. Eaken (2002) notes that the US had become an imperial nation when the first lot of the settlers moved from England to Virginia and began to occupy lands while heading towards the West. The late 19th century saw American expansionism heading towards Hawaii and Latin American lands. The US government passed laws like Platt Amendment and the Teller Amendment to grant permission to the US to interfere or even occupy other nations, if they were unstable. Johnson (2000) suggests that the ordinary American people do not know about the covert operations carried out by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) worldwide and thus they are also not aware of the unexpected consequences of such operations and policies. He asserts that the acts of terrorism carried out by individuals or so-called rogue states are in reality the blowback from the operations carried out by the American agencies (8). Johnson contends that the Americans

reap what they sow through the CIA around the world. His postulation was quite predictive as the incidents of 9/11 clearly proved to be the blowback of what the US was doing worldwide. Johnson postulates, "Terrorism by definition strikes at the innocent in order to draw attention to the sins of the invulnerable" and the actions of the American so-called innocent elites "are going to harvest unexpected blowback disasters from the imperialist escapades of recent decades" (33). He labels the US imperialism as Stealth Imperialism which shies away from being called imperialism since the people of the country remain in dark about the imperial intents and they would not like their governments to behave in an imperialistic manner. In its stealth mode, the US imperialism supports and installs puppet governments, assuring its hegemony over the foreign lands. Thousands of troops deployed by the US in various bases worldwide are beyond any international laws and cannot be charged with crimes against humanity, war crimes or genocide. Johnson contends in the end of his book that the US has labelled Iraq and North Korea to be rogue states but the US must ask itself whether it has not become a rogue superpower itself (216). America attained its maximum physical control through direct military action around the World War II when it had physical control of Japan, Austria, Germany and Korea and even Philippines. But since the physical control could not be prolonged, the imperialism was made latent through a more hideous stealth mode.

It is highly significant to study the concept of American exceptionalism to understand the contemporary mechanics of the US imperialism. The theory can be traced back to Frederick Jackson Turner who presented a paper "Significance of the Frontier in American History" in 1893, highlighting the American exceptionalism, saying that the US has a distinct place amongst all the countries of the globe due to its unique historic origin/evolution. Kellner (2003) also traced the origins of the American Exceptionalism in the nineteenth century when the

French scholar Tocqueville asserted that the US was journeying on a path to which there was no perceivable limit. Foster (2001), while criticizing the American exceptionalism, emphasises on bringing to light the US imperial designs and its militarism to inform the people of America as to how the US governments avoided public scrutiny by using mass media propaganda tools.

The US can be called the modern-day Rome, being the world's greatest economic, political and military power. The military ambition of the US has killed more than a hundred thousand civilians in Iraq while about half a million children died due to the sanctions imposed by the US after the Gulf War. Foster (2001) contends that after the demise of the Soviet Union, American ruling elite needed an enemy that could substitute the Soviets in order to justify its imperial intents. Various watch words including clash of civilizations, rogue states, and war on terrorism were brought forward to signify the new enemy and the necessity to maintain or even further enhance the military budget. Saddam Hussain provided a pretext to the US in 1990, by invading Kuwait to the US to expand its imperial agenda yet, Foster argues, a quick, devastating victory in Iraq drastically decreased the element of threat created by the US to further its imperial agenda.

There are certain sectors in the US government and business that motivate the actions of the empire; the most prominent among these is the arms industry that works in close alliance with the military and political elites together with the oil and finance industries. The alliance of these imperially driven forces is together called military-industrial-complex which mutually benefits from the war mongering and the poaching of natural resources including oil from weaker nations, without any regard to the interests of the US Public. Imagining the horrors of a third world war, Mills postulated that war could not and cannot resolve any issues weather political or religious or moral; war cannot even ensure peace or serve the national interests (3).

After the US invasion of Afghanistan in 2001, the journalistic stories used the phrase American Empire for more than one thousand times during 2002-03 and many reviewers of the situation in the US recommended some form of colonial or imperial control over Afghanistan and other countries having dangerous regimes (Lake 2007).

American military bases also play a vital role in maintaining the imperial designs of the US empire. Johnson calls it a novel kind of empire that can be termed as the empire of bases. It is a kind of empire which does not control the whole geographical setting but maintains its hegemony through its limited presence in an area; this kind of presence cannot even be taught in a geography class at a school. This new form of imperial militarism defies even the US constitution, yet it goes unnoticed by the US public. There are more than half a million military personnel deployed around the world. Apart from the military personnel, there are numberless spies, technicians, civilian contractors, teachers and others are also working in various countries. To dominate the seas of the globe, around thirteen task forces are deployed in and around gigantic aircraft carriers. Johnson believes that despite the fact that the official figures given by the government departments are misleading, it is estimated that there are more than seven hundred military bases being run and maintained by the US in more than 130 countries while the number of bases maintained within the US is more than six thousand. After the 9/11, the US has established several new military bases in Afghanistan, Kuwait, Iraq, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Qatar, and Israel; the stats on these bases are, however, kept secret are understated (Johnson). The defect in the military strategy adopted by the US is that it goes for inappropriate military solutions of the problem of terrorism. Johnson agrees with Correlli Barnett, a British military historian, who observed that the US invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq has considerably increased the menace of al-Qaeda instead of decreasing which shows that military action is not

the solution to the problem of terrorism. The US needs to use more subtle ways tackling with threats by a better understanding of the foreign cultures which is currently lacking among the policy makers of the US ruling elites. Johnson postulates that terrorism constitutes only a small portion of the American military strategy, the major part of this strategy focuses on expansion of the empire and military dominance of the globe (*TomDispatch.com*).

Michael Cox (2004) while quoting Marx rightly asserts that “all international history...has been the struggle between different kinds of Empire vying for hegemony in a world where they only measure was success and the only means of achieving this was through war” (585). Cox asserts that the US is an empire but without a consciousness of being one; an empire that is always shocked when its deeds with so-called good intentions are criticized abroad. Cox mentions two major challenges faced by the imperial powers, the danger of decay from the inside and the threat of being overstretched abroad. While referring to the neo-colonial nature of the US hegemon, Cox points out difference between the US Empire and other empires of the past; the US establishes an indirect rule instead of a direct in order to avoid taking more responsibilities (586). Unlike the empires of the past, the US avoided direct contact with its Others or the barbarians; during the cold war, for example, it did not directly attack the Communist China or the Soviet Union. Cox, despite criticizing the policies of the Bush administration, favours the militarism of the US Empire saying that war was legitimate against the lot of a dangerous people. However, he still believes that the war on terror has weakened the empire instead of strengthening it (605).

MacDonald’s argument regarding the debate of the US Empire is quite significant for understanding various aspects of the debate. While evaluating the literature available on the debate of American Empire, MacDonald divides the debate into three streams. Authors of the

first stream are called the *imperial enthusiasts*. The imperial enthusiasts agree that the America is an empire but they also portend that the actions and strategies of the empire around the world are not only beneficial for the American public but also for the global publics. They are advocates of the empire and enthusiastic about the greatness of the US as an empire; they not only celebrate this phenomenon but also suggest that the empire should exert itself more forcefully following an aggressive policy for building the empire (MacDonald 48). The scholars of the first stream favour American foreign policy and advocate further enhancement in the empire building intents of the policy. Max Book and Robert Kagan are among the enthusiasts who recommend that the imperial attractiveness of the US should be used to subdue or neutralize the security threats posed by various elements around the globe. A group of liberal imperialist scholars among the enthusiasts, including Niall Ferguson and Michael Ignatieff, stress on humanitarian and ethical role of the empire (Ignatieff, Ferguson). The second stream of the authors participating in the debate on the US Empire are labelled as *imperial critics*. This group of the authors also agree with the fundamental postulation that the US is necessarily an empire; however, they consider this role of the US to be something have deadly consequences for the entire world. They offer multiple reasons for looking at the US empire and its agenda with suspicion. Some scholars also argue that empire building is counterproductive as the aggressive intents of an empire negate and threaten the liberal order of the world. They believe that the use of aggressive military might threatens the dynamics of international politics as it is less effective than other means of power assertion (McDonald 49). Some other critics such as Jack Snyder and Ivan Eland warn that the US imperial strategy may lead to such foreign commitments that would cost too much money and may also lead to overexpansion that is very difficult control; the cost of the empire and its overexpansion thus will lead to the decline of

the US power. Some critics, such as Alex Callinicos and David Harvey, from the Marxist tradition also fall in the same category. The Marxists look at the US as a morally degenerate empire that economically exploits people through hegemonic domination and imposition of capitalist free markets around the globe (49). The third stream of scholars who took part in the debate on the US Empire though their writings are *imperial sceptics*. The proponents of this category do not consider the US to be an empire, rather, they consider the national and international strategies of the US to be necessarily anti-imperial. They agree with the fact that the US has enormous economic might and a very powerful military, yet they believe that the US is unable to behave imperially due to certain reasons. The international norms and laws against occupying other countries, for example, prohibit the US from behaving like colonialists of the past. Within the country, the US has a political ideology that does not favour imperialism. Another reason for not being imperial is the fact that the US ruling elites subjugate other nations through multinational alliances and certain global organizations like the World Bank or the IMF (49). In certain cases, the US imperial strategy involves neo-colonial interventions where the US either chooses to impose hegemonic control over other nations through partial or short physical presence or even no physical presence.

Schlesinger defends the idea of calling America an Empire by arguing in his paper “The American Empire? Not so Fast” that even if the US can be called an empire, it is a very limited kind of empire which has no comparison with the Roman, British or French empires. Starting with the mention of two extreme images of the US Empire given by Chomsky and Wolfowitz, Schlesinger argues that whoever is right we can at least say that the empire exists. The obvious signs of an imperial outlook are all there including a gigantic economy, a powerful military and an impressive cultural power. Going back into the history of America, there were many

US presidents and early historians who used the world empire for the country. The first instance goes back to 1783, when George Washington referred to the new born country as a rising Empire. A few years after that, James Madison also referred to America as a great empire. Since the eighteenth century, the word empire has been used to refer to territorial expansion while during the last decade of the nineteenth century the word had been used in the contemporary sense i.e. subjugating people of distant lands (Schlesinger 43). Many individuals from the US elites had expressed their desire to annex various geographical entities since the start founding of America, including Cuba, Central America and Canada, yet their dream could not be translated into reality. They used various terms like natural growth, natural right, geographical predestination, and political gravitation to predict that many geographical entities that lay in close proximity of America will become part of it to form an empire. The desire to expand made the US ruling elites to occupy California and New Mexico during the 1940s. Later, Alaska was purchased from Russian and the Virgin Islands from Denmark while Hawaii and Philippines were also annexed though the US had to forego Philippines after forty years of occupation. Despite all the imperial adventures, Schlesinger claims that “Americans, unlike the Romans, the British, and the French, are not colonizers of remote and exotic places. We never developed colonial outlook.

The United States established no colonial department. It trained no administration to manage the “outposts of empire” (45). Schlesinger’s claim does not necessarily make the US a non-imperial power, though it does throw light on how the US Empire was different from other empires of the past. He seems to euphemize when he calls America to be “an informal empire” having “military bases, status-of-forces agreements, trade concessions, multinational corporations, cultural penetrations and other favours” (45). The US Empire is different in a

sense that it does not maintain an occupied country under its administrative control, it acts in a neo-colonial fashion as it either controls countries through changing regimes, occupying countries and then pulling out forces after appointing compliant regimes, or maintain military bases in the occupied or non-occupied territories around the world. Schlesinger quite ironically argues, while referring to 1960s' South Vietnam, Israel, Pakistan, South Korea, Egypt, Taiwan, Iraq and Philippines, that the US "has become the virtual prisoner of its client states" as these states understand that the US will never withdraw its support despite the fact that they keep on defying "commands and demands" (46). Having this in mind, Schlesinger quite naively concludes that the US is not a competent empire it can at most be considered an empire that is "a feeble imitation" of the British, French or Roman empires. Schlesinger forgets to recall all those services the US has been getting out of these client states to install the new world order and maintain its hegemony in the Middle East, South Asia and other parts of the world, in exchange of a meagre financial support and an inevitable instability that follows.

Auken's (2014) criticism of the US imperial designs in the Middle East is closer to reality as compared to Schlesinger. He sees US intervention in the Middle East to be extremely violent that has taken countless lives. The US backed intervention in Syria for regime change has taken more than a hundred and thirty thousand lives and rendered around nine million people homeless. Violent armed fights, suicide bombings and assassinations are a matter of routine in Syria just as it had been during and after the US occupation of Iraq. The political and ethical responsibility of all the blood that is spilled on the streets of Syria and Iraq goes to the US imperialism. The imperial power of the US has committed such heinous crimes in Syria and Iraq which can be comparable to war crimes of the Nazis. The oil-rich Iraq was invaded on the false pretext of the weapons of mass destruction that were never found. It was a war imposed

by the US Empire based on a lie that has taken more than half a million lives. Auken further argues that the US desire to remap the Middle East is having the potential of taking millions of more lives as “the cost in blood of a new partition of the region would likely put the partition of India some 65 years ago in the shade” (globalresearch.ca). The imperial strategy of the US in Syria and Iraq has also fuelled the sectarian conflict between the Sunni and Shia communities as the empire intends to dominate the people of these countries through classical principle of divide-and-rule. The threat of al-Qaeda never existed in Iraq or Syria before the US intervention but now the US sponsored weapons and money is flooding into the region which is making extremist groups including al-Qaeda more powerful than ever. There is a chance that the US Empire’s material aid for the rebels in Syria would one day backfire just as in case of the Afghan Mujahedeen fighters who turned into terrorists after the Soviet defeat (Auken). Carter though has a soft corner for the US as a superpower as he believes that the US had a repute of being a great and just power before the Bush administration waged war on Iraq, which did not pose a real threat. Due to this unforgivable wrong decision, the US has lost its sympathy of the whole world that the US had earned after 9/11:

That reckless, unnecessary, and unforgiving decision – to wage a war of choice with a country that was neither an enemy nor a real threat – is at the very root of all we’ve lost during George W. Bush’s presidency. We’ve lost our good reputation and our standing as a great and just superpower. We’ve lost the sympathy of the world following September 11 and turned it into an alloy of fear and hatred. We’ve lost lives and allies. We’ve lost liberties and freedoms.

We've lost billions of dollars that could have gone toward a true assault on terrorism. It could fairly be said that in the age of George. W. Bush we have lost our way. (Carter 5)

The most ironical manifestation of the global US military interventions is the creation, working and war against the terrorist groups like al-Qaeda and the Islamic State, as these groups were originally created by the US and its client states. The US supported the extremist Islam in Afghanistan during the cold war period and used it as an ally. There is a long history of America using the Islamic groups to serve its political purposes around the world. The Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, Sarekat Islam in Indonesia, Jamaat-e-Islami in Pakistan were used to serve the purposes of the empire in different times (Chengu *globalresearch.ca*). There exists a love-hate relationship between the US and al-Qaeda depending on the nature of the US Empire at a particular time and setting. They either aid or target al-Qaeda, depending on what serves them better in furthering their hegemonic agenda. The Islamic State is the contemporary love affair of the US Empire as it is helping it destabilize Syria by backing the rebel groups there. Chengu provides a detailed analysis of how the US suppressed the Sunni population and brought the Shia minority into power in Iraq, depriving the Sunni business and working classes from their prosperity. This led the Sunni working classes to start their protest in form of an armed struggle against the occupying forces of the US and then the Shia ruling elite. There are three dimensions of the war in progress in Syria; the conflict between the rebels and the Syrian government, the conflict between Saudi Arabia and Iran, and the conflict between the US and Russia. The broader goal of the US intervention in Syria, however, is to neutralize Israel's enemies including Lebanon based Hezbollah, and Palestinian Hamas by depriving them of the support provided to them by Iran and Syria. Chengu sums up the US imperial intents in the

Middle East in form of an epigrammatic analysis of the situation: “America’s Middle East policy revolves around oil and Israel”. The US Empire is taking a three-pronged benefit of the existence of the Islamic State. The Islamic state provides a pretext for a military interference abroad; it helps them picture a threat to the western civilization back in the US; and use is as a pretext for justifying mass surveillance within the US. Chengu sums up the argument by proclaiming that “Terrorism is a symptom; American imperialism in the Middle East is the cancer” and the War on Terror itself is “terrorism...conducted on a much larger scale by people with jets and missiles”.

A debate of including the United States of America in the realm of post-colonial studies, or neo-colonial so to say, began in early 1990s which had the potential to challenge the pivotal assumptions of both the subject of American Studies and the postcolonial theory. The later debates have suggested that the notion of calling the contemporary world to be the age a non-imperialist, un-localized empire by Hardt and Negri (xiv, 134) can conveniently be challenged. Schueller proposes that the American literature and culture needs to be discussed through the lens of postcolonial literary theory, as “entreaties for a new imperialism, and calls for reinstating a nineteenth-century type of colonialism, now with the US replacing Britain and France, are ample proof that the suitability of postcolonial theory to the study of US culture should no longer be a subject of debate” (162). Schueller asserts that in the wake of heightened xenophobia, and a kind of compulsory patriotism together with intensive emphasis on the western values by the western intelligentsia after the tragic incidents of 9/11, clearly necessitates study of the US culture, literature and politics through the lens of Postcolonialism. Other signs that necessitate such study include the repeated mention of binaries of civilized/barbaric, us/them, self/other and the calls for establishing a new imperial power and

a re-enactment of the British and French colonialism by the US. The debate can potentially challenge the thematic assumptions of both the American history and the postcolonial studies. Among the major aspects of this debate are the question of applying the term postcolonial to America, the nature of the US post-coloniality, and the questioning of the self-other binary keeping in view the phenomena of transnational capitalism and globalization. The early attempt in *The Empire Writes Back*, “the American experience and its attempts to produce a new kind of literature be seen as the model for all the later post-colonial writing” (Ashcroft et al. 16), of inclusion of the US in the postcolonial studies faced criticism. The central debates on the US post-coloniality include issues like the internal colonization in the US, the questioning of self/other binary models in the wake of globalization and a globalized capitalism. Scholars like Frenkenberg and Mani rightly suggested that the notion of post-civil rights may be used interchangeably with the term anticolonial struggle for debating the *after* to colonialism (239). Schueller lists a number of works produced on the American studies have rejected the postulates of *The Empire Writes Back*, in favour of the idea that imperialism plays an important role in formulation of national identity. These works include *Cultures of the United States Imperialism* (1993), *US Orientalism: Race, Nation, and Gender in Literature 1790-1890* (1998), and Rowe’s *Literary Culture and US Imperialism: From the Revolution to World War II* (2000) (163). Hulme’s view point in this regard is interesting as well when he proposes that a country “can be postcolonial and colonizing at the same time” keeping in mind the fact that the US as a postcolonial country “continued to colonize North America, completing the genocide of the Native population begun by the Spanish and British” (122). Hulme’s assertion vividly suggests that the notion of postcolonial nation refers to the white people of America only as other communities living in the US, including African Americans, Native Americans,

Asian Americans or the Mexican Americans have to be dealt under a different postcolonial model.

The non-white communities and their culture can better be theorized under the umbrella of internal colonization and the ensuing Postcolonialism. But the implication of this proposition raises many questions such as the question of how to theorize the relationship between colonization and slavery or should the African American culture be included in a black diaspora. The fact of the matter is that the African American intellectuals have already started to position themselves in terms of postcolonial thought (Schueller 164-65). The increasing impact of globalization has made many scholars believe that in future postcolonial study of the US culture and politics will be seen in light of the globalization theories as in the contemporary world the flow of information is virtual which in turn is giving birth to virtual communities. The impact of social media is so strong that even the theories of imperialism would have to be reshaped. Appadurai, in this regard, believes that the contemporary cultural phenomena cannot be fully understood unless it is seen in light of the hyperreal global culture assuming that the citizens of this culture live in imagined worlds instead of imagined nations (29-33). Many other scholars such as Hardt and Negri also suggest the need of redefining the concept of empire. They call the contemporary world to be an age of empire which is converged around America but not localizable as it used to be in the past (247). They also believe, unlike other scholars, that the empire is post-national, postmodern and non-imperial in nature (134). Schueller rightly associates the US ethnic studies with Postcolonialism and suggests that the US post-coloniality cannot be understood without understanding the ethnic makeup of the US society and culture. He believes that there are questions concerning the US post-coloniality that still need to be answered through further debates: what texts should or should not be considered as colonial

discourse, how can European colonialism be differentiated from the US colonialism, what aspects of the US culture can be considered postcolonial, and most importantly, can all racial minorities be considered postcolonial? (172). Schueller asserts that considering the interests of the contemporary critics in debating various aspects of the US post-coloniality, it can be said that “the period of critical isolationism and exceptionalism in American studies is over.” (173).

2.4.3. ISA of Media and Interpellative Fear

The US imperial agenda rests on interpellation of the masses through propaganda of fear spread through Ideological State Apparatus of mass media which makes people to accept the ills of war and its after math: “when ordinary people perceive a grave threat to their safety, they are susceptible to adopting antidemocratic preferences regardless of whether they score high in authoritarianism” and the US public, interpellated by the media, even agrees to support pre-emptive wars, tortures, and illegal wiretapping (Hetherington and Suhay 557). Marranci argues that in the wake of the 9/11 attacks, the Bush administration manipulated the situation by magnifying the threat and creating interpellative panic through propaganda in order to achieve its imperial expansionist goals. The interpellative propaganda resulted in demonization of the Muslim community living in America, Australia and Europe. To enhance the impact of fear and to further interpellate the masses in favour of the neo-imperial designs, the power of al-Qaida was overemphasized through exaggerated accounts of their abilities (5). The interpellation of the Muslim community as an extremist people, dangerous enough to be allowed to live in the civilized West. Many controversial laws were introduced in the guise of antiterrorism security measures in Europe and Australia which made the life of the Muslim communities even more difficult (Tufail and Poynting 2013). In reality the terrorist attacks had very insignificant impact on the citizens of the Western countries; the impact was more serious

though at the political front which was created by the Western ruling elites themselves. The difference between the aftermath of the acts of terror in the past and the 9/11 was that instead of just using the metaphor of war, or instead of just investigating into the act of terror, a real war was initiated on many frontiers (Marranci 5).

Marranci (2016) contends that the propaganda spread in favour of the war contained rhetoric that made it look like a clash of civilizations, a war between the civilized and the savages, between us and them; the Western leadership including Bush, Blair, Berlusconi and John Howard ignited the passion for war through the rhetoric of civilizational war which was then reverberated on ISAs like social media, websites, talk shows, newspapers and other forms of media to interpellate the masses in Europe, America and beyond. An example of such frightening propaganda was Fallaci's book *The Rage and the Pride* (2002) which was an interpellative address to the Europeans and a demonization of Islam and the Muslims (Marranci 6). More than a million copies of Fallaci's were sold only in Italy and the book remained on top of the bestseller chart for many months. Fallaci seems to deliver a sermon like a priest to his fellow Christians warning them about the threat imposed by the Muslims and Islam: "You don't understand, you don't want to understand that a Reverse crusade is underway. A war of religion they call Holy War, Jihad...for those Reverse Crusaders, the West is a world to conquer and subjugate to Islam" (Fallaci 27). The war on terror has resulted in enhanced discrimination against Muslims residing in the West and the atmosphere of surveillance and suspicion has made it even more discriminatory for the Muslims. Marranci emphasizes on the need for research on how the Muslims see the West and their contemporary attitude towards the Muslim world and postulates that Occidentalism commonly prevails among the Muslim communities worldwide (52). The War on Terror phenomenon has refurbished the notion of

Occidentalism as a result of an increased discrimination against the Muslim communities and interpellation of other communities against them. The rising discrimination and Occidentalism has also given vent to many conspiracy theories. All the Muslims who believe in certain conspiracy theories and have notion of Occidentalism in their minds are not necessarily radicals or fundamentalists; rather, they are ordinary people who reject terrorism and condemn violence in all its forms (Marranci 52).

John Feffer also critiques the neo-imperial agenda of spreading false-fear against the Muslims and Islam to interpellate the European and American publics. Many republican presidential candidates hailed and interpellated the Muslim community by expressing hatred towards Islam in their speeches; Herman Cain even pledged Muslims will not be appointed to office. Right-wing donors spent more than \$40 million in the service of anti-Islamic efforts (Feffer 9-10). Feffer considers it to be a complex phenomenon which can be called Islamophobia that in turn is the outcome of several incidents including 9/11, London and Madrid bombings, fear of the Taliban and al-Qaida, Iranian leadership, and organizations like Hamas and Hezbollah. He rightly asserts that hatred for Islam and the Muslims is due to a mistaken, interpellative belief, spread by the media and far-right wing activists, that people like the Taliban and al-Qaeda are representatives of more than one and a half billion Muslims around the globe. The hatred and animosity for Islam or Islamophobia so to say has been cooking in the minds of the US government's policy makers and war planners; the interpellative Islamophobia has not come out of the blue, it rests in the unconscious of the Christians from thousands of years when the Crusades were planned and fought (11). The fear of a Muslim conquest of Europe in an effort to establish a worldwide Caliphate is deliberately spread by the ruling elites of Europe and America to interpellate their masses against Islam.

Feffer compares the contemporary clash of Christianity and Islam with the Crusades that started after the conquest of Jerusalem by the Seljuk Turks in 1095. The Crusades remained continued in some form until the fall of the Ottoman Empire in 1924, a time when the Islamic Caliphate was also abolished. The second phase of the Crusade has begun which Feffer calls Crusade 2.0, in form of destruction of Iraq, and the longest war fought by the US forces in Afghanistan (Feffer 12). The difference between the two Crusades lies in the fact that during the eleventh century Crusades, hordes of necessarily barbaric European Christians were contesting a much-advanced Islamic civilization and in doing so, they prevented the possibility of developing a peaceful interrelationship. Likewise, Crusade 2.0 is also creating a gulf between the Muslims and the West while taking countless lives, wasting money and resources and distorting the worldview of the Western people through neo-imperial interpellative practices (30). Islamophobia, like any other phobia, refers to “an irrational fear of Islam” and Islamophobes “see terrorist *jihad* under every Islamic pillow. They break out in a sweat at the mere picture of a minaret or *imam*” (19-20). The false fear is spread not only by the politicians and the ruling elites of the West, but also by the interpellative writers like Martin Amis who openly calls himself an anti-Islamist and openly asks the West to make the Muslim community suffer till the time they mend their ways (20). This kind of (mis)representation enhances the intensity of Islamophobia among the publics of the West.

2.4.4. Imperial Wars and Interpellative Practices

Belsey rightly portends that the imperial and neo-imperial powers impose their ideological discourse on the masses around the world in order to interpellate their target communities:

Ideology suppresses the role of language in the construction of the subject. As a result, people ‘recognize’ (misrecognize) themselves in the ways in which ideology ‘interpellates’ them, or in other words, addresses them as subjects, calls them by their names and in turn ‘recognizes’ their autonomy. As a result, they ‘work by themselves’, they ‘willingly’ adopt the subject-positions necessary to their participation in the social formation. (Belsey)

John Feffer provides an interesting analysis of the conflicts between the West and Islam in his 2012 book *Crusade 2.0: The West's Resurgent War on Islam*. The book opens with a striking sentence which refers to the Repressive State Apparatuses (RSAs) used by the West, particularly the US against Islam and the Muslims to interpellate them: “it was the Summer of Hate, and the target was Islam” (7). Feffer evaluates the events that took place in the US in the summer of 2010 when a great number of angry protesters gathered in Manhattan to protest against the construction of a Muslim Community centre called Park51. Another similar incident took place in Murfreesboro, Tennessee against the construction of another Islamic centre. Many other incidents of this kind also took place around the same time including firebombing of a mosque in Florida and vandalism against Islamic centres in Texas, Michigan and Wisconsin. Meanwhile, Florida based Terry Jones decided to burn copies of the Qur’an on the 9/11 anniversary. Many other campaigns were run during the summer of 2010 that contained elements of hatred against Islam. Feffer compares all these incidents with the anti-Communist hysteria and anxiety that had developed during the Cold War era (8-9) and postulates that after the Cold War era “In America’s Cold War theology, the Soviet Union replaced the Islamic world as the threatening infidel” (53). Beyond the US, the European countries relied more on the ISA of law by passing legislations against the Muslims. Spain,

France, and Belgium started debating on bills regarding restrictions on Muslim dressing while Switzerland banned construction of minaret for mosques. European publics also voted against further integration of Europe in form of Turkey's inclusion into the European Union. The stream of hatred and anti-Muslim sentiment did not stop in 2010 and 2011 saw introduction of anti-sharia legislation passed by more than a dozen US states.

The difference between the eleventh century Crusades and the Crusade 2.0 is that big Muslim populations were not living in the countries ruled by the Christians, whereas, in the contemporary world, a great number of Muslims are living in the US and Europe where the ruling elites cannot openly declare Islam to be their enemy nor can they use the word Crusade openly. They euphemize the expression and say that they are only fighting terrorism, not Islam. Despite this diplomacy and duality, many Muslims around the globe believe that they are being victimised by "air strikes from above and Islamophobic slurs from below" (13). The Obama administration has only changed the terminology from war on terror to overseas-contingency-operations, otherwise, the US and its western allies are fighting wars in the same way in many Muslim countries including Iraq, Pakistan and Afghanistan. The US drones are still killing al-Qaeda leaders, which results in killing of innocent civilians as well. These actions taken by the contemporary Crusading Americans have brought the favourability graph of the US in the Muslim world further down (14). The similarities between the Crusaders of the past and the present are also very striking; they were extremely violent whenever they found an opportunity to spill blood while the Crusaders of the present day also inflicted extreme violence during the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. The pope at that time and his followers openly expressed their desire to spread Christianity to every part of the world while the Crusaders used to go back on their word very often. The contemporary Crusaders too promote worldwide campaigns in the

name of liberalism, Christianity and democracy and very often lie to their people as they did in the case of Saddam Hussein when they threatened their publics from the Weapons of Mass Destruction, which were never found in Iraq (Feffer 31). While discussing decline of American anti-Americanism and declining American reputation after the Afghanistan and Iraq wars, Carter quotes Ceres P. Doyo who wrote in the *Philippine Daily Inquirer* “If I were an American, I would be red-faced. If I were an American citizen, I would write my own individual letter of apology to the world, to the people of Iraq and to the detainees at Abu Ghraib” (289)

Feffer postulates that the new Crusaders of the Crusade 2.0 are not primarily concerned about Islamofascism or radicalization of the Muslims: “what really keeps the Islamophobes up at night is the growing economic, political, and global influence of modern, mainstream Islam” (15). One of the most striking argument in favour of this proposition is that the country that “caused the greatest fear and trembling in European capitals is not Saudi Arabia or Yemen. Rather, it is Turkey” though Turkey has moved towards a liberal democracy led by an Islamic political party (16). Feffer contends that the eleventh century crusades as well as the contemporary crusades are not completely motivated by religious reasons, there were other very powerful motivational factors as well, including economic advantage, geographical expansion, and power. These motives even motivated the Crusaders to sometimes invade other Christians and even form alliances with Muslims. The contemporary Crusade 2.0 is also like the crusade of the eleventh century as the contemporary crusaders, the US and its European allies, are also concerned more about gaining geopolitical advantages of areas that are strategically well placed. The early Crusaders wanted to get back Jerusalem and its surrounding areas not just because a place of pilgrimage was conquered by Muslims but also because it was

an important trade route. Contemporary Crusaders are apparently fighting against terrorism but their major concern is to take control of various energy sources such as the Iraqi oil and the pipelines of the natural gas that are routed through the newly founded Central Asian states. In order to attain their goals, the US has made many tactical alliances with the Muslim groups such as Sunni fighters in Iraq, non-democratic ruling elites of Yemen, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, and the Northern Alliance in Afghanistan (Feffer 17). The military personnel fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan are neither fighting to win the hearts of the Muslims or occupy oil and gas rich lands for their countries; the Western ruling elites needed a gigantic enemy to keep their young soldiers motivated for fighting in far flung lands. They made a grand enemy by putting together images like the Taliban, Osama bin Laden, Saddam Hussein, Syrian and Iranian leadership, Hamas and Hezbollah and interpellated them through their Ideological State Apparatuses into savages that are not just aiming to occupy lands but a threat to the whole Western civilization. The crusaders of the Crusade 2.0 do not openly agree that it is a clash between Cross and Crescent, rather they portray it to be a battle between “a liberal West” and “unreasonable religious fanatics” (18). Every religious ideology of the world is capable of producing extremists and all religious people of the world have shown signs of extremism at some point of time in human history. Islam, on the other hand, is not eternally or fundamentally violent any more than Judaism or Christianity. Apart from that, Islam is only a small portion of what the lives of the Muslims constitute as they belong to dozens of different geographical locations where a variety of languages are spoken and a variety of social, and cultural values are followed. Attacks on Islam through anti-Islamic military or political campaigning are as much a threat to the human civilization as the acts of terrorism carried out by some Muslim extremists. Just as the main stream Muslims are asked by the Christians to denounce the acts

of terrorism, the Christians must also denounce Islamophobia (Feffer 23). Today's crusade or the Crusade 2.0 fought by the West uses the tactics of isolation, division and war which are also the tactics of al-Qaeda and their ideology cannot be countered by using the tactics they use. The West needs to engage the Islamic world in a "post-crusade, post-Cold War, and post-war-on-terror manner. To do this the West not only needs to put an end to the war on terror but also terminate the imagination that has been haunting the Western mind for the last thousand years (24).

2.4.5. Emergence of Contemporary Neo-Imperialism

Noam Chomsky in his book *Power Systems* (2013) offers a detailed analysis of how the US imperialism worked in the past and how it works today. Starting with the US imperial policies during the Vietnam War during 1960s, Chomsky brings the reader to the contemporary US imperial adventures in Afghanistan and the rest of the world. There existed a peace settlement between the US and Vietnam in the mid-1950s but considering it to be imperially unsuitable, the US abolished it and created a client government in the South Vietnam which started torturing and killing people and around 1960 it had already killed more than seventy thousand people. Later, in early 1960s the US under the administration of John F. Kennedy decided to attack the country and ruthlessly killed people and destroyed their crops by dropping chemically charged napalm bombs (1-2). Chomsky believes that "The United States was founded as an empire". The earlier administrations of the US openly considered the Native Americans to be savage beasts that had to be exterminated or at least pushed away to the barren lands. George Washington clearly had imperialist agenda as he wanted to destroy the Native Americans' habitats and settle the White Americans there. They had very clear racist agenda regarding populating the American lands as they wanted to send the slaves back to Africa,

Native Americans to the stony mountains, and also to get rid of the Latins. America was supposed to be populated by the superior race of Anglo-Saxons only (3).

Chomsky considers “settler colonialism” to be the “worst kind of imperialism” because it exterminates the native population and their habitats as compared to other forms of imperialism that only exploit the native populations (4). The US imperialism did not stop after occupying all the Native American lands around 1898; it started reaching out countries in the area and occupied Cuba which was ideologically called Cuba’s liberation where as in reality the US prevented Cuba from getting its freedom from Spain. The next targets were Hawaii and Philippines killing thousands of people in Philippines. The US established a typical colonial set up in Philippines which still exists in form of a neo-colonial system; this is why Philippines could not join hands with other Southeast and East Asian countries in the extraordinary economic development they have achieved during the last few decades (Chomsky 4). The question of America’s decline as an imperial power is very complicated and cannot be answered in a simple yes or no. The US became a global imperial power after the Second World War. That was the time when the US boasted as the largest economy of the globe but the influence it exerted on other nations was only at regional level. Leaving behind the imperialism of the British, the US had become far more rich and powerful after the World War II. This position of power and authority declined with the passage of time when decolonization took place and Japan and Europe recovered their economies out of the disasters of the Second World War.

Chomsky sees the contemporary integration of the Latin America something that has decreased the US influence in the South America considerably and it has become difficult for any power to exploit or defeat them one by one, as the imperial powers use to do. The South

American countries have huge wealth but they have millions of poor people to deal with as the class difference between the upper and the lower classes is huge; the wealth of the continent is concentrated in the hands of a wealthy few who are mostly white and Europeanized elites. Despite all these issues, the Latin American countries have been successful in coming out of the US's hegemonic control and exploitation (Chomsky 6). This doesn't mean that the US imperialism is diminishing, though it is on the decline. The US reacts to the measures taken by the Latin American countries for their political liberation from the US control. Chomsky believes that "the whole framework for the discussion of US decline is misleading" as China's economy is not based mostly on what the US and other countries sent there for being assembled by its cheap labour (9).

Chomsky quite boldly calls the US attack on Afghanistan to be an act of *terrorism*: "this fits the definition of terrorism exactly, but it's much worse. It's aggression." (16). There were many anti-Taliban leaders already struggling to remove them from the government; one such leader was Abdul Haq who believed that the US could have removed the Taliban from power by supporting people like him instead of bombing and killing thousands of Afghans including innocent people. But the US was in an imperialist mood, intending to conquer a poor helpless country and establish its imperial rule there. The same situation was in Iraq, where Saddam could have been overthrown from within Iraq but under the imperial impulse, the US wanted to occupy the whole country and install a comprador class there that would always remain submissive to the imperial regime (16-17).

The US policy around the world remains duplicitous and self-serving and a clear reflection of its double standards. On the one hand the US propagates its favour for democracy in the world while on the other it favours, installs and assists despots, dictators, and even authoritarian

monarchs everywhere around the globe as they fit into its imperial, hegemonic agenda better than democratic leaders. Chomsky mentions many such leaders who can be included in the list such as the Eastern European dictator Nicolae Ceausescu, Philippine's Ferdinand Marcos, Indonesian Suharto, Haitian leader Jean-Claude Duvalier, Zairean Mobutu Sese Seko, and South Korean Chun Doo-hwan. All these leaders were later replaced by the people of their countries from within, when they were no more needed by the US and Europe. In case of Iraq and Afghanistan too, the regimes could be replaced from within but the empire's intent was not just to replace the governments, it wanted a complete control of the regions due to the strategic value of these countries. Afghanistan has been attacked by several empires starting from Alexander the great, the British Empire and most recently by the US Empire due to its highly significant strategic and geographic location as it is on the crossroads of the Middle East, South Asia and Central Asia (17). Hidden under the guise of the war on terror, the US is looking for establishing the Trans-Afghanistan Pipeline (TAPI) to carry natural gas from Turkmenistan and has to go through the Afghan district of Kandahar. That is why all the countries of the region, including Pakistan, India, Afghanistan and Turkmenistan, have been involved by the US in one way or the other. The US wants to keep Russia away from the resources of the Central Asia and have a control over these rich natural resources itself. Another reason is to isolate Iran that had planned a pipeline across Iran, Pakistan and India. The US wants India to get a pipeline from Turkmenistan, instead of Pakistan. That was the reason why the US allowed India to import nuclear technology in 2008, in clear violation of the Non-proliferation Treaty (Chomsky 18).

One of the most dangerous neo-colonial tools used by the US Empire is putting things in its own favour using terrorist states: "small countries hire individual terrorists.... The United

States hires terrorist states” (Chomsky 21). Controlling other nations through client states is very convenient for the Empire as it involves no risk of losing the US military personnel or even facing public criticism inside the US. The hired states are paid money of given other facilities including strategic partnerships to make them do the job for the Empire. India is the prime example in the contemporary world as it has come out of its nonaligned position to get aligned with the US which facilitate the US by having an indirect influence on China, Pakistan or the whole South Asian region, through India. Israel is another client state of the US that helps it carry out its imperial intents in the Middle East. Israel is also helping India to carry out state terrorism in Kashmir and other areas where the local populations want independence. Chomsky maintains that the US ruling elites do this to avoid congressional sanctions as they did in case the terrorist regime of Guatemala which was funded by the US government through its client states Taiwan and Israel (21). To establish a better geostrategic advantage over China, the US has also helped India and Israel to come closer and cooperate on various matters of defence, security and trade.

Graydon Carter in his book *What We've Lost* (2004) argues that the Bush administration's decision to invade Iraq after 9/11 was one of the biggest blunders of American history. Bush and his administration deceived the US people about a country that was neither an enemy nor a threat to the US: “the deceptions that took the United States into Iraq were the work of an administration without care for logic or truth” (5). Invasion on Iraq was not due to any Weapons of Mass Destruction, as these weapons were never found in Iraq. It was the result of imperial desire for grabbing more resources and subjugating a nation for exploitation. Carter believes that the Bush administration had an eye on Iraq, they only needed a pretext to invade the country: “Iraq was always the G-spot for the Bush administration. September 11 gave them a

pretext they could manipulate to sell the nation on an invasion.” (29). Policies of the Bush administration thus, were neither unifying for the people of the United States nor for the world that was affected by the war he waged. There was deception and recklessness in his actions and thoughts and the whole lot of the ruling elite was so much in favour of the decisions he took that all his thoughts were translated into action without the chance of any accountability. Carter quotes words of Hermann Goering, Hitler’s Luftwaffe chief and designated successor—that were uttered during the Nuremberg war-crimes trials in 1946—to bring an analogy to what Donald Rumsfeld did in case of Iraq war: “people don’t want war...but [they] can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger” (28). There was a lot secrecy involved in the matters of the war and other ensuing issues during the Bush administration days which implies that the people of American were kept in dark about the actual situation that led to war and its devastating aftermath, “The Bush administration’s methods of governing have been kept largely secret from both the public and Congress, its tactics being obstruction, deception, and intimidation” (325). Carter emphasises on the vindictive and reckless nature of the American ruling elite and asserts that the reckless actions, particularly the act of waging war on Iraq, taken by them will be seen in the future as actions that brought the downfall of the United States:

It is more than possible that the Bush White House will be looked at years from now as one of the most secretive, deceptive, vindictive, unaccountable, reckless, and downright venal administrations in American history. It is also more than possible that the invasion of Iraq will be looked on as the defining event of the age, an unnecessary conflict that set-in train a future devastating to the United States and to the rest of the

world. This war without reason, this war without end, could in time become our great undoing. (Chomsky 336)

Carter concludes his book by quoting words from George W. Bush's August 2002 speech, which appears to be an expression of a fascist, imperialist, autocratic leader who does not have any fear of accountability: "I'm the Commander – see, I don't need to explain – I don't need to explain why I say things. That's the interesting thing about being President. Maybe somebody needs to explain to me why they say something, but I don't feel like I owe anybody an explanation." This behaviour and bent of mind very well suggest that Bush had a lust for imperial hegemony and this was rooted in the mind even before 9/11; Carter claims in this regard, "much of the Bush family's interest in political life has its roots in a clamouring for raw, unfettered power" (324).

2.4.6. Empire's Interpellative Deceptions

Kamran Mujahid in his book *9/11 and the New World Order* (2013) analyses the connection between the new world order and the events of 9/11, wrapped in mystery, changed the world in many ways. The New World Order, he contends, is not brought forward by an elite of extremely wealthy families that are connected to each other by business interests, intermarriages and other types of relationships, in order to control the politics of the world. Behind the political and military actions taken by the US Empire, there are hidden hands of these wealthy elites who want to control the whole world through a form of global dictatorship using interpellative means such as ideological state apparatuses. They use their money to deploy mind control and surveillance tactics. They are secretly behind many manipulated wars and assassinations and false flag operations that their interpellated publics fail to understand. They use Ideological State Apparatuses of media and education to control minds and fund

researches to psychologically control or brain wash entire nations. Mujahid considers 9/11 to be a great false flag operation that was staged by this elite to compel nations into hideous wars (9-34).

Mujahid (2013) equates world control with mind control and suggests that the US employs psychological tactics to control the minds of the people at home and abroad so as to maintain its hegemony at home and around the world. The strategy for mind control is disseminated by government agencies and the media and even the elites of the country and of other nations are given specific directions which benefit the hegemonic intents of the government and help them take the world towards a One World Government (10). Jim Keith, much like Mujahid, also considers 9/11 to be a false flag operation and suggests that there have been efforts to control masses through an ideology of power, particularly in European countries during the latter part of the nineteenth century. Science and psychology which used to be tool to understand the man and its existence was employed to find ways of controlling human mind for a new form of feudalism. Human mind is controlled by agencies like CIA through electronic images that come through media and provide an engineered and false view of reality to the publics of the world (10). Edward Bernays had also postulated that understanding the motives and mechanics of the group mind is key to controlling masses by making them think the way we want them to think, without even letting them know what is happening. The British monarchy, Rothschilds and Rockefellers in 1913 made the mind control process sophisticated by hiring a group of experts for engineering public opinion of the British people to gain favour for British war against Germany. British Prime Minister Churchill used the term High Cabal for some wealthiest elites of the world who wanted war. Later, Tavistock Institute of Human Relations was established in London for research on mind control and public brain washing. Following

the example of Tavistock, many institutes were established in the US which were funded by the Elite (11-12). Keith reveals that the purpose of Tavistock was to aid in mind control on global level. It influenced publics “through the media, the scientific establishment, corporations, governments, and the military” (30). The institute was created in 1921 by the British military intelligence in collaboration with a psychiatric institute. The institute acted as a centre for global social control through the use of psychological shock troops who were sent around the world to infiltrate various organizations for implementing the policies conceived by Tavistock institute. The broader purpose of the institute is to create one world order by abolishing autonomy of the nation states and creating a central totalitarian control system (Keith 30-31). Edward Bernays was also a member of the group that was tasked to change the British public opinion for a war with Germany. Later he immigrated to the US and founded a new area called Engineering Consent. Engineering Consent implies application of scientific approaches and pragmatic practices to make publics think in a certain way (Bernays *Engineering of Consent*). The Elite or the Cabal, suggests Mujahid, own all many big banks of the world and major oil companies and they have the power to assert influence over the US military, the CIA, and the justice system including the Supreme Courte. Apart from this, only six corporations in the US own most of the media and these companies are managed mostly by Zionists who are then allied with the banker owners’ elites. The Elite, having US military and the intelligence agencies like CIA in control, carry out false flag operations, espionage and assassinations of even high-profile personalities. Killing of John F. Kennedy and Italian PM Aldo Moro and the disasters like 9/11, Bologna railway station bombing and Oklahoma City bombing were all hatched in the minds of the Elite (Mujahid 19-21). To establish imperial hegemony within Europe and America, the imperial designs include espionage and violence

against their own people as well. One such example is of Operation Gladio which was jointly carried out by MI6, CIA and NATO in various European countries, using false flag operations against the ordinary Europeans and even the prominent politicians that refused to submit their will in favour of such operations. Under this operation every European country had a stay behind secret army which were initially created to protect Europe from any invasion from Russia. The army maintained by Italy was called Gladio. To scare the people of Europe from the communist menace, these armies carried out secret espionage and terrorist activities. Countless innocent Europeans were killed and a devastating confusion was spread around Europe including Turkey (22-23). Mujahid postulates that the same scenario was built up in case of 9/11 where to scare European and American public from al-Qaeda's threat, thousands of Europeans and Americans were killed by the secret armies so that a favourable atmosphere may be created for military actions around the world against a necessarily self-created enemy. People are deceived through psychological tactics and false media stories. Just as people of Europe are still unaware of how NATO stabbed into their backs through its secret armies, they would never know how the US killed its own people through its secret army to simulate al-Qaida threat (23-25). Gladio does not end there as a new operation named Gladio-B was initiated in 1997 in the Central Asia with an aim to destabilize the region and its surrounding countries including Pakistan; the existence of the operation was revealed by Sibel Edmonds, a former FBI agent and an expert of Turkish, Persian, Azerbaijani languages, in her book *Classified Woman*. Edmonds claimed that al-Qaeda leadership including Ayman al-Zawahiri had regular meetings with the US military command and intelligence agencies from 1997 to 2001 and they were also taken to various areas of Central Asia on NATO pales to take part in destabilization operations being carried out by the US military and intelligence agencies. This

fairly suggests that the terrorists and al-Qaeda operatives carrying out espionage and terrorist activities in the region including Pakistan are also deep assets of the US Empire, installed there to destabilize the region so that (Mujahid 111-12). When in 2011, NATO supplies through Pakistan were stopped for a long time as a result of a NATO attack on a Pakistani check-post, the suicide attacks in Pakistan halted completely during that period of time, suggesting quite vividly that the espionage activities were backed by the US and NATO. The purpose of Gladio B is to destabilise the Central Asia and parts of South Asia in such a manner that the Chinese and Russian powers are pushed back from there and illegal arms and drugs trafficking is made possible which will ultimately benefit the oil and gas companies, owned by the US and European elite, operation in the region (113).

The investigations of 9/11 incidents lead to the conclusion that that the plan was not made or executed by Osama Bin Laden or even al-Qaeda, though it was forcefully propagated by the compliant media of the US and the US government officials. The whole official story was a blatant lie used only as a pretext to attack Afghanistan (Mujahid 28). Ruppert (2004) too after a convincing argument concludes in his book *Crossing the Rubicon* concludes that both al-Qaida and Osama bin Laden do not qualify to be the suspects for committing the 9/11 incident as they do not qualify the critical litmus test that is necessary for every murder prosecution. The most qualified suspects for the heinous act of 9/11 was among the government agencies and the White House. The motive was to harvest the significant financial interests in the US and around the globe. People from Clinton administration and George Bush administration were clearly involved who used the intelligence agencies, US Secret Service and the CIA to stage the whole incident (Ruppert 1). Ruppert even believes that Osama “is probably the last witness the United States would like to have interrogates...Osama Bin Laden has been a well

cultivated, protected and valued asset of the US and British intelligence” (123). The media presented al-Qaeda and Osama as reality but in fact they were part of a mythology, an ideological construct that was used war propaganda and since both Osama and al-Qaeda members were Muslims, it was considered justified to attack Muslim countries. Sense of sight of European and American publics were deliberately rendered impaired with the dust of Islamophobia, racism and political indoctrination.

Many American intellectuals believe and making their public to believe that the principles of globalization in form of the new world order, thought out by the US Empire, are in the best interest of the American people and the rest of the world while America, in this regard, is the best candidate for leading the world. Ferguson (2004) believes that a strong and unquestionable imperialism backed and supported by strong allies and international institutions is in the best interest of the world. Mead (2004) also suggests that the US has been able to build a strong world order after the World War II which is considered by the world as an inevitable and genuine order. He also points out that there are certain elements in the world that question its inevitability and pose a threat to it. Fukuyama (2004), much like Ferguson and Mead, celebrates the outcomes of the US efforts towards globalization and establishment of a new international order, yet these researchers fail to analyse the disastrous outcomes of these efforts in terms to the resistance and bloodshed observed in many parts of the world where people do not like to accept the Western values and question the inevitability of globalization. Zakaria (in Hoge) rightly challenges the Western thinkers for considering globalization and modernization to be inevitable and in broad interests of the world populations, considering that many cultures and societies of the world detest the liberal modernization agenda of the world and have started to fight back even in terms of guerrilla resistance movements. The imposition

of the liberal values of the West through the globalization agenda on such societies poses the threat of disruption to these settled societies around the world. Democracy, for example, is seen by many as an exploitative system in which a small number of people belonging to the elite stratum of societies serve their own interests in the name of the peoples' government. The whole system installed by the capitalist thought stands on the foundation of greed and lacks the vital component of social justice. Despite all this opposition of the anti-capitalist resistance, Meads believes that state control on the economic organization and production and trade would not reap any benefit. Scholars like Ferguson, Fukuyama, Mead, Dobbins, Cooper and Hoge believe that the resisters of the world order, like terrorists, in the contemporary world threaten the world so much that the United States has to interfere, mainly through offense rather than defence. Fukuyama stresses the importance of dealing with the threats rising out of scenarios caused by failed states and considers this to be the pivotal point in global politics of today. Mead also seem to favour the US imperial agenda by stating that the world order spread by America would not only bring domestic security for the American public but also result into peace and harmony around the world and lead the world towards a prosperous and democratic future. The facts, however, are quite contrary to the assumptions of these researchers as the world has seen more destruction and bloodshed under the recent imperial manoeuvres of the US Empire than any other time in the history of the mankind. Cooper accepts that the US governments have a stern, hegemonic so to say, belief that whatever is beneficial for them is also beneficial for the whole mankind. While agreeing with the US stance, Cooper believes that the US has to do it in a more transparent and collaborative way, keeping his allies aware and informed. He agrees with the imperial agenda of cleaning the untidy places of the world but he emphasises on doing it more though implementation of law, negotiation and bargaining.

Ferguson (2004) favours the US Imperial design by saying that the troubled parts of the world, such as Liberia, that suffer from bad governance and economic depravity, can benefit a lot if the US Empire runs their administrative affairs.

2.4.7. Neo-Imperial Dimension of the Global Empire

Hodges (1976) in his essay “Neo-colonialism: the New Rape of Africa” interestingly proclaims that the once classic and optimistic saying of the former Ghanaian leader Dr Kwame Nkrumah: "Seek ye first the Political kingdom and all other things shall be added unto it" appears incredibly and shockingly and naïve today when we examine the outcome of a persistent, exploitative and reckless surge of a damaging neo-colonialism through numerous regions of the Africa and other parts of the world, that were considered to be—at least supposedly—free or sovereign. Sadly enough, the end of World War II could not bring genuine independence to the African countries from an elongated phase of exploitation of the neo-colonial imperial powers.

Hodges rightly claims that the imperialist powers deceptively expressed that they would give political and economic autonomy to the countries they once subjugated but a genuine shift of power from the colonizers to the colonized never took place. Thus, the colonized countries were made independent only in terms of the legal language appended on the official freedom papers.

Hodges asserts that though there are some noteworthy examples of courageous blacks who have stood in front of the encroachment of neo-colonialism recently, the determination and strength of white imperialism remained so persistent as to overwhelm and engulf many Third World countries. African leaders like Julius of Tanzania and Sékou Touré of Guinea have resisted the neo-colonialist hostilities of the former rulers. Hodges claims that the most severe

problems faced by many post-colonial African states including Ghana can be attributed to a different form of neo-colonialism called mental or cultural colonialism that is controlling the third world people (18). This type of colonialism is much more sinister than neo-colonialism as it implies a wilful destruction and denigration of the cultural heritage of the non-white people; just as Malcolm X once pointed out that the most heinous crime committed by the white people was to make the black people hate themselves—by black people he meant all the non-white, coloured people of the third world. The outcome of this cultural demeaning was the creation of a comprador class that unconsciously served the interests of the colonialists at the cost of their own nations and peoples (19). William J. Pomeroy in his book *American Neo-Colonialism: Its Emergence in the Philippines and Asia* (1970) evaluates the American imperialism and its various aspects with special reference to the Philippines and the Asian region. He raises the question as to how the United States became an imperial power without physically occupying colonies as was done by the colonial powers of the past. By referring to Lenin, Pomeroy asserts that the US has been able to maintain indirect colonies where the countries apparently remain independent but inwardly become a subjugated land controlled by the neo-colonial distant authority (7).

The neo-colonial style of the US power has its roots in the Cuban policy and the anti-imperialism of that day has necessarily become the neo-colonialism of today. Pomeroy links the neo-colonial outlook of the US with its reform movements at home and asserts that the US emerged as a welfare state at home while at the same time it expanded its neo-colonial boundaries abroad. Evolution of the US imperialism in the Asian countries can be understood through the study of Korean and Vietnam Wars and the US relations with the Philippines. It is

interesting to note that the benefits of the neo-colonial era have been much greater than the benefits of the US colonial era (Pomeroy 223).

Ball discusses Obama's black dissent in connection to his political actions and his personality as a leader of a colonial or neo-colonial state by referring to his oxymoronic "connected distance" to blackness (35). Being an African American Obama represents both the colonizer and the colonized and poses a challenge to those communities who want some kind of decolonization in the US society. Obama's blackness and his African American descent has not brought any clarity to the people who wanted change in terms of improvement of the plight of the black people living in America. The neo-colonial subjects may appear in the top ranks of the US leadership people like Abbey Lincoln are still not sure about "what will tomorrow bring?". The answer to this question was found, quite like Tariq Ali, by Kwame Ture in the assertion that "Black visibility is not Black power" which suggests that a change in the colour of the colonizer or the neo-colonizer does not necessarily transform the racial scheme of things. Ball asserts that people around the world do not recognize the white supremacy and the white attitude towards the black, the way the African Americans see it.

Mohan asserts in his article "Promotion of Modern Technology" that the modern technology is a tool used by the neo-colonial powers to maintain their hegemony on the third world countries rightly. He raises the question: Is the catchphrase 'leap frogging into the 21st century' truly as objective to deal with advancement as it is made out to be? will it motivate the youngsters living in India into working toward a domain that inspires advancement, diligent work, sacrifice and even envisioning of the future? Where has this new belief system risen up out of? In the colonial times, when the colonizers anticipated their power, it was in terms of their militaries or scientific virility. The military might have kept the colonial people subdued

and the scientific achievements and advancement of the colonizers made the colonized think that they were an inferior lot. Therefore, the colonized people even felt it appropriate to express their own religions and customs in terms that were more relevant to the religion of their oppressors i.e. Christianity (Mohan 1815).

Robert L. Allen, in his article “Reassessing the Internal (Neo) Colonialism Theory” written in 2005, has provided a historical background of the development of internal or neo colonialism within the American society where there is a complete segregation of the white and the black and despite apparent equality, the black people still remain the colonized subjects of the white, dominating Americans. They do not even have a control of the political, cultural or economic institutions in their own community (Sales 71-74). Allen calls the black colony to be the internal colony or a domestic colony that is controlled by the people of their own country. In the face of the American racism, Black people remain economically deprived, unemployment, homeless and impoverished; they are subject to violence and police brutality (5). Allen argues, while quoting Malcolm X, that the black skinned people and all the other dark-skinned people including Afro-Americans, Asians, Arabs, Africans, and Latinos can unite and become a strong force for bringing about change in the US and Europe (8). While quoting a group of scholars from Latin America, Allen asserts that there is a stark similarity between what is happening in the third world countries and what is happening to the third world immigrants in the US. The formal colonies, despite having apparent independence, remain under cultural and economic domination of the colonial powers through the local bourgeoisie or comprador classes (10). Grosfoguel (2003) also has the similar stand point when he argues that demise of the colonial administration does not mean the demise of the colonial relationships between the colonizers and the colonized. Thus, the line between colonialism and the post-colonialism is very thin and

dubious. He postulates that there are subaltern people living in the US who are still subject to colonial and racial hegemony. The white hegemony is kept through legal and institutional hierarchies based on racist agendas.

Price argues that the US attacks on Afghanistan and Pakistan are not an act that can be attributed to Obama's personal nature; it is rather an attack by a capitalist economy and the social system Obama serves. He considers the US to be a war-waging state that seems to believe in Randolph Bourne's proverbial assertion: war is the health of the state. Price asserts that the world will not be safe until the imperial, capitalist states like the US, Japan and the Western European states are abolished. To Price, all the reasons for the war given by Obama administration are senseless as he sent more troops to Afghanistan in order to withdraw its troops. The attacks on drone attacks and the attacks by CIA operatives in Pakistan and operations carried out by non-Muslim troops in Afghanistan will further antagonize the overwhelmingly Muslim majority of the region. Price considers the declining US economy to be the root cause of its international military adventures. The US is necessarily becoming a debtor, de-industrializing nation that is losing its economic competition to Asian and European nations. The Great Recession is the harbinger of the whole global capitalist system. These declining economic conditions have led the US ruling elites to use the only asset that makes them superior over the rest of the world i.e. the military might. The weaker, smaller nations of the world are attacked and their resources are plundered mercilessly; other nations are dominated through economic sanctions, politics and military might. Price considers it to be an irrational situation where the US ruling elite is trying to dominate the world economically and to do so they make use of politics and military. But they cannot rule the world this way as they cannot fully dominate the nations like Iraq, Afghanistan or Pakistan. The result of all these war

mongering will not be different from what happened in Vietnam. Price further asserts that the result of military intervention in Asia can be more dangerous as India and Pakistan are two declared nuclear powers while Iran is also in process of developing nuclear weapons. Israel on the other hand also has nuclear weapons which makes the probability of the use of nuclear bombs in Asia much greater than any other region of the world.

Walt, while suggesting the existence of neo-colonialism in Africa, argues that the dismantling of the European empires has not made African countries independent as the countries were taken over by the elites who took over after the colonial powers left. Most of the countries in Africa moved to dictatorships and military rules while most of the rulers were extremely corrupt which further increased the gap between the masses and the ruling elite even vaster. The neo-liberal reconfiguration of the African economy during the 1980s further increased poverty, injustice and joblessness increased, particularly in the warzones of Africa. The colonial strategy of making Africa a continent that would provide raw materials for their industries remained effective even after the demise of the colonial rule. The neo-liberal economic system still benefits the west and deprives the masses of the former colonial countries. Walt sees solution to this problem in a radical change based on socialist development. A change that can put an end to the hegemony of the ruling elites and defy the imperialist policies imposed on Africa.

The contemporary US Empire too has similar strategies in place when it comes to the post occupation period. They occupy countries but instead of prolonging their presence there, install puppet governments consisting of the comprador class which follows the policies dictated by the US authorities. The occupation of Iraq and Afghanistan in the recent past has almost similar stories to tell. Iraq was occupied for some time and then before leaving the country, the US

forces installed a puppet government which “is not representing Iraq in a globalising world: it is representing the globalising world in Iraq. The fact that the USA physically occupied Iraq, installed a government and passed a raft of legislation by decree might suggest almost total US dominance over broader globalisation forces and thus that the Iraqi state is almost solely an instrument of US empire” (Herring & Rangwala 667). The Iraqi governments in no way characterize the independent resolve of their countrymen; rather, they represent a globalising agenda imposed by the imperial forces outside Iraq. The US influence among the globalising forces is more than any other country as it physically occupied the country, made a government of its choice and then passed laws according to its own will; this clearly mean that the US empire’s interests were kept on top of everything else during the whole process of government formation in Iraq. Herring and Rangwala further argue that there are two types of imperial domination i.e. globalization from above and globalization from below. Globalization from above is the political control through installation of puppet governments and globalization from below means controlling the economy of the country through neoliberal institutions and other actors of informal economy (680-81). The globalization, whether from above or below, is very dynamic and unpredictable as the US keeps on changing the imperial strategy in Iraq while keeping other global forces, such as the UNO, World Bank, and IMF, at a considerable distance where they can operate in Iraq but not very freely. The changes and reversals in the US policy towards Iraq keep the situation unstable and unpredictable and the sovereignty of the Iraqi people remains unaccomplished (Herring & Rangwala 681).

2.5. Conclusion

A thorough review of literature related to postcolonialism, interpellation, ideology, subjectivity and other related aspects revealed that a postcolonial, Althusserian analysis of

Tariq Ali's writings has not been carried out yet which provides a sufficient gap for my current research. Both fictional and non-fictional writings of Tariq Ali have a great potential of providing an insight into how the contemporary imperial power imposes its agenda over the world and how it can be subverted. A study into how the neo-imperial powers of the world interpellate their subjects and how the imperial strategies of dominance can be subverted would provide a deeper insight into the relationship of the contemporary neo-imperial powers and their interpellated subjects.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

The chapter describes the methodological foundation of the study and discusses the conceptual framework used for analysis. Being a literary study, qualitative method of research is used. The suggested model of textual analysis has also been discussed in this chapter. The content analysis technique used by the researcher is explained and the Thematic Categorization Matrix created and used for the research has been provided in this chapter.

3.2. Conceptual Framework

I have employed the postcolonial theory to seek answers to the research questions. Keeping in mind the vastness of the field of postcolonial studies, I have delimited the analysis to application of a particular theoretical component i.e. Ideology, Ideological State Apparatuses, and Interpellation. The discussion of interpellation will also entail discussion on other related concepts including the Ideology, US Empire, Marxism, post-colonialism and neo-colonialism/neo-imperialism.

Althusser promoted the use of the word interpellation in an influential composition “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses” which appeared in *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays* (1971). The Althusserian concept of Interpellation suggests that various ideological state apparatuses construct representations of the individuals that are taken as reflections of reality. Althusser’s notion of interpellation is closely connected with his articulation of ideology. He postulates that “ideology is a ‘Representation’ of the imaginary

Relationship of Individuals to their Real Condition of Existence” (162). Althusser considers ideology to be a moderator between individuals and systems of power while at the same time reproducing the means of production ensuring submission, exploitation and repression of the working classes, “reproduction of labour power requires not only a reproduction of its skills, but also...a reproduction of submission to the ruling ideology for the workers, and a reproduction of the ability to manipulate the ruling ideology correctly for the agents of exploitation and repression” (Althusser 132). Ideology provides non-traditional means of repression to the dominating power to reproduce itself by accommodating its subjects into its power structure. Interpellation complicates the relationship between the dominating power and its subjects as the subjectivity of the individuals is constructed by their interpellated image.

Althusser assumes that interpellation is analogous to the shouting of an officer in a street, “Hey, you there!” hearing the officer’s voice, “the hailed individual will turn around. During this process, an individual realizes his subjectivity and this subjectivity is perpetuated through “Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs)” such as media, family, and educational institutions. Althusser considers ideology and interpellation to be one and the same thing, mutually interacting and reinforcing each other: “ideology has always-already interpellated individuals as subjects, which amounts to making it clear that individuals are always-already interpellated by ideology as subjects, which necessarily leads us to one last proposition: individuals are always-already subjects. Hence individuals are 'abstract' with respect to the subjects which they always already are” (Althusser 175-76).

Social subjectivity thus remains essential to subjugate the individuals because “every... social individual, cannot be the agent of a practice unless he takes the form of a subject” (95). State and other oppressive forces need individuals that fulfil the needs of society and safeguard

their interests; they achieve this goal by constructing the social subject through the process of interpellation.

3.3. Suggested Model of Textual Analysis

The present study carried out textual analysis using the qualitative content analysis technique to analysis of selected texts of Tariq Ali. Within the domain of textual analysis, content analysis technique - which is considered to be suitable for social sciences and humanities –will be carried out. The basic objective of content analysis is to analyse large amounts of texts qualitatively or quantitatively by taking into consideration the concepts and words used or suggested in the texts under analysis. Content analysis is carried out by categorization and coding of themes and concepts present in the texts. It is “a methodical and objective means of unfolding and quantifying phenomena” (Elo and Kyngas 108). It is a method used for analysing interviews, documents, open-ended questionnaires, talk shows and other forms of media content. Words, sentences and phrases are distilled into content-based categories.

In this context, content analysis helps in testing theoretical issues for a better understanding of texts or documents. Furthermore, textual entities such as books are distilled into smaller categories, assuming that the same phrases or words share the same meaning when they are classified under the same categories (Cavanagh 1997). In another study, Vimal and Subramani (2017) have described the following three different approached for carrying out qualitative content analysis: a) conventional: codes and various categories of coding are derived from the data itself; b) directed: coding is done through guidelines provided by a theory or some existing findings; and c) summative: comparisons and counting techniques, based on numbers, are used. In this perspective, this research employed the directed

approach to analyse the text as the codes while the coding categories were derived from the postcolonial theory. With this, a categorization matrix was created; details of the creation of the matrix are given below.

The categorization process is based on the assumption that when words, phrases, expressions, etc. are classified under the same categories, they share the same meaning (Elo and Kyngas 108). The objective is to obtain a compressed and comprehensive description of the phenomenon. The result of the analysis leads to organization of concepts or categories that enable the researchers to interpret the phenomenon. The list of concepts or categories leads to the building up of a model, conceptual map/system. In content analysis, the terms ‘concept’ and ‘category’ can be used interchangeably (Elo and Kyngas 108). Content analysis can be used for analysis of both qualitative and quantitative data; both deductive and inductive approaches can be used to carry out this analysis. The process involves reading of the target texts several times so that a deeper insight into the texts can be obtained.

There are three main phases in the content analysis process: preparation, organization, and reporting. In the preparation phase the unit of analysis is selected which can either be words, phrases, concepts, categories, or themes (Polit & Beck 2004, Guthrie et al. 2004). The unit of analysis for this research is thematic categories. Deductive content analysis approach is used for the current study as it involves testing of an already existing theory i.e. interpellation.

3.3.1. Categorization Matrix

The current research has utilized the deductive approach in carrying out the content analysis. Deductive content analysis approach is used when texts are to be seen in a new theoretical perspective. The categorization matrix was created utilizing the model proposed by Polit and Beck (2004) and the process suggested by Marshal and Rossman (1995). The

matrix was grounded in the themes taken from the post-colonial theory delimited to Marxist and Althusserian notions of Ideology, interpellation, and Ideological State Apparatuses and related postcolonial themes. The categories were further divided into generic and sub-categories to accommodate the minor themes stemming out of the major themes. The textual data (i.e. three fictional and four non-fictional works) was coded on the basis of themes (such as: neo-imperialism, Ideology, ideological state apparatuses, interpellation, and subversion) derived from postcolonial theory.

In the end, analysis of the text through the coded material was carried out with the objective of answering the questions posed by the research; the analysis led to the findings and conclusion of the study. Keeping in mind the scope of the research only those aspects of the text are analysed that correspond to the categorization matrix. However, all the new relevant concepts that emerged during the study and coding of the texts, were converted into additional sub-categories and added to the categorization matrix. After discussing the contents and meanings of the categories in relation to the texts, results were derived, as suggested by Marshall and Rossman (1995). The complete Thematic Categorization Matrix, prepared and used for the current research is provided as Appendix-1.

CHAPTER 4

A CRITIQUE OF NEO-IMPERIAL INTERPELLATION IN *THE EXTREME CENTRE* (2015) AND *ROUGH MUSIC* (2005)

4.1. Introduction

In order to establish the post-coloniality of Tariq Ali together with his critique of interpellation, neo-imperial and neo-liberal designs of the western ruling elites, a thorough analysis of Tariq Ali's two important non-fictional works has been carried out in this chapter. The chapter endeavours to establish Tariq Ali's position on the development and role of global capitalism, colonialism, Postcolonialism, and the place of interpellation and neo-imperialism/neo-colonialism within that development.

The chapter also analyses and critiques Ali's position on Marxism by raising some very significant questions: why is Tariq Ali critiquing the neo-imperial ideology? Where does Tariq Ali stand in relation with Colonialism, Marxism, history, development, and Capitalism? Is he part of the preparation for the global communist revolution? Why is Tariq Ali so critical of neo-imperialism? Tariq Ali, being a Pakistani by origin and based in the UK for the last more than fifty years, has the outlook of a postcolonial author; he represents Pakistani diaspora and has a hybrid personality as he represents both the cultures of his county of birth and his country of residence. His writings represent a very strong mix of cultural representations as he extensively writes about politics in the UK as well as the ups and downs of politics in Pakistan. He is generally known to represent The Left and his non-conformist attitude towards the politics in the UK. Ali's anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist stance is also evident from his

writings. The very titles of many of his nonfictional books suggest his anti-war and anti-imperialist stance e.g. *Bush in Babylon: The Recolonization of Iraq*, *The Two Fundamentalisms: Crusades, Jihads and Modernity*, *The Duel: Pakistan on the Flight Path of American Power*, *Rough Music: Blair, Bombs, Baghdad, London, Terror*, *The Obama Syndrome: Surrender at Home, War Abroad*, and *The Extreme Centre: A Waning*.

4.2. The Capitalist Lie: Interpellation of the Proletarians in *The Extreme Centre*

Tariq Ali's fiction as well as non-fiction sees the world in terms of Marxist-Socialist class system where the ruling elites controlling the means of material production in a society also controls the ideological means of society. He closely follows this Marxist notion, beautifully elaborated by Marx and Engels:

The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas: i.e., the class which is the ruling material force of society is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, consequently also controls the means of mental production, so that the ideas of those who lack the means of production are on the whole subject to it. (Marx and Engels in Easthope 39)

Tariq Ali in many of his nonfiction works seems to reverberate Lenin's words: "our main efforts should now be concentrated on explaining to the proletarian masses their proletarian problems, as distinguished from the petty bourgeoisie which has succumbed to chauvinist intoxication" (Lenin 1964, 111). The "shameless capitalist lie" (Lenin 110) propagated by the colonial, neo-imperial, capitalistic and bourgeoisie powers alike is that their interests and the interests of the colonized, neo-colonized and proletarians are one and the same; therefore, the growth, wellbeing or development of the capitalist elites is in fact the development of the proletarians as the growth of capital opens up more employment opportunities. The bourgeoisie

class and its ideology both are equally harmful for the rest of the society and “to deprive the bourgeoisie not of its art but of its concept of art, this is the precondition of a revolutionary argument” (Macherey *Translator’s Preface* vii).

Horvat rightly asserts in this regard, “capitalist development leads to the concentration of capital, employment and power” and in its severity, it may even lead to “complete destruction of economic freedom” (11). A majority of people or the proletarians so to say have least control over democratic, political and economic processes while the power and wealth concentrates in the hands of a small bourgeoisie, bureaucracy or the Power Elite. Marxism critically emphasizes upon this phenomenon and points out the inequalities in terms of distribution of wealth and power between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat which ultimately gives birth to contradictions or class struggle, encouraging the proletarian masses to initiate struggle against the Power Elite. The corporate culture prevalent in the corporate capitalism legally binds its bureaucracy to pursue profit without showing any concern for the welfare of the proletariat masses or any harm caused to the society or culture at large. Corporate capitalism, due to its overwhelming possession of wealth and power, influences the governments and their regulatory agencies for making policies that bring more profit for them, though mostly at the cost of broader social or economic good of the proletarian masses (Abeles 484-86). Macherey attaches his only hope with the proletariat class claiming that “only the proletariat class is capable of destroying the old world and its systems” (Macherey 317).

Tariq Ali in his non-fictional work *Bush in Babylon* critiques the United States for its imperial war mongering along with other allies on the interpellative and deceitful pretext of Weapons of Mass Destruction. The pretext was so lame that it could not convince the global masses which was evident from the unprecedented protests around the world. Condoleezza

Rice herself defied the pretext of WMD by saying that even if Saddam had an arsenal of WMDs, he would not be able to use it “because any attempt to use them will bring national obliteration” (*Bush in Babylon* 147). Thus, the Anglo-American attack and the fierce cluster-bombing on major cities of Iraq cannot be justified. The irony of the situation was that the threat to peace did not come from the imaginary WMDs, rather it came from “the rotten heart of the American Empire and its satrapies, Israel and Britain” (147). The Bush administration and its British allies kept on insisting that Iraq had to be disarmed. Bush and his comrades extensively used the ISA of the compliant media to interpellate the masses at home and abroad to convince them through false ideological propaganda and “grotesque exaggerations” (147) that Iraq was a threat to the peace of the world owing to the fact that it has biological and other weapons of mass destruction. It was a systematic, well planned propaganda that was spread through the speeches of the US ruling elites, particularly President Bush. Some extracts given by Tariq Ali provide ample proof that President Bush was determined to instil the falsehood in the minds of the US masses to interpellate them in favour of the war: “Iraq has stockpiled biological and chemical weapons.... It is seeking nuclear weapons”, “the regime has produced thousands of tons of chemical agents, including mustard gas, sarin nerve gas, VX nerve gas” and Saddam Hussain has been holding meetings with his nuclear scientists that are his “nuclear mujahideen” and “Iraq regime continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapons ever devised” (147-49).

The same interpellative propaganda was mimicked by the British elites to satisfy his public and politicians and convince them to favour the military adventure against Iraq. Ali subverts the propaganda by considering it to be full of “half-truths, speculation, and straightforward lies” (*Bush in Babylon* 149). A former National Security Advisor to Tony Blair and a former

head of Joint Intelligence Committee, Sir Rodric Braithwaite provide a detailed account of how interpellative lies attached to the WMDs were spread through ISA or media and politics, during the year 2003, to interpellate the masses and the elites of the Western world:

In the first months of this year we were bombarded with warnings that British cities might at any moment face a massive terrorist attack. House wives were officially advised to lay in stocks of food and water. Tanks were sent to Heathrow airport. People were unwilling to go to war...to overthrow an evil dictator in a distant country.... But in this atmosphere of near hysteria, they began to believe that Britain itself was under imminent threat and that we should get our blow first. (150)

Tariq Ali, an activist of the political left, critiques the bourgeoisie and their capitalist intents and raises voice in favour of economic and social equality and policies that ensure thinning of the income gap among various strata of society. He, quite symbolically, dedicated *The Extreme Centre: A Warning (The Extreme)* to Hugo Chavez the Venezuela President, an anti-imperialist, known for his strong opposition of the US Imperialism, Marxist tendencies of his thought and his landmark contribution for the Bolivarian Alliance of the Latin American nations for their political, social and economic integration. Ali is a candid critic of contemporary neoliberal economics which makes him critique capitalist regimes and their anti-social policies. He was also present in Porto Alegre, Brazil, during the World Social Forum 2005 where he was among many other to sign the Manifesto of Porto Alegre.

The book is a critique of democratic capitalism and neo-liberalism in most first world countries and the capitalist lies spoken consistently by the ruling elites to ensure the masses that the economic, financial and social policies they implement are in favour of both the capitalist elite and the masses. The contemporary democracies in Europe, America, Canada

and Australia are corrupt and “in serious trouble” (1) due to their redundancy and “poverty of any real progressive ideas” (3) as instead of serving the needs of common people or the proletariat, the parties in power are serving the needs of special interest groups that interfere the political processes through spilling money into the democratic processes for lobbying. The democratic parties in Western Europe since the collapse of Soviet Union could not deliver policies that could improve the lives of their people, particularly the proletariat class. “Capitalism, intoxicated by its victory and unchallenged from any quarter, no longer felt the need to protect its left flank by conceding any more reforms. Even a marginal redistribution of wealth to reduce inequalities was off the agenda” (2-3). The ruling elites are either members of the capitalist minorities or they are influenced by them through the money they invest in the political processes. Politicians, as a result, evade all such principles of democracy that assure equality of power relations and distribution of wealth. The distribution of wealth is quite unjust and the people of these countries are getting alienated from the democratic process. Being a staunch opponent of neoliberal and capitalist economic policies, Ali strongly criticizes the politicians in the United Kingdom for being influenced so heavily by the imperial intents of the United States and satirizes the way The Labour Party of Brown and Blair in the UK surrendered “willingly and completely to the needs of a deregulated capitalism and imperial wars” (*The Extreme* 3). Ali strongly believes that the contemporary politicians of Europe and America “mark a break with virtually every form of traditional politics” all these politicians including “share an authoritarianism that places capital above the needs of citizens and uphold a corporate power rubber-stamped by elected parliaments” (3). Intellectuals and activists of the political left see the explosive growth of national and multinational corporations to be structures that lead to wide spread attrition of basic civil and human rights as it deprives

societies of equitable or just power-representation in political, economic and socio-cultural spheres. The corporate culture exploits the consumers by manipulating their consent through capitalist lie and by creating false needs to make them buy products that are not really needed. This is also done through the agency of Fetishism. They interfere, both openly and secretly, in the democratic and economic process through legal but very high-priced interpellative lobbying in order to influence the politics in their favour. Resources are wasted on expensive advertising campaigns and unnecessary competition.

The English bourgeoisie are concerned more about how to gather more finances for themselves and for the country and care only to formulate policies that favour their own class and interpellate the rest of the classes, making them believe that their benefit is in benefit of all. They have an interpellative and submissive media that promotes the ideology that suits them and has the power to present fake, interpellative reality to be real in order to generate false-consciousness among the proletariat through interpellation: “They are immured in exclusive bunkers accessible only to bankers and businessmen, servile media folk, their own advisers and sycophants of various types. They live in a half-real, half-fake world of money, statistics and focus groups. Their contact with real people, outside election periods, is minimal. Their public face is largely mediated via the mendacious propaganda of the TV networks” (*The Extreme* 4). While celebrating the elitist hegemony, “They refuse to step down and talk to the people whose worlds they have destroyed” (4).

The ruling elite in the United Kingdom tends to be anti-social and anti-democratic by not allowing serious criticism from the opposition forces, “In power they tend towards paranoia, treating any serious criticism as disloyalty, and grow increasingly dependent on spin doctors who themselves behave and are treated like celebrities”. The political opposition does not

perform its oppositional functions well since it also forms part of the extreme centre and has interests in the policies made in favour of capitalism and the corporate culture, when “political differences are minimal, power becomes an end in itself and a means to acquiring money and well-paid consultancies after leaving office. Today the symbiosis between power and money has almost everywhere reached unbelievable extremes” (*The Extreme* 4). The bourgeoisie tend to exhibit more interest in making money for themselves than allowing the proletarians to improve their social and economic conditions. Big institutions like National Health Service (NHS) that symbolise social welfare are destroyed through regulations like Health and Social Care Act. The services available to the classes other than the bourgeoisie are reduced day by day generating a “climate of discontent with the NHS, forcing the middle classes to go private and pay either out of their pocket or with their health insurance” in order to encourage them to forego whatever is left in the institution (*The Extreme* 57).

Ali’s criticism of the British neo-imperial elites is analogous to the elite or the bourgeois class in the Orthodox Marxist theory which postulates that the removal of the capitalist bourgeoisie is an essential requirement for the proletariat revolution. Ali uses the term “Extreme Centre” for this dominating and exploitative class in the Britain and the America, “cowed and docile politicians who work the system and reproduce themselves are what I label the ‘extreme centre’ of mainstream politics in Europe and North America” (*The Extreme* 4). He warns the extreme centre to mend its ways. The extreme centre was quite moderate before “the warmongering Green leaders entered the government coalition to promote wars abroad and neoliberalism at home” (8). Ali has a genuinely Marxist view of the society and politics in the United Kingdom where the “US-styled politics” (7) and a hegemonic, exploitative bourgeoisie is keeping the proletariat deprived, using the ideological state apparatuses of media

and education and making them believe that their interests are the interests of all. The class of contemporary politicians in the United Kingdom, believes Tariq Ali, has a “dystonic vision of capitalist supremacy espoused by Washington, implying the deployment of military force abroad and the redistribution of income away from the poorest to the most prosperous layers in society” (*The Extreme* 6) They are a “class of nouveau entrepreneurs” who have hardly any concern for the “safety regulations or trade-union rights for their employees” (7). Ali posits that “The contradiction between the dense concentration of capital and the needs of a majority of the population is becoming explosive” and “it requires mass mobilizations, popular assemblies, to create new movements and parties” (15). These propositions have obvious connotations that refer to Ali’s desire for a Marxist revival in form of a “huge revolt from below” (*The Extreme* 99) that requires mobilization of the proletariat to replace the bourgeoisie in order to take the means of production in their own hands in order to ensure a more just distribution of wealth or in the long run head towards a socialist society.

Ali, propounding a socialist stance, criticizes the steps taken by ruling bourgeoisie in the United Kingdom against social welfare where capitalism and neo-liberal economy has given rise to consumerism which has “conquered all” by manipulating human needs (*The Extreme* 173). Having knowledge of the stern control of the petty bourgeoisie over the means and modes of production, he is disappointed that Working-class Toryism has vanished rapidly under Thatcher which paved the way for her dismantling of the 1945 reforms under the motto “Each for oneself”. He rightly denounces the way Thatcher government promoted individualism and consumerism and privatized public housing and institutionalized “household debt via easy mortgages and borrowing facilities designed to aid the new consumerism” (*The Extreme* 5). Later, the extreme centre representatives Blair and Brown encouraged anti-social, neoliberal

policies and “crippled” the National Health Service (NHS), once “the most socialized health care systems” in Europe, by taking it to privatization with the help of 2013 Health Act; the institute is now “reduced to a logo” (*The Extreme* 55-60).

4.2.1. Capitalism, Militarism, and Neo-Imperialism: Ideological Intersections

The growing neo-colonial impact of the United States in the world reveals that capitalism, militarism and imperialism/neo-imperialism go hand in hand. The desire for imperial hegemony is not new to the US hegemon. It has its roots in the US history and the logic created by political-economic capitalism. The act of buying the Louisiana Territory by Thomas Jefferson, the conquering and colonizing of lands during the US-Spanish or US-Philippine War in the late nineteenth century and informal control of the foreign countries after the second World War through economic and military threats are a few examples from the past that fostered the imperial impact of America around the globe. The new kind of imperialism creates “subsovereignty” which means that the states remain independent only in theory, not in practice (Foster 1-2). It was declared in the American National Security Strategy in 2002 that the best suited model for success for the US Empire would be “freedom, democracy and free enterprise” which clearly implies the value of capitalism for the imperial hegemony. The growth of empire is deeply rooted in the logic of capitalism. Capitalism has divided the world into centre and periphery since its birth during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The major capitalist countries endeavour to open up new economies in the world in order to have low priced raw materials from the peripheral economies. The third world economies also serve as reservoirs of cheap labour. This scenario, controlled by the core countries in the world system, favours conditions in which the third world poor nations remain dependent and under debt burden of the imperial power (Forster 34). The document vividly proposed that dominance of

the entire world should be the goal of the empire. The US will wage pre-emptive war against any nation that would pose threat to the US hegemon or its allies or any nation that is declared an enemy by the Empire (Foster 2). With this new paradigm, the US has waged wars against Iraq and Afghanistan and interfered on many levels in the Libya, Middle East, and Pakistan. The European countries are not an exception in this regard as the US imperial designs also include maintaining hegemonic authority over NATO and the EU.

In the wake of North America's direct or indirect influence over the socio-political scenarios in the European countries and including the United Kingdom, Ali sketches a neo-imperialist picture of the region, particularly the Eastern Europe, where the neoliberal, capitalistic values imported from the North America are installed by the bourgeoisie. There has been an "increasing Americanization of European politics offering a Tweedledee or Tweedledum choice – with a decline of the popular voice" (*TES* 3). Americanization of European politics and culture is a clear sign of a neo-colonial or neo-imperial domination of the North American empire on the United Kingdom and other European nations.

The proletariat suffer in the region because "most of the eastern European states are run by corrupt politicians, with capitalism the privileged reserve of criminal gangs of one sort or another" (*The Extreme* 9). Ali warns the elitist rulers of the world by asserting that if the capitalist economic crises are not overcome, smaller nations like Scotland, Kurdistan, and Catalonia will take advantage and will look for stronger bids for freedom. Apart from this, many Socialist, anti-capitalist, and Left-wing movements having Marxist-Leninist or Maoist elements including Syriza (in Greece) and Podemos (in Spain) will get stronger, as they are already "looking closely at the Bolivarian republics of South America" to challenge and "defeat the extreme centre" (*The Extreme* 9-15) represented by the petty bourgeoisie who allow

“bankers, crooks” and “cheats” to exploit the economy and create “anarchy of credit creation” to “privilege the wealthy” (92). Prevalence of these political and economic conditions is making hope for social reform, to ease out the pain of the proletarian subjects, bleak and implausible. The United Kingdom cannot be separated from the neo-imperial hegemonic intents of the United States since its political elite is strongly bound and submissive to the imperial desire of the US bourgeoisie. The “special relationship” that exists between the US and the UK is termed as “dog-like coital lock” (*The Extreme* 124) that has its own pains and pleasures but being a lock, it cannot be broken; the UK, instead, forms part of the imperial discourse of the global empire and likes to be part of its violent imperial adventures in the foreign lands.

Tariq Ali considers suppression of the movement of independence in Scotland and the negative outcome of the independence Referendum to be a result of “a campaign of fear accompanied by ideological tricks and knavery” of the hegemonic ruling elite of the United Kingdom. He traces the roots of pro-independence movement in Scotland in the anti-social, pro-capitalist policies of the ruling elites such as “Thatcher’s dismantling of the welfare state and Blair-Brown’s embrace of the same process” (*The Extreme* 71-2). Ali’s analysis of the Scottish inclusion in the United Kingdom in 1707 is essentially postcolonial as he believes that Scotland was “tricked into the Union” (72) which was essentially a “compact between the English bourgeoisie and a weak and desperate Scottish elite, one of whose rewards was entry into English markets and later access to its colonies in North America and Asia” though the proletariats of the land gained little. Ali has reproduced the *People’s Vow* written by the Scottish writer Alan Bissett in *The Extreme Centre* while suggesting that a *People’s Vow*

should be written and implemented for England as well. The *People's Vow* appears to be a Marxist manifesto of change in its outlook and spirit:

We won't let the poor suffer any longer for errors made by bankers and politicians. Our movement will endorse higher wages and deeper investment over greed and the backslapping bonus culture.... Together with trade unions, community groups, charities and academic experts, we will prepare a people's budget to save Scottish public service. We won't let anyone sell our natural resources to the highest bidder.... Scotland's people will have the power to own and control their resources.... We won't allow equality to become a buzzword.... We won't let NATO use Scotland as dumping ground for nuclear weapons. If politicians fail to act in 2015, we will launch an intensive campaign of civil disobedience against Trident to highlight the deep inequalities between public opinion and Westminster. Nor will we tolerate laws that put our vital public services in peril to global corporations. (*The Extreme* 85-6)

Inclusion of this document in the book is significant considering Tariq Ali's leftist and socialist background and his appreciation for socialist revolutions in the South America. The document clearly presents an anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist, resolve of the Scottish intelligentsia that wants to get rid of a system where politicians are backed and influenced by bankers and corporations, where the English bourgeoisie is in control of the resources of the Scottish people, equality is only a buzzword and imperial forces like NATO are using the Scottish land to meet their hegemonic needs. It also warns the extreme centre comprising a neoliberal, capitalist, Americanized elite to be ready for a civil disobedience in case the public opinion is not heard soon. There are clear signs of a desire for revolution led by the proletarians

against the bourgeoisie that should lead to a new form of government that would base its policies on the principles of social welfare and communal and gender equality. The document does not indicate a desire for a proletarian dictatorship, yet it has the germs for a system somewhat resembling Socialism.

The imperial, capitalist alliance of European Union (EU) is denoted by Ali as “Euroland in Trouble” which is in a mess and the stars on its flag “are beginning to fade” (88-108). Ali suggests that the neo-imperial agenda imposed by the United States is one of the reasons behind the decline of the European Union as the dream of Jacques Delors, the Frenchman, to create a social Europe “founded on the born-again fanaticism of the Washington Consensus: neoliberal capitalism was the only way forward”. Thus, the process of progress and development is hampered in the European countries due to emerging and seamless acceptance of the neo-imperial agenda based on the rule: “privatization at home, wars and occupations abroad” (91) sanctioned by the petty bourgeoisie of the extreme centre who are essentially “intoxicated by the triumphs of capitalism” (93). Europe in general and East European states in particular have become “vassal states” and are acting like “most loyal and compliant” subjects of the imperial United States (91). Ali images the EU as an imperialist, nondemocratic, hegemonic, dictatorial body “the mothership of the extreme centre” (104) which is governed by “set of unelected bureaucrats, working for banks, the IMF, the ECB, etc.” who dictate policies to the elected governments of the EU, having the neo-imperialist North America at their back.

The masses and the proletariats living in the EU are either less aware of the situation or under influence of an interpellative Capitalist Lie propagated by petty bourgeoisie or “merchants of the status quo” (108) heading the EU who make them believe that “only

European Union is able to guarantee the social rights of all European citizens and to eradicate poverty. Only Europe can solve the problems of globalization, climate change and social injustice” (105). These shameless capitalist lies, Ali believes, are destined to wither away as many anti-EU parties have emerged out of “pervasive loss of trust in the elites”.

Tariq Ali’s evaluation of the EU and NATO is a discourse that can essentially be called Postcolonial and Marxist in nature. He has dedicated a separate chapter for discussion on North Atlantic Treaty Organization in *The Extreme Centre* discussing the history, function and role of NATO with reference to Europe, the United States and the remaining world. The chapter starts with the description of what was discussed during the emergency conclave or held on 5 September 2014 in Wales to discuss how to deal with the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS). While discussing the matter, a significant question was raised regarding hegemony, Eurocentric and neo-imperial nature of the organization: “Should NATO prepare a rapid deployment force enabling it to send in a few thousand soldiers, commandos, backed by air power, wherever it was necessary to defend Western interests and the Global Empire? Or should it scale down its operations and accept that its interventions in Afghanistan and elsewhere had been a failure” (*The Extreme* 109). The question contains strong connotative meaning that NATO is a self-righteous hegemon, responsible to safeguard the Western and interests together with the interests of the US Global Empire against the Others or the rest of the world.

There is a clear indication that NATO’s “imperial impulse” to “exploit” and “civilize” its others is alive and functional and even after the demise of the colonial era and failure in Afghanistan and Iraq, they are ready to embark upon a new “civilizing mission” (Ashcroft, *Key Concepts* 20). NATO’s imperial impulse is more concerned with improving its image as an

essential force in order to interpellate or “make sense to sceptical public opinion” and to do so there is no better way than presenting and stereotyping the ISIS enemies. This process of othering is essential for the existence of the Self in the colonial discourse, the Empire as the Imperial Self cannot achieve value unless it has its Other, the enemy that is to become focus of power (Ashcroft *Key Concepts* 156). By invoking the fear of threat of the enemy, NATO in fact desired to bring in significant policy changes with an aim to further negotiate its neo-colonial position.

NATO was initially formulated to avoid or defend any Soviet aggression but it never fought a war during the Cold War years. It was used mainly for military propaganda and to establish a hegemonic control over its allies, rather than punishing its enemies that did not really exist. Ali sees the inclusion of the Eastern European states in NATO as neo-imperialist expansion of the US after the Soviet collapse since these states became US satellites. He criticizes NATO’s role at the time of the Bosnian war when Serbs brutally massacred the Bosnians as NATO’s bombing started “when the worst of the slaughter had already been perpetrated in Bosnia” and the whole campaign was a nothing but a “dismal failure” (115) as the “Yugoslav army emerged from Kosovo virtually unscathed” (116-7). NATO’s second military adventure was its operation in Afghanistan which was “another spectacular failure” (118) and “an unmitigated disaster” (119) as the situation in Afghanistan became worse after withdrawal of NATO forces.

NATO’s six month’s bombing mission in Libya was not much different. It destroyed Gaddafi government and the infrastructure and installed a comprador, puppet government there to establish neo-imperial control of the region, but the media was frequented by the news “about chaos in Libya from jihadi groups controlling the airports, to the NATO appointed prime minister being removed”. Ali sarcastically puts question “what more striking image of

‘democracy’ than a NATO-created parliament floating on the Mediterranean, waiting for a country to rule?” These brutal hegemonic adventures led to wreckage of a self-made enemy killed thousands and rendered millions homeless. The decision to deploy military to fight ISIS will bring only this much change that “the same people who were sent undercover to fight in Libya will now go openly, wherever needed” (119). The entire purpose of NATO’s creation and existence is neo-imperialist in nature though at times the physical presence of its forces in foreign lands makes it look like a traditional imperial power.

Being handmaid of the US, NATO destroys countries, mostly in the Muslim world, and helps the empire replace regimes in these countries based on lies and false accusations like presence of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs) in Iraq; these lies interpellate the masses at home and abroad in favour of the imperial military action. Ali believes that the decline of the global empire seems improbable in the near future and those who think that its economic problems or the setbacks in South America will lead to a decline soon have little more than wishful thinking. All empires in the history of mankind had their decline but in “false optimism of the US’s imminent decline” the oppositional political forces should not “abandon effective opposition” against the “grand hegemon” (125). The domestic financial and economic problems in the US make it even more violent abroad. The enemies like the Taliban, Gaddafi, Saddam and the Jihadists of the ISIS are presented as savage and horrendous enemies of the world through a strong media used as Ideological State Apparatus. The global media networks controlled and sponsored by the empire are made to propagate that any force that challenges the neoliberal, neo-imperial or capitalist agenda of the empire are “the enemies of the people who should be imprisoned, tortured or exterminated at will” (126). The Eurocentric view is

promulgated through media networks out rightly rejecting any view point that challenges the imperial or neo-colonial discourse.

There is no serious threat to the imperial hegemony of the US. Even the threats imposed by China or Russia through the disputes in Ukraine and South China Sea do not offer any serious challenge to the empire that can develop into a political or military confrontation in the near future: “The global empire is the continued maintenance of US hegemony in a world where new forces are not rising up against it but are certainly challenging it. Russia has defied it in the Ukraine; China is opposed to many US policies in the Pacific. Since NATO acts solely as the European arm of the global empire, other arms are being created in various shapes and forms in the Pacific Zone.” (121).

4.2.2. Neo-Imperial Ideology and Interpellation in *The Extreme Centre*

Tariq Ali resists the ideology propagated by the British politicians in power and critiques how they have maintained their hegemonic control over the interpellated subjects through Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs), particularly the ISA of media. He considers “New Labour” to be Blair’s “most significance ideological success” (*The Extreme* 6). The neoliberal and capitalist ideology was though a “hallucinatory euphoria” yet it was “aided and abetted by a sycophantic news establishment, helped to cement the new consensus” (*The Extreme* 7). Ali calls it a grave “ideological assault”, “ugly”, “brutal”, and “hegemonic” (*The Extreme* 7, 61-68), which can be translated as ‘domination by consent’, in Gramsci’s words. The hegemonic politicians perpetuated their ideological assault by first controlling the BBC. To perpetuate their ideology and to make full use of Ideological State Apparatus of media, they “unceremoniously removed” all those people in the BBC who resisted their ugly, brutal ideology.

Ali comes up with an example of the hegemonic overpowering of the government on the media and using it as an Ideological State Apparatus by quoting a 1983 live conversation between a Bristol housewife Diana Gould and Margaret Thatcher that put an end to live TV phone-ins involving the prime minister. The conversation took place in the background of the Falklands crisis when an Argentinian battleship was destroyed by the British Navy while it was actually sailing away from the Falklands. Thatcher did not like to be questioned on that issue and disliked the overall coverage of the issue considering it “too left-wing”. As a result, BBC was transformed into “the top heavy managerial monster” (*The Extreme* 65). Later, BBC started suffering from an “atmosphere of fear and self-censorship” where “creativity had been suffocated” and “yes-men” were promoted. Ali suggests that the British media cannot come out of the influence and interference of the extreme centre “unless there is an uprising by licence-fee payers” (678) or “a huge revolt from below” (*The Extreme* 99). In Marxist terms Ali appears to be hopeful about an uprising or at least a partial revolution by the proletariat and sees solution of many problems related to the middle and lower classes in active opposition of capitalism and imperialism.

The strong impact of the imperial and neo-imperial ideology has been influencing the subjectivities of the masses of world, including the citizens of the West though the neo-imperial ideology and interpellation. Being subject to the new world order the masses in the West either “became passive spectators or active supporters of the new world order, busy reinventing themselves and rewriting their personal histories, caricaturing the radical upheavals of the past in which some had been enthusiastic participants” (128). They have been subject to commodification and objectifications installed by the capitalist and neoliberal strategies including “explosion of consumerism and celebrity-worship, profit and

pornography” (128). The interpellated subjectivities of the western proletarians are made to believe that the US ideological and military domination would harbinge a golden age. The illusion of progress, prosperity and freedom is marred by the outcomes of the imperial wars and capitalist greed. The cost of the so-called “‘war on terror’ has been much higher than the price of the Vietnam War while the petty bourgeoisie ruling the nations bound with the imperial designs are plundering their resources through corruption. To justify its existence, the empire keeps on making or defining its new enemies. The current new enemies “are either former Islamist allies or new economic partners/rivals who refuse to surrender their sovereignty altogether” (129). Despite its apparent greed, military brutality and capitalist lies, the chances of defeat coming from outer forces like a rising China, Putin’s Russia or rise of political Islam, seem bleak. Ali asserts that the power houses of the US can only be defeated from internal political forces. The neo-imperial ideology has interpellated the subjectivities of its proletariats so much that those who oppose the foreign imperial adventures in the US and Europe are considered either “bad patriots” or “a little more than back-stabbing traitors” (141-2). The moderate Islamist forces of the Arab East being “too happy to accommodate most imperial needs” are playing the role of the comprador class of petty bourgeoisie that has no will to carry out struggle for cultural or economic autonomy by opposing the neo-imperial policies of subduing and plundering the world in the guise of its civilizing impulse.

4.2.3. Forces of Dissent: Subversion of New-Imperial Interpellation.

Tariq Ali, after criticizing the capitalist, neo-imperial, democratic values prevalent in the West, considers Socialist, Marxist ideology, adapted by the Bolivarian leadership in South America, to be the alternative of the exploitative neo-imperial capitalist-democratic system: “the Bolivarian experience, though it is far from perfect, offer a much better model for Europe

and other parts of the world than neoliberalism” (*The Extreme* 178). Ali’s argument revolves around the exaltation of Bolivarian dissent that has the power to subvert the neo-imperial interpellation. He argues that the masses are ruled and exploited by a few elitists who control the wealth and other power centres including the military organizations. The Bolivarian Revolution was a political process in Venezuela led by the revolutionary iconic leader Hugo Chavez, the founder of Fifth Republic Movement and head of the United Socialist Party of Venezuela. The uprising was motivated and named after Simon Bolivar, a revolutionary leader who came to prominence during the 19th century Spanish American wars for independence and under his revolutionary leadership many vital parts of the northern South America got independence from Spanish colonial rule. Chavez’s claim to popularity was due to his efforts to establish popular democracy or Bolivarianism that will put an end to corruption and encourage economic independence ensuring equal distribution of wealth. Chavez made “socialist motherland and victory” to be the slogan of the revolution he was leading (Aponte-Moreno 2012). Chavez utilized military for public service including antipoverty activities, education, distribution of food in slum areas, and mass vaccination instead of using it as a repressive tool. He also introduced government funded health care systems and sporting facilities for the marginalized people in Venezuela. Chavez also planned and implemented to some extent Mission Habitat which provided housing facility with complete social services including healthcare and education. These revolutionary steps taken by Chavez have every reason for Tariq Ali to get inspired and propose a system in Europe and elsewhere in the world that may ensure basic necessities of life to the proletarian masses.

Ali venerates the Cuban revolution and the Marxist ideal of “from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs” which can be achieved through a revaluation or

upheaval and the consequent anti-capitalist structural reforms. Ali has a firm belief that the capitalist, imperialist is doomed though the state machineries are willing to do whatever it takes to save the system. Ali does not see a proletarian dictatorship, as conceived by Carl Marx, after over through of the bourgeoisie; instead, he advocates a revived and overhauled democratic system that is not run by a selfish gang of elites, established as a result of proletarian “movements from below” (175). While reminiscing the Russian Revolution of 1917, Ali believes that conditions in Europe are different from that of Tsarist Russia. He finds Cuban Revolution of 1959 and the struggle of Hugo Chavez of Venezuela inspiring though these movements together with the anti-capitalist Bolivarian struggle in South America was suppressed time and again by the imperialist US and EU and their “media barons of South America” (177). The process that empowered Bolivarian leadership in South America cannot be replicated easily in Europe due to deindustrialization and decline of the old working class. European trade unions and working classes have been demoralized due to privatization and other neoliberal policies. The movements like Radical Independence Campaign in Scotland, Syriza and Podemos, however, are beacon of hope inspirational guide for the European proletariats. Ali while quoting Lenin’s 1913 statement emphasises that oppression alone cannot encourage revolution, both the proletarian and the bourgeoisie should find it uncomfortable to rule or to be ruled in the old way. He believes that radical democracy is not the only solution, it is important to make alliances both on the proletarian and bourgeoisie levels in order to bring about change that will ensure heavy regulation of capital and state ownership of utility services.

4.3. “The Grammar of Deceit”: Interpellation and ISA of Media in *Rough Music*

The idea of interpellation resides in the core of ideology that interpellates its subjects using ideological and repressive state apparatuses. The elites of neo-imperial West do not

openly express their ideological mind-set in order to escape censure from the masses; they wear false-masks and pretend to be the champions of democracy and freedom, instead of being the Christian crusaders invading the Muslim territories. Eagleton, in this regard has provided a clear view of the contemporary neo-imperial politics:

“...the West has not yet quite decided whether it needs to go thoroughly ideological or not, in the sense of engaging in an open battle or rival systems of value. It is an ambiguity mirrored as I write in the Bush/Blair couplet – the former unabashedly ideological, the latter still concealing his penchant for extremist policies under the veil of post-ideological pragmatism. Which of them presages the future of global capitalism?” (Eagleton *Ideology* xvi).

Tariq Ali’s non-fiction *Rough Music* (RM), in this backdrop, is an aggressive attack on the policies of the war mongering political bourgeoisie who bomb cities abroad and control all the Ideological and Repressive State Apparatuses at home in order to maintain their imperial, hegemonic control over their own publics and the publics of the countries they subdue. Terry Eagleton’s statement presents an evaluation of the conflicts of the contemporary world between the East and the West. Pointing rightly opens his review of *Rough Music* in these words: “This is an angry and polemical book. I mean that as a compliment. For how can the social critic write without anger in what Tariq Ali calls ‘these scoundrel times’? Times when governments lie to their people, to drag them against the will and good sense of the majority, into illegal wars in the name of democracy and the rule of law.” (Pointing 470).

The West’s wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, and the Middle East are without doubt ideological; though it is somehow declared in American case and hidden in Britain’s case as they are struggling to control the world on the basis of faith rather than reality. Beyond the conclusion

of the Cold War, America, instead of using its position of power to engage in welfare of its people, initiated a “nakedly ideological politics” and took the world to a new era of conflict and destabilization (xv). Eagleton believes that the new ideological adventurism of the Global Empire neither began with 9/11 nor with the revival of Islamic radicalism. Its roots stem out of the plans made by certain fanatic and dogmatist politicians and intellectuals, led by George W. Bush, to engage the United States into a phase of neo-imperialist ambition (xiii). Graydon Carter in his book *What We've Lost* (2004) quotes words of Hitler's designated successor Hermann Goerin— these words were uttered during the Nuremberg war-crimes trials in 1946—to bring an analogy to what neo-imperialist Bush and his allies did in case of Afghanistan and Iraq wars: “people don't want war...but [they] can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger” (28). An artificial threat was created and made part of the hype created in favour of war both in America and the United Kingdom. Tariq Ali suggests rightly suggests that what happened after 9/11 was only a continuation of the well thought out plan which had been hatched in the minds of the US ideological zealots much before the events of 9/11 and whatever was shown to the world through the ISA of media was nothing but capitalist lie or, as Ali puts it, grammar of deceit.

4.3.1. ISA of Media: Hiding Repression, Interpellating Masses

Terry Eagleton provides multiple definitions of Ideology that interpellates its subjects; among these some are extremely relevant to the study of neo-colonial or neo-imperial discourse: “false ideas which help to legitimate a dominant political power”, “systematically distorted communication”, and “that which offers a position for a subject” (*Ideology* 1). The

falsified ideas are sometimes so strongly internalized by the interpellated subjects that it becomes very difficult for them to realize what they are thinking is imposed by the bourgeoisie ideology. Marx calls this false-consciousness, a consciousness that positions the masses as subjects who do not have the ability to recognize the falsehood of the elitist oppressors. The most effective and powerful ideological apparatus employed by the neo-imperialist regimes in Europe and the US is the media which, instead of being “combative, creative” or “critical” in the “scoundrel times”, has become “loyal” to them (*RM* 64) and helped them spread the capitalist lie or the “grammar of deceit” (15). Media and ideology go hand in hand as spread of ideological falsehood needs to be manoeuvred through effective and speedy communication which is performed by media of all kinds.

The capitalist elites ruling the UK and the US frequently lie to their publics and disrupt the will of the majority by dragging their nations into illicit wars, killing their enemies indiscriminately. Ironically, in their so-called war against terror, they inflict terror on their self-made enemies, violate civil liberties, torture them, imprison them without trial, destroy their cities and murder them in places like Guantanamo, Abu Ghraib, Belmarsh and Woodland prisons (76-84). Torture, imprisonment and physical violence are part of the Repressive State Apparatuses (RSAs) that are used by the Global Empire to subdue and punish its subjects without the chance of being answerable to anyone. These RSAs are backed and supported by Ideological State Apparatus (ISA) of media. Stuart Taylor Jr. in his article “Falsehoods about Guantanamo” describes horrendous details of the ways and means used by the US forces to torture the detainees of Guantanamo detention centre. Quoting many arguments of the US bourgeoisie including President Bush, White House Press Secretary Scott McClellan, Vice President Cheney and Defence Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, Taylor elaborates how these

imperialist elites of the US government lied about the Guantanamo back in 2005. Their argument against the detainees was that they were mostly caught during fight in Afghanistan, though they were not wearing military uniforms. They interpellated them through media of being extremely dangerous terrorists, bomb makers, and would-be suicide bombers. Hundreds of these detainees were released as they were found innocent after long detentions and horrendous tortures. It was later found by reporter and researcher Corine Hegland that majority of the detainees were not captured in Afghanistan, what to say of being captured on a battlefield trying to kill the US soldiers. Most of them were neither Al Qaeda members nor Taliban soldiers and majority of them were not even captured by the US military; instead, they were arrested by Pakistani authorities in Pakistan and later handed over to the US which means they could not be accused of fighting against the US forces. They were detained and tortured on the doubt of association with the Taliban and Al Qaeda only, that too in quite indirect ways. This means that many of them were not dangerous to Americans before being taken to Guantanamo but after years of tortures, brutalities and detention, they might have developed a strong desire to spill American blood. The biggest, interpellative lie was spoken by the Pentagon when they continuously called Guantanamo to be a centre of humane treatment which was contrary to how the detainees were treated in reality. Al-Kahtani, a Guantanamo prisoner, was tortured brutally by dripping water on his head, blasting cold air on him, keeping him awake by loud music, shaving his beard and head, being forced to wear bra, panties and to dance, forced to urinate on his own body, straddled by an interrogator, stripped naked and forced to do many other humiliating acts during interrogation (Taylor Jr. 13-14). These neo-imperialist lies were spoken confidently and repeatedly in front of the Western masses that unconsciously got interpellated, considering them to representation of truth.

The Capitalist lies of the empire allow it to attack, subdue, torture and kill masses in the countries they attack for the reasons other than they present in their ideologically controlled media and even educational, religious and political state apparatuses. They lie to the international community and to their own people in order to interpellate and deceive them about their real agendas that are based on a capitalist desire of looting the wealth and resources of the world. While discussing decline of American anti-Americanism and declining American reputation after the Afghanistan and Iraq wars, Carter quotes Ceres P. Doyo who wrote in the Philippine based *Daily Inquirer* “If I were an American, I would be red-faced. If I were an American citizen, I would write my own individual letter of apology to the world, to the people of Iraq and to the detainees at Abu Ghraib” (289). But instead of being red-faced with shame, the unquestionable ruler of the hegemon, George Bush, in August 2002, proudly asserts his position of being beyond questionability: “I’m the Commander – see, I don’t need to explain – I don’t need to explain why I say things. That’s the interesting thing about being President. Maybe somebody needs to explain to me why they say something, but I don’t feel like I owe anybody an explanation” (Carter 338).

The neo-imperialist elite of the West has successfully interpellated the European journalists. In a socialist flurry of Marxist thought, Ali quotes Carl Marx to criticise these journalists, who were formerly leftists or Marxists, for approving the so-called humanitarian interventions in Kosovo, Baghdad and Afghanistan by saying that “Putrefaction...is the laboratory of life” (423). Marxist contempt for capitalism is also strongly brought forward by Tariq Ali in his criticism of the petty bourgeoisie of led by Bush and Blair and toadyism of the print media in the West (40). The so-called war for freedom or war on terror was not based on a threat to the liberal, civilised western world; it was instead an ideologically triggered imperial assault of

Blair's "muscular Christianity" as Blair is "undoubtedly the most religious Prime Minister that Britain has thrown up since Gladstone" (12). Belsey believes that Ideology is a paradigm through which we experience the world; it is experienced on unconscious level, remains "unquestioned" and is "inscribed in discourse" as well as "taken for granted" (5). Tariq Ali, however, experiences it on conscious level as his hybrid position puts him at the third space where he is at the same time a colonizer and a colonized who experiences Ideology, yet, being a mimic subject, he has the potential of subverting the ideological discourse. The neo-imperial discourse of the contemporary Global Empire is necessarily ideological as "all discourses are ideologically positioned" and cannot be "neutral" (Macdonell 59). Something that Robert Clark had said about the Chinese government's internet censorship policy in his article "Officially Sanctioned Falsehoods" rightly applies to the neo-imperialist ruling elites of the UK and the US who spread the officially sanctioned lies through media's ideological state apparatus that remains loyal to them, especially at the times of war. The masses of the West, much like Chinese masses, "have no ability to filter out lies and misinformation" (Clark 46). The media apparatus of the neo-imperial Global Empire interpellates the proletarian masses at home and abroad by making them believe that the wars they are fighting are legitimate and necessary to perpetuate their so-called freedom by civilizing the uncivilized.

Ali's response, in *Rough Music*, to the illicit wars against the Iraq and Afghanistan is predominantly postcolonial and subversive which defies the neo-imperial, interpellative, ideological discourse of Bush and Blair. He considers these wars to be neo-imperial design of Bush, Blair and their comrades to occupy the foreign lands, loot their resources and replace the defeated regimes with puppet pseudo-democracies that enable them to maintain control over the foreign lands without their physical presence. Carter, speaking from the centre, criticizes

Bush's decision to go to war against Iraq considering it to be a "reckless, unnecessary, and unforgiving decision— to wage a war of choice with a country that was neither an enemy nor a real threat". He suggests that American has lost a lot which could be saved if Bush had not gone to war, "we've lost our good reputation.... We've lost the sympathy of the world following September 11 and turned it into an alloy of fear and hatred. We've lost lives and allies. We've lost liberties and freedoms. We've lost billions of dollars that could have gone toward a true assault on terrorism... in the age of George. W. Bush we have lost our way" (5). Bush and Blair wanted to invade Iraq using Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) as a pretext to pacify the reluctant British masses as a legal justification for the military invasion. Ali has included a Memo on Iraq as an appendix (91-94) to his book *Rough Music* which determines the illicit nature of the Iraq invasion. The memo was issued on July 23, 2002 which was later leaked to the *Sunday Times* in 2005. The memo indicates clear hegemonic intents of the imperial powers to invade and subdue Iraq using one pretext or the other to appease their public: "Bush wanted to remove Saddam, through military action, justified by the conjunction of terrorism and WMD. But the intelligence and facts were being fixed around the policy" (91-92). They had to fix facts through manipulation and falsehood, the capitalist lie that promotes the profit of the bourgeoisie at the cost of the proletarians' wellbeing. They had to had to make up facts based on falsehood because while going through the path of truth they could see that the "the case was thin" since "Saddam was not threatening his neighbours, and his WMD capability was less than that of Libya, North Korea or Iran" (93). The Global Empire had only three legitimate options for justifying the military action: "self-defence, humanitarian intervention, or UNSC authorisation" but none of these three was applicable at the time of the decision which compelled the empire to go through the route of capitalise lie of WMD threat.

4.3.2. Interpellative Propaganda of the Neo-Liberal Discourse

The Grammar of Deceit refers to the Capitalist lies and the Marxist critique of capitalism and its deceitful ways of exploiting the masses by hailing and interpellating them to give benefit to the select few who form bourgeoisie ruling classes in the world dominated by capitalism and neo-liberalism. Tariq Ali, being a socialist and Marxist, criticizes the neo-liberal capitalist policies that were developed during 1980s called monetarism or Thatcherism, later followed by Tony Blair and his successors. The capitalist, neo-liberal ideas also form part of the policies formulated by powerful global organizations including International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the World Trade Organization (WTO). They work on the Global Empire's agenda of controlling and economically subduing the world through apparently attractive but interpellative, false notions of modernisation, progress and economic reform, supported by an Ideologically driven media that terms these policies to be driven by common sense (Harman 4). The neo-liberals tend to revert the economy back to its orthodox position of free trade and least government interference, called economic liberalism in the past, which ultimately leads to decrease and annihilation of social welfare schemes. The contemporary neo-liberal doctrine is necessarily anti-social as it gives full autonomy to capitalists and industrialist through non-interference policy. Capitalists enjoy reduced taxes on profits and high rates of personal incomes, the state-owned social services and industrial units are privatized, taxation controls on imports, regulations on private industries and firms are abolished, and control on financial flow across countries are decreased or removed to provide a more liberal environment to the capitalist bourgeoisie. Tariq Ali contests and subverts the neo-liberal ideology that asserts the significance of removing controls from economic activity believing that the state interventions on economic activities after the First World War led to waste and inefficiency and caused

economic collapse in the Eastern Europe and became major reason for persistence of poverty and backwardness in African and Latin American countries. It is necessary, claim the neo-liberals, to liberate the economic activity from artificial means of control for the betterment of humanity as it will help the capital to flow in a direction where it can be more efficiently used. Privatisation of the state-owned institutions will lead to lesser bureaucratic or trade union controls and improve productivity. The neo-liberal doctrine does not mind the rich getting richer as they believe that the wealth has to trickle down to the poorest and ultimately benefit everyone. Institutions like WTO, IMF and World Bank threaten economic sanctions on countries like Pakistan that if they do not enforce neo-liberal policies of free economic activity they will have to face sanctions. The IMF pressurizes countries to reduce or even abolish subsidies and social welfare programmes and to privatize education, health and other services owned by the government (Harman 4-8). Tariq Ali and other intellectuals of the Marxist left come up with counter propaganda proposing that the neo-liberal policies are devised to benefit influential owners of multinational companies to have greater freedom to invest anywhere in the world and loot the resources from wherever they want and are propagated through all sorts of media mostly controlled by the powerful capitalists. Tariq Ali critically examines the neo-liberal agenda of the Global Empire that emerged after collapse of Soviet Union in form of the new world order which shattered the world peace by imposing wars in Iraq, Serbia, Chechnya, Caucasus, central Asia, the Middle East and Africa. The neo-liberal promise of economic prosperity and revival made to the former Soviet bloc and Eastern European countries proved to be an illusion since it brought economic chaos instead economic prosperity.

Tariq Ali in *Rough Music* suggests that the falsehood, the capitalist lie, related to the WMD propaganda was part of the neo-imperial ideology of the US and the UK. The truth was

manipulated and spread among the masses through the Ideological State Apparatus (ISA) or Media and the Repressive State Apparatus of Law in some cases. When an ex-member of the Weapons Inspection Program and a government scientist Dr David Kelly became the basis of a BBC-story about how the Blair government manipulated evidence related to WMD to sell its decision to go to war, Blair humiliated Kelly publicly. Later, Kelly committed suicide before his appearance before the parliamentary committee. The role of Bush and Blair governments to manipulate truth through the ISA of media is thoroughly discussed in the chapter “The Media Cycle” (RM 25-43). Ali claims that the British media was divided at the time of the Iraq invasion but it was quite unfortunate that on political spectrum, there was no “official opposition” (25) to promote anti-war stance. The majority of the proletarian masses, however, was against the war which was evident from the largest public demonstration in the history of Great Britain during February 2003. The ISA of print media completely backed the “war mongering Labour government” in interpellating the general public through falsehood but the reaction of BBC was complicated. BBC, which formed a major part of the ISA, was supposed to be in favour of the government’s war initiative as both the top authorities at BBC, i.e. Gavyn Davies (Chairman of the Board of Governors) and Greg Dyke (Director General) were considered supporters of the New Labour. Contrary to the expectations, BBC administration annoyed Blair and his “Chief Spin Doctor” (26) Alastair Campbell due the realistic coverage of the great demonstration of February 15 and the composition of audience in BBC’s programme *Question Time* “which were overwhelmingly hostile to the war, reflecting British public opinion” (27) though BBC worked hard to find people who were in favour of the war. The anger was expressed through a letter written by Blair, who was annoyed at the failure of a major part of the ISA for spreading his Capitalist lie or the grammar of deceit, accusing the

BBC administration that it had “not got the balance right between support and dissent; between news and comment; between the voices of the Iraqi regime and the voices of Iraqi dissidents; or between the diplomatic support we have, and diplomatic opposition” (28). Dyke’s response to Blair’s letter could not appease the government as it claimed that the public demonstration was “the biggest ever backbench rebellion against a sitting government by its own supporters” (28) and also pointed out that “on many occasions in my time as director general, the Downing Street press office under Mr. Campbell denied stories that later turned out to be true” (29). Dyke’s statement clearly indicated a solid reason to distrust the government’s official stance due to its habit of spreading falsehood in the past. Later, the blame for death of Dr David Kelley, which was obviously caused by the decisions taken at the Downing Street, was also transferred to BBC. To manipulate the judgement of Dr Kelley’s apparent suicide, Lord Hutton, “a tried and tested servant of the state” (31) was appointed who did his job.

4.3.3. Subversion of Interpellation: Efforts and Hurdles

The interpellative, neo-liberal ideology, satirically labelled by Ali as “Blair’s banana monarchy” (35), sacked both Gavyn Davies and Dyke who had posed a subversive threat to the media ISA of Blair’s neo-imperial discourse. Blair thus used Repressive State Apparatus of legal authority to protect the media ISA and his reputation. Ali satirically calls the “pro-Blair, pro-war, pro-government”, ideologically driven, interpellated media, during the war, to be “the new supportive media” (42) which gave birth to interpellated subjects who truly believed in the elitist ideology and considered “the humanitarian interventions from 30,000 feet over Kosovo and Baghdad” to be impressive.

Ali, quoting the words Edward Said, rightly elaborates the neo-imperial impulse UK and the US to civilize and exploit other nations using false justifications based on distorted facts:

“revisionist justifications of the invasion of Iraq and the American war on terrorism that have become one of the least welcome imports from an earlier failed empire, Britain, and have coarsened discourse and distorted fact and history with alarming fluency” (43). The egotist and narcissist sense of superiority embedded in the neo-imperial discourse does not allow the journalists positioned in the core of the media ISA to admit that the empire has the right to civilize every nation they consider to be backward or nonconformist to the Western or Eurocentric ideology. The British journalists working in the US “don’t have the honesty to say straight out, yes, we are superior and reserve the right to teach the natives a lesson anywhere in the world where we perceive them to be nasty and backward” (43). Ali, through his discussion on the role of media during the Iraq war, postulates that UK and the US together with other European allies form a neo-imperial capitalist power which has drawn clear lines between the centre and the margin and in order to exploit the resources of the weaker nations, they invent false pretences, invade the margin, deceive their proletariat masses to enjoy the liberty of spending the tax-payers’ money to cause mass murder of innocent people in the countries they invade.

The neo-imperial adventures of the UK brought destruction to the country in form of deadly London bombings of July 7, 2005 carried out by four young Muslims. They blew themselves up at the under-ground sub-way and a bus in London, taking fifty-six lives. Ali censures the interpellative denial of the British government and its bourgeoisie that these attacks did not take place due to their involvement in the Iraq-war. The claim of Blair government, i.e. “the regime and its apologists” (*RM* 49), was part of their interpellative strategy or the “grammar of deceit” as not only the public opinion but the intellectual voices of the country also had a clear understanding that the brutal incident took place due to the unjustified war against a stable

Muslim country. The Mayor of London had warned the government, before the unpopular invasion of Iraq, that it would “inflare world opinion and jeopardize security and peace everywhere” (46). Tariq Ali’s response to these bombings was very clearly postcolonial in nature since he defied the imperial assault on Afghanistan and Iraq and the war mongering missions of the Blair government. He openly declared that the so-called war-on-terror was “immoral and counterproductive” as it sanctioned the use of “state terror—bombing raids, tortures, countless civilian deaths in Afghanistan and Iraq—against Islamo-anarchists whose numbers are small, but whose reach is deadly” (47). He asserted that a political solution would have been better than a military one. Ali’s anti-imperialist, anti-colonial stance vividly comes to surface when he asserts ending the occupation of Palestine, Afghanistan and Iraq can put an end to the violent reaction of the Islamo-anarchists around the world. He also terms security measures taken by the British government to be equivalent to reduction of civil liberties for the general masses. Ali rejected the ideological stance of Tony Blair which considered poverty to be the cause of violence and emphasized that the prime cause is the violence of the neo-imperial Western allies carried inflicted upon the masses of the Muslim countries. He disrupts the neo-imperial ideology of Bush and Blair by saying that “the bombing of innocent people is equally barbaric in Baghdad, Jenin, Kabul as it is in New York, Madrid or London” (48). Alan Cowell of *The New York Times* wrote on July 8 that the British Prime Minister had “finally reaped the bitter harvest of the war on terrorism” (49) which was a critical evaluation of Bush’s “poodle” who tried to denounce the incident by calling it a barbaric act against civilization.

The neo-imperial powers follow the footsteps of the colonial powers of the past whose mission was to civilize and exploit the uncivilized barbarians through interpellation, using both ISAs and RSAs. Both Bush and Blair responded to the London bombing in the same way,

calling it an attack on “our civilization” by barbarians (49). The colonial binaries of self and other, centre and margin, civilized and barbarian reappear in the neo-imperial discourse containing the same old desire for control and power. Carter suggests that Bush not only caused division in the world but also divided its own people at home on social, political and economic levels. He seems to suggest that the divide postulated by Marxists has been aggravated in the US society by the actions taken by Bush administration; “Bush promised to be a uniting president, not a dividing one. The truth is, he has polarized the country in ways not seen since Vietnam or before: rich against poor, right against left, South against North, the middle against the coasts” (Carter 325). Tariq Ali’s postcolonial response to the neo-imperial intents and actions of the West disrupts the interpellating ideological discourse of the empire by arguing that the so-called barbarians attacked Madrid and London, not Paris or Berlin, for the obvious reason of what went on in Iraq. The neo-imperialist, “civilized” war mongers led by Bush and Blair did not even bother “to count the Iraqi dead” (49). The civilization called *our* by the Westerners is no doubt valuable and everything related to the civilization or progress of civilization should be held precious yet the Western world needs to realize the truth behind their so-called civilization as “it was itself established by violence – by fraud, invasion, revolution, extermination and the like – and that this brute force was then sublimated into the very powers which currently protect it: law, armed forces and the like” (Eagleton *xii*). It does not mean that violence carried out by the bombers should be accepted or justified, yet it calls for an understanding that the so-called civilization should also realize the presence of violence at its own core. The neo-imperial design of hegemonic occupation is replete with use of violence against falsely-created-enemy forces and civilians of the countries they attack. Their ideology interpellates these enemies through ISA of media and education by propagating their

stereotypical images of violent people, extremists, terrorists and barbarians who have to be annihilated from the face of earth to protect the civilization. There is a need to counter the ideology propagated by the neo-imperial discourse to unveil the truth about the excesses of the neo-imperialist power as “the very forces that are intended to subdue chaos are secretly in love with it” (Eagleton *xii*).

Despite the fact that the masses continued to oppose war and believe that the London attacks were an outcome of the involvement of the west in the unjustified wars, the media and government ministers continued to negate the fact that there was some association between the ferocious attacks in Baghdad and Afghanistan and the bombings in London. The arrogant imperialist Tony Blair carried out with the capitalist lie and the grammar of deceit and asserted on 26 July that the British policy on Iraq, Afghanistan and its support for Israel and American had nothing to do with London bombings. It was despite the fact that the foreign office had clearly more than a year before the bombings that anger was rising in the Muslim community in Britain. Michael Jay, the Permanent Under-Secretary at the Foreign Office had warned the Downing Street in a despatch to Sir Andrew Turnbull. He asserted in his letter that apart from disadvantage, discrimination and exclusion, British foreign policy in Iraq and the Middle East was causing anger in the younger generation the British Muslims which might lead them to extremism.

The neo-imperial discourse and the interpellation it caused among the Muslim communities residing in the west clearly suggested that the Islamic fundamentalism was directly responsible for the extremist and terrorist attacks like the ones took place in Madrid and London. Tariq Ali subverts this ideological stand point propagated by the empire and its state apparatus of media by referring to a study on suicide terrorism carried out by an American academician Robert

Pape, from University of Chicago. Ali suggests that the British bourgeoisie must go through this study to amend their views about terrorism and its causes. Pape, after analysing hundreds of suicide attacks, postulated that there was hardly any connection between religious fundamentalism and suicide terrorism. The goal of these bombers is strategic and secular than religious. Pape rejects the postulation of most of the western imperialists that religion is the root cause of such attacks, though it is a tool used by many organizations to recruit terrorists, and postulates that the recurrent objective behind these attacks, suggested by Pape in his analysis, is to “compel modern democracies to withdraw military forces from the territory that the terrorists consider to be their homeland” (51). Ali unveils the hypocrisy and double standards of the Western media by pointing out the “price tag” (52) it places on citizens of the Western countries and on countless people murdered on the orders of the brutal imperialists Bush and Blair. The purpose of discussing the cause, asserts Ali, is not to justify what was done by the bombers in London but to make Blair confront what is widely viewed by masses and intellectuals alike i.e. the role of Britain in the Middle East, Afghanistan and Iraq and its insistent support for the wars initiated by Israel and the US.

Ali’s satire on the self-righteous, ideologically driven, imperialist Blair regime is made obvious in the title of another chapter of *Rough Music* “A Public Execution ‘In Good Faith’” (RM 55-65) which deals with the savage execution of Jean Charles de Menezes, an innocent Brazilian young man on the Tube train station on July 22, 2005 when he was mistakenly taken as a terrorist. He was a poor electrician, going for work in the morning when his head was drilled with seven bullets shot by special force officials on “shoot to kill” orders. Ali criticized the officials who gave the brutal shoot to kill orders and the way those shooters pounded eleven bullets into his body when he was not even resisting and was completely in control of the

surveillance team who had grabbed him. The commissioner of metropolitan police Sir Ian Blair shamelessly lied that Menezes had link to terrorist activities and he was under surveillance. The ideologically driven media, the Ideological State Apparatus of the Blair regime, also came up with deceitful stories about how he was wearing a heavy jacket for which he was spotted as a terrorist and got killed where as in reality he was wearing a light jacket. In a vein of satire, Ali criticizes the “the loyal media” for spreading the bourgeoisie ideology that the shooters carried out the execution “in good faith”, in a country where “capital punishment is forbidden”, as if demanding “an even greater, blinder faith” from the general masses (64). The media falsely blamed that Menezes jumped through the barrier and ran from police whereas it was contrary to the fact as he used his pass to cross the barrier and calmly entered the train and sat on a seat peacefully. The print media also came up with falsified head lines like “Bomber Shot Dead on the Tube” and “One Down, Three to GO” (59). The public and “premediated execution” of the Brazilian man who had South Asian features, concludes Ali, can only make the dark-skinned individuals stay away from the tube instead of deterring suicide bombers.

4.3.4. Interpellative Binaries and the Way Forward

The self-other and centre-margin binaries vividly portray the imperialist and neo-colonial agenda of the ruling Blairite elites when they phrase out their anger in terms of we/you, us/them binaries and place the Muslim communities, the Asian races and everyone else that is not white British at a marginalizing distance created by a process of othering. Tariq Ali, in a postcolonial flurry of thought, subverts such statements and expressions by calling them mantras of “Anglo-Saxon politicians” that are “shrouded in untruth” and are constantly repeated. One such mantra of falsehood is “We shall not permit these attacks to change our way of life” and “our values” (*Rough Music* 67). The capitalist regime creates interpellated savage images of mad

fundamentalists who represent uncivilized ideology and are determined to destroy everything touching modernity, democracy and “our” British values. This imperial ideology is then propagated through the Ideological apparatuses of media through its loyal components to explain the proletarian masses why it is necessary to restrain civil liberties to maintain freedom. The curbing of civil freedoms on the pretext of terrorism is seen as a neo-imperial design aiming at hegemonic control of its own proletarians and the proletarian and comprador classes of weaker nations abroad. Ali disrupts the ideological agenda of the Blairites quoting Lord Hoffmann that restricting civil liberties would be more damaging for the British society than terrorism itself. The repressive policies of the government are an effort to mask the truth that the terrorist attacks in Britain had everything to do with British policies and actions in the Middle East, Iraq and Afghanistan. The laws related to preventive detention, restraining the right to silence, pre-emptive strike, invasion of privacy, restrictions on asylum seekers, incarceration without trial, and intensifying the use of identity cards were proposed by the Blair government. This kind of repressive policies were used by former colonial powers to keep a stern hegemonic control over the imperial subjects but the same laws were proposed for implementation in Britain that would lead to, Ali suggests, a new form of authoritarianism.

Tariq Ali’s conclusive remarks in the final chapter of the book are again postcolonial or anti-imperialist and Marxist in nature. He sees solution to the terrorism issue in Britain in withdrawal of Britain’s troops from Afghanistan and Iraq “not because it is under terrorist pressure, but because these interventions were wrong in the first place” (85) being based on neo-imperial agenda of domination and exploitation and the colonial discourse of civilizing and exploiting the uncivilized and the weak. The ideological state apparatus of religion is considered by Ali to be an important component of the ideological manoeuvres of the British

government that officially sponsors religion by fostering single-faith schools. Terry Eagleton in “Introduction to the 2007 Edition” of his book *Ideology: An Introduction* quotes some highly ideological remarks of the novelist Martin Amis who warns his people of the alarmingly high rate of increase in the Muslim population in Europe and in highly marginalizing tone asserts, “we’re just going to be outnumbered” (Eagleton x). He urges that the Muslim community must be made to suffer by curtailing their liberties, deportation, or strip-searching everyone who looks like the Arabs and Pakistanis in order to hurt them so much that they “start being tough to their children” (x). Eagleton condemns this statement and argues that how would the Westerners feel if the Yemenis or Saudis strip-search them on sight and deport them as the Westerners have murdered much more Arabs as compared to the people who died in the World Trade Centre. He further argues that if Martin Amis is strip-searched in some Arab country he would say that all Westerners do not wish to harm the Arabs, there are only a few who are Islamophobic. Amis’ statement is laden with racism and stereotyping of the Muslim community when he recommends humiliation and insult indiscriminately for all those who look like Arabs or Pakistanis “so that they will return home and teach their children to be nice to the White Man” (xi). The statement seems to spring from the colonial discourse that establishes the binaries of East/West, Black/White or Civilized/Savage.

More than one-third of the state-owned educational institutions are single-faith-religious while their number is increasing as the government is permitting more secular schools to be handed over to the Church of England. Britain, Ali rightly suggests in a Marxist strain of thought, is resided by Muslims, Hindus, Jews, and even the non-religious people who have as many rights as Christians have. Religion, therefore, should be taught “as comparative history” (85). Ali also criticizes the Ideological State Apparatus of Media and its efforts to spread the

neo-imperialist ideology that interpellates the Muslim community by presenting “good Muslims” on TV and other media “arguing that violence is not advocated in the Koran and therefore the bombers are wrong” which ironically implies that if Koran had permitted such acts, it would have been fine. Ali disrupts the imperialist ideology that marginalizes the Muslim community and presents them as interpellated subjects by saying that “Establishing a religious criterion” in the circumstances faced by Britain can be “counter-productive” as Koran has both “pacifist” and “violent” readings while The Old Testament is replete with invocations of torture, revenge and rape. He raises a subversive question: “what if some young Muslims convert to the oldest and purest monotheist faith and start to implement the prescription contained therein?” (86). Tariq Ali’s critique of the neo-imperialism of America and its satellite Britain cannot be summed up better than in the following paragraph:

Britain needs to quit its role as automated adjutant to Washington’s neo-imperialism and develop a rational, independent foreign policy. A central plank of this must be an economically, politically and militarily viable Palestinian state, with full state rights. The linkage to the US-Israeli expansionist project in the Middle East has been a disaster not just for Britain but for the whole region, Israel included. Anglo-American governments’ build-up of Islamic fundamentalism in Pakistan, Afghanistan and elsewhere in the 1980s had produced a catastrophe; they have learnt nothing from it. Now they have launched a war against Islamism that is producing an even greater catastrophe—and still they are incapable of learning from it. (*Rough Music* 86)

4.4. Conclusion

Tariq Ali’s nonfictional works *Rough Music* and *The Extreme Centre* provide ample discussion on the adverse effects of neo-liberal, capitalistic policies practiced by the elites of

the UK and the US. Tariq Ali has maintained his non-conformist stance in both the works and has criticized the neo-imperialist stance of the West that has caused plenty of unrest and bloodshed in the world. Both the works thematically reverberate Lenin's words: "our main efforts should now be concentrated on explaining to the proletarian masses their proletarian problems" (Lenin 1964, 111). He quite vocally raises his voice against social and economic inequalities created by the anti-social, neo-liberal approach. Ali's Socialist stand point is articulated through his stance against the ways of the contemporary democracies in Europe, America, Canada and Australia that are corrupt and instead of serving the needs of the common people or the proletarians, the parties in power are serving the needs of certain special interest groups that interfere the political processes through spilling money into the democratic processes for lobbying. Ali has a genuinely subversive and Marxist view of the society and politics in the United Kingdom where the US-like politics and a hegemonic, exploitative ruling bourgeoisie is keeping the proletariat deprived by using the ideological state apparatuses of media and education and making them believe that their interests are the interests of all. Tariq Ali sums up his critique of the Western ruling elites by warning that that if the capitalist economic crises are not overcome, smaller nations like Scotland, Kurdistan, and Catalonia will take advantage and will look for stronger bids for freedom. Apart from this, many Socialist, anti-capitalist, and Left-wing movements having Marxist-Leninist or Maoist elements including Syriza (in Greece) and Podemos (in Spain) will get stronger.

His work *Rough Music* provides a violent attack on the policies of the war mongering political bourgeoisie of the West who bomb cities abroad and control all the Ideological and Repressive State Apparatuses at home in order to maintain their imperial, hegemonic control over their own publics and the publics of the countries they occupy. Tariq Ali's response to the

wars initiated by the neo-imperial western powers, in Afghanistan and Iraq, is clearly postcolonial and anti-imperialist in nature. He disrupts the neo-imperial ideology of Bush and Blair by refuting the usefulness of war and equating their bombings of the innocent people in Baghdad and Kabul with the terror attacks in Madrid and London.

CHAPTER 5

SUBVERSION OF NEO-IMPERIAL INTERPELLATION IN TARIQ ALI'S FICTION

5.1. Introduction

This chapter critiques three fictional works written by Tariq Ali in light of the post-colonial theory and more specifically the Althusserian notions of ideology and interpellation. The postcolonial notions of allegory, palimpsest and appropriation have been explored to decipher Tariq Ali's subversive techniques that he utilizes to recover the image of Islam and the Muslims, damaged by the interpellative practices of the neo-colonial powers. Before we analyse Tariq Ali's subversive strategies, used in his fictional works, we need to review the background in which he decided to defend Islam and the Muslims in his fiction.

In the texts of *The Islam Quintet* under discussion, Ali disrupts the interpellative, Eurocentric stereotypes using subversive strategies of reversing the binaries, valorising the marginalized and in some cases even hybridizing the centre and the margin. By presenting the Islamic version of the history, Ali successfully disrupts the interpellative myths and allegories of colonial hegemony by recovering the re-inscribed identities and representations in the cultures of Jerusalem and Moorish Spain at carefully and meaningfully chosen points of time in history. The native narrators are given voice and the marginalized characters are empowered to reverse their marginalized position. In order to challenge and destabilize the interpellated image of Islam, Ali methodically reverses centre/margin and self-other binary by recovering the true identities and allegorical images of the two sides in *The Islam Quintet*.

5.2. *The Islam Quintet* and the Need to Subvert Neo-Imperial Interpellation

Kamila Shamsie, in her article *Defending the Faith*, suggests that Ali decided to write *The Islam Quintet* after being confronted by a comment, loaded with neo-imperial orientalism, during the Iraq war, that “Muslims have no culture”. Ali decided to subvert this colonizing gaze by presenting grandeur of the Islamic culture during various historical epochs when “learning and culture were synonymous with Islam—and appreciated as such by the most enlightened Christians” (Shamsie).

The novels included in *The Islam Quintet* were written both pre and post-nine-eleven, yet they all serve the purpose of subverting the interpellated image of the Muslims and Islam, though the need for these subversive writings had increased many-folds after the nine-eleven incident. The imperialist, capitalist elite of the United States, after the nine-eleven terror attacks, exploited the opportunity quite immediately and embarked upon a military crusade that later destroyed Afghanistan, Iraq and badly effected many other countries including Pakistan. President Bush grasped the opportunity quite timely and in his address on 20 Sept. 2001, he indicated the ambitious imperialist agenda and interpellated the masses in favour of war by saying that the terrorist networks were present in more than sixty countries of the world and all those countries that harbour the terrorists would be considered hostile regimes. Foster believes that it was the beginning of the deadliest phase of imperialism by the Western power elite. While the British justified their imperial violence as a benign white man’s burden, the Americans even refused to accept the existence of an empire by saying that by attacking other nations and killing numberless people, they were in fact defending the cause of democracy, justice, and freedom in the world (Foster). The satirical words written by John T. Flynn in 1944 about the US imperial designs still remain highly relevant to the contemporary world affairs:

“The enemy aggressor is always pursuing a course of larceny, murder, rapine, and barbarism. We are always moving forward with high mission... to regenerate our victims while incidentally capturing their markets, to civilize savage and senile and paranoid peoples while blundering accidentally into oil wells or metal mines” (222). The destructive imperial doctrine takes its root differently in different minds, believes Flynn; there can be economic, religious, racial, political, and commercial reasons behind the imperial adventures or at times there is just a quest for glory. Flynn however, concludes that the core reason behind such adventures is always economic but the reasons that are made public for the sake of propagandist and interpellative debate are always ethical (222). Marranci, in this regard argues, the Bush administration deliberately magnified the threat, creating interpellative panic through propaganda in order to achieve its imperial, expansionist goals. The interpellative propaganda resulted in demonization of the Muslim community living in America, Australia and Europe. To enhance the impact of fear and to further interpellate the masses in favour of the neo-imperial designs, the power of al-Qaida was overemphasized through exaggerated accounts of their abilities (Marranci 5). The interpellation of the Muslim community as an extremist people, dangerous enough to be allowed to live in the civilized West. Many controversial laws were introduced in the guise of antiterrorism security measures in Europe and Australia which made the life of the Muslim communities even more difficult (Tufail and Poynting). In reality the terrorist attacks had very insignificant impact on the citizens of the Western countries; the impact was more serious though at the political front which was created by the Western ruling elites themselves (Marranci 5).

Tariq Ali’s anti-imperial, postcolonial stance remains consistently alive throughout his fictional and non-fictional works. The effort he puts in to recover the image of Islam in the

Islam Quintet is more directly and more vividly pronounced in his non-fictional work *The Clash* (2002) where he subverts the interpellated and hailed image of the Muslims and Islam. The West, he portends, falsely accuses Islam of spreading the religion by sword. He articulates that the Muslims of the Arabian Peninsula were not just driven by a fervent desire of entering paradise, rather their motivation also lay in the material comforts that came in the form of war exploits and booty but, unlike Christians, they did not conquer lands to kill all those who were not Christians or who refused to become Christians (15).

Tariq Ali posits in *The Clash* (2002) that in the contemporary world only the Muslim community has been interpellated as being fundamentalist but looking critically at various religions and ideologies of the world it can be said that the problems faced by humanity are because the clash of fundamentalisms; many fundamentalist regimes are fighting for their hegemony over the resources of the world. The world ruled by contradictory beliefs and societal organisms. Capitalism, socialism, communism, anti-imperialism, and anti-communism are for or against some standard characteristic of reality. Ali further argues that the power of ideology and ideological state apparatuses has interpellated the journalists and intellectuals in favour of the Empire, who once used to criticize the imperial and neo-imperial acts of the United States. Sweeping generalisations are drawn from incidental or trivial occurrences, and many leading American and supporting European journalists have abandoned unbiased observation and independent thinking in favour of an imperial super patriotism (281). US pundits are repeatedly on the vantage point for indication that things are not as good abroad as at home, and broadcasting from the numerous garrisons of the Empire – London, Sarajevo, Riyadh, Cairo, Lahore, Seoul, Tokyo – they crave in chorus for the acquainted American legitimacy they have left behind. Those Americans – Gore Vidal, Susan Sontag, Noam

Chomsky, amid many others – who refuse to obey by drawing attention to some of the flaws of the empire are cruelly condemned by the super-patriots. In an ideologically charged atmosphere, “Criticism of the US foreign policy is treated as displays of ‘anti-Americanism’ or, in more recent coinage, ‘Occidentalism’ (282). Tariq Ali, thus, feels a strong need to subvert the interpellated image of Islam created by the neo-imperial Western rulers. In his effort to do so, he took the challenge of writing *The Islam Quintet* wherein he endeavours to recover the image of Islam and the Muslims.

Tariq Ali’s subversive strategy against, interpellative practices of the neo-imperial powers, in his fictional works predominantly relates to the concept of allegory. Allegory represents actions and situations in a narrative through symbols and forms a prominent literary feature of a text. In postcolonial context, allegory presents a significant opportunity to disrupt colonial and imperialist notions of history and representation. Imperial discourse represents literary symbols, paintings and statues as allegories to assert imperial hegemony. In postcolonial discourse a counter strategy of disrupting these allegorical representations is used by appropriating colonial allegory and using it to respond to the imperial allegories of hegemony. Aijaz Ahmad critically looked at a statement made by Fredric Jameson that “third-world texts are necessarily... allegorical...they are to be read as...national allegories” (Jameson 69) for its homogenizing nature while Stephen Slemon (1994) considered it to be Eurocentric and considered it valuable for conducting postcolonial counter-discourse by reading the colonial texts. A postcolonial study of allegory can be carried out to disrupt or contest the imperialist or Eurocentric versions of history that interpellates its subjects through the allegorical means of mis-representation and stereotyping. Certain texts that do not even directly deal with any specific colonial situation can be explored for colonial ideology and interpellation through

study of allegory. Moreover, postcolonial study of allegory can also seek to evaluate monolithic cultural traditions in order to replace them with cross cultural pluralism. Ashcroft postulates that “a postcolonial allegory contests and disrupts the narrative assumptions of colonialism such as the inevitability of ‘development’ of progress, of ‘civilization’, the dominance of the chronological view of history, the Eurocentric view of ‘the real’” (Ashcroft *Key Concepts* 8). Postcolonial allegory can therefore be very effectively used as a strategy of subversion and resistance against the interpellative practices of the neo-imperial discourse.

Tariq Ali’s fictional works present subversion of neo-imperial interpellation, allegory and palimpsest that either erased history of the Muslims or (mis)represented it in allegorical terms in order to interpellate the masses of both the Western countries and the Muslim world. The historical fiction produced by Tariq Ali in form of the Islam Quintet containing a set of five novels taken from various vital historical moments of the Islamic history; these are: *Shadows of the Pomegranate Tree* (1992, quintet 1), *The Book of Saladin* (1998, quintet 2), *The Stone Woman* (2000, quintet 3), *A Sultan in Palermo* (2005, quintet 4), *Night of the Golden Butterfly* (2010, quintet 5).

5.3. Subversion of Neo-Imperial Interpellation in *A Sultan in Palermo* (2005)

Tariq Ali’s subverts the interpellated image of Islam and the Muslims by challenging the neo-colonial interpellative allegory in his novel *A Sultan in Palermo* (2005). First and foremost, Ali, in this fictional work, challenges the interpellative historical knowledge of the colonizers and revives vital moments of Islamic history in order to contest, subvert and re-present the image of Islam through postcolonial allegory and revival of the erased/re-inscribed historical images. This re-inscription of the image of the Muslims and Islam also aims to subvert the neo-imperial interpellation that demeans the Islamic culture by portraying it to be

something void of tolerance, inclusiveness and peace. Islam's mythical, allegorical and interpellative image, which presents it as a religion that is a threat to the West, having followers who are barbaric, extremists and uncivilized, is recovered through postcolonial allegory of Islam that subverts the interpellative image and puts it back to the position of a religion of peace and harmony.

The first step in Ali's subversive strategy is the choice of time and place. He deliberately picked certain specific moments from the history of Islam when Islam and the Muslims had been contributing significantly to both the material and moral progress of the mankind. While dealing with the events that relate to encounters between the Arab and the European cultures. The novel offers a site of cultural harmony and pluralism; it also reveals Ali's own hybrid subjectivity where he can be located both at the colonized and the colonizer's space. He deliberately blends-in ethnic groups of Arabs, Asians, Europeans and Africans, offering allegorical images that stem out of historical accounts of Islam, Christianity and Judaism. His attempt to restore the interpellated, erased/misrepresented images and identities positions him as narrator who is retelling the historical accounts of the colonized, in order to decolonize Eurocentric, interpellated accounts of history. *The Sultan* is also an attempt to rightfully contextualize the recent encounters between the neo-imperial powers and their interpellated *Others* in the Middle East.

Tariq Ali has elaborated the dynamics of Western stereotyping and interpellation of the Muslims or any other regimes who hinder in the way to the imperial or neo-imperial control in his non-fictional work *Speaking of Empire and Resistance*, jointly written with David Barsamian. Ali rightly censures the interpellative stereotyping of the Western imperial elites in these words:

It's total failure of the Western imagination that the only enemy they can see is Adolf Hitler.... Gamal Abdel Nasser, the nationalist leader of Egypt, was described by British prime minister Anthony Eden as an Egyptian Hitler.... Saddam Hussein became Hitler when he was no longer a friend of the West.... The Croatian fascists and the special SS-recruited brigades in Bosnia and Kosovo that had fought for Hitler are rarely mentioned. Now al Qaeda and the Taliban are portrayed as Islamo-fascists. The strong implication is that Osama bin Laden is Hitler, even though he has no state power at all (2-3).

Tariq Ali's most significant postcolonial expression against neo-imperial interpellative allegory and Palimpsest appears in *A Sultan in Palermo* in form of the last words spoken by Amir Philip, a hybrid character, before he is sentenced to be burnt in fire to satisfy the Christian Barons who believed that he under the guise of his conversion to Christianity, he is still a Muslim. The Christian barons interpellated their Sultan through ISA of politics and compelled him to punish the Amir, though he was very close to the Sultan's heart. Interestingly enough the last words of Philip seem to present an allegory of Saddam Hussain's hanging after the fall of Baghdad and Amir Philip's words seem to be Saddam's address to George Bush before he was hanged: "we were your strength, we gave you the courage to be independent, our learning, our language, our culture enabled you to boast that you were superior in every way to your poor cousins in England" (103). Both Amir Philip and Saddam Hussain became victims of the neo-imperial elite that was able to interpellate their masses through their false interpellative propaganda.

Tariq Ali's project of retelling the history, in his fictional and non-fictional works, provides him ample space to showcase events and incidents from the pages of the golden ages of Islam

to subvert the interpellated image of the Muslims by subverting and even reversing the colonial binary of civilized-savage. He accomplishes this by relating historical events where the Muslims were much more powerful and civilized than Christians or Jews while the Christians were uncivilized and barbaric. In *The Clash of Fundamentalisms* (2002), he portends that there was a time when, after the conquest of Spain and its surrounding areas, Muslims brought civilization to an utterly uncivilized Europe. Tariq bin Ziyad, the young and prominent lieutenant amassed 7,000 men to take on the shores of Europe on April 11, lending his name to Jabal Tarik in the process. This remarkable feat happened in less than a century after the death of the Prophet. In the same way, Tariq bin Ziyad successfully defeated King Roderick in July that year winning the hearts of the beleaguered locals in the process (35). Under the Muslim rule, Cordoba was a centre of civilization, culture and knowledge, headed by the enlightened caliph Abderrehman III. It was a time when there was darkness and ignorance in Europe, thus, the Muslim Cordoba's only fitting competitor was not a European metropolis, as one would expect; rather, it was the Eastern city of Baghdad, the centre of the Caliphate in Mesopotamia (*The Clash* 35).

Tariq Ali subverts the Eurocentric, interpellated image of the Muslims, being an uncivilized people having an inferior or no culture, by revealing various facts from history that disrupt the colonial binaries of colonizer-colonized and civilized-savage by revealing the greatness of the Muslims as rulers of Spain and meanness, treachery and barbarism of the Christians at the time of the re-conquest of Spain. The greatness of the Muslims is revealed through the description of a time when the centre of civilization was the capitals of the two Islamic Empires, Cordoba and Baghdad that were famous for "their schools and libraries, musicians and poets, physicians and astronomers" (35-6).

The neo-imperial powers also interpellate the Muslims to be an intolerant and extremist community. Ali, in a defensive mode, subverts this interpellation by revealing that the religious tolerance and harmony, in the Muslim Spain, were of a high degree. So much so that scholars from various religions held debates on various scientific, philosophical and religious issues, providing a clear evidence of Islam being a tolerant religion, which was not imposed on the subjects of the regions ruled by Muslims. Cordoba had the edge in dissent where even secular and interfaith debates were in vogue. The fact that Islamic hegemony was not forcibly imposed had led to genuine debates among the three religions, producing an Andalusian synthesis from which native Islam benefited a great deal. The city became notorious for its dissenters and sceptics. In Baghdad, they would speak half in admiration, half in fear, of the ‘Andalusian heresy’. The Andalusian passion for experimentation can also be seen in some of its architecture (*The Clash* 36). The Christians of that time, in a clear contrast to the Muslims, behaved in a more fundamentalist, uncivilized manner, particularly, during and after their conquest Granada in 1492. They not only killed every single soldier of the Muslim army but also carried out a complete “ethnic cleansing of Muslims and Jews from the Iberian Peninsula” (37). Thus savagery, ignorance, and fundamentalism were the Christian traits while knowledge, civilization, and religious tolerance belonged to the Muslims; hence, the contemporary interpellation of the Muslims, spread through ISAs of religion, media and education, as being terrorists, fundamentalists and uncivilized is neither rational nor justified.

A Sultan in Palermo is the fourth instalment of the *Islam Quintet* which was published in 2005, i.e. at time when Ali also published his non-fictional work *Rough Music*, which was a critique of the Bush/Blair united force that was well into its neo-imperial adventure of bombing Iraq and Afghanistan and killing countless innocent Muslims through their air and

ground strikes. Bush and Blair interpellated their own countrymen and the rest of the West by levelling false accusations against the Muslims and creating unjustified fear among their publics. Thus, *A Sultan* was written at a time when the Muslims, their history, their culture and their religion were subject to defamation and attack and there was a dire need of recovering the deformed, tattered image of the Muslims by providing a counter narrative. Tariq Ali did this quite successfully in *A Sultan*.

The novel is set in the medieval city of Palermo in and around the year 1153. Palermo was one of the major cities of the Moorish Spain, much like Cordoba or Baghdad that were places where culture and civilization flourished. The city is retaken by the Christians and the Norman Sultan Rujari or King Roger II is the Christian ruler of Palermo though the city is still dominated by the Arab cultural and linguistic influence. King Roger feels proud in using the title of Sultan and surrounds himself with Muslim, Arab intellectuals. In mimicry of Muslim Sultans, he has a *harem*-like household, where he keeps several concubines. His household is administered by a team of eunuchs, much like the Arabian or Turkish harem. He is not well and the Christian ecclesiasts, expecting his death to be near, are expecting to grab the power.

The plot is woven around Muhammad al-Idrisi, a cartographer, his love affairs, and his friendship with the Sultan. The novel is set in Palermo, at a time when perhaps the Muslim ruler al-Muwahiddin had more chances of getting Tariq Ali's attention in terms of his military or political hegemony in the area; yet Ali deliberately makes the Sultan of Palermo his centre of attractions, suggesting that a multi-cultural world stemming out of cultural and ideological tolerance and harmony, containing the Greek, Jewish, Christian and Islamic cultural interactions, had much more express than a space dominated by the Islamic culture

alone. The multiplicity of cultures and the harmony is later destroyed when various religions pull apart violently from each other due to certain followers from each religion including Muslims.

Postcolonial spirit of Tariq Ali's discourse is vividly brought forward in *A Sultan* when he disrupts the interpellation and dismantles the re-inscribed Palimpsest and neo-colonial allegory by emphasising on the greatness of the Muslim civilization of Sicily where Arabic culture advanced so much that even the Christian kings had idealized it and adopted many aspects of it including the very titles they bore. Ali suggests that love for learning, knowledge and research was so deep among the Arabs that despite opposition of certain scholars, a group of translators and transcribers was appointed to translate the works of pagan Greek philosophers, scientists and poets such as Galen, Pythagoras, Hippocrates, Plato, Socrates, Aristotle and al-Homa/Homer into Arabic language. They were not allowed to produce more than three copies for each work. Yet al-Idrisi's paternal-grandfather managed to produce and hid a copy of Homer's poetry in a secret chamber in the Palermo library while the rest of the copies were placed in the Baghdad library (*A Sultan* 6). This bit of information is given to one of the major characters Al-Idrisi by his father who later discovers these secret translations hidden in a secret compartment at the library of Palermo. Sultan Rujeri of Sicily is one of the central characters in the novel who is al-Idrisi's friend and patron and discusses various matters including al-Homa's poetry, Rujeri's contempt for the Crusades and various aspects of the Arab statesmanship. The colonizer/colonized binary is disrupted yet again when the Sultan expresses his contempt for England and agrees that it is a "land of perpetual winter in the Ocean of Darkness" (41). Like the *Shadows of the Pomegranate Tree*, *A Sultan in Palermo* presents a Christian ruler who—though under compelling

circumstance—prefers violence instead of tolerance in his dealings with the Muslims. Both the novels begin with a time when religious and cultural tolerance were prevalent which suggests that religious harmony, at least among the people of the book, is possible in presence of wise and just rulers. These violent incidents caused by the Christians clearly disrupt the interpellated image of Islam and the colonizer/colonized binary of the neo-imperial ideology spread through its media apparatus by suggesting that Christians had always been a more violent people as compared to the Muslims who are being targeted for being violent and barbaric in the contemporary world.

Al-Idrisi's mother tells him how his grandfather, "a venerated mathematician of Qurtuba, had been publicly stripped of his dignity and put to the sword, together with eighty other scholars" by a special breed of Christians, "the zealots who killed in the name of religion", who "feared knowledge more than death" (*A Sultan* 3). The Christians press the dying Sultan to teach Muslims a lesson and advise him to "destroy all the mosques in Palermo because they are breeding grounds of rebellion" (30). The Christians are described as cruel and violent since "the cross that marks their shields is the colour of blood" (53). Ali reverses the binary of civilized/barbaric to reveal the historic truth that there was a time when the Muslims were learned, scholarly and civilized while the Christians were barbaric, illiterate, barbaric and extremists.

5.3.1. Al-Idrisi's Cartography: A Disruptive Tool against Interpellation

Al-Idrisi is a representative of the Muslim civilization of Spain created by Tariq Ali to subvert the interpellated, misleading image of Muslims in the Western neo-imperial ideology. He is so much fond of knowledge and learning that he cuts himself off from all his friends, family and even lovers for more than a year only to satiate his thirst for learning so

that he could stay in the Palermo library and concentrate on his research, suggesting a general love of knowledge among the Muslim scholars of the time. He is given the title “*Abu Kitab*”, the father of the book, and “*Amir al-Kitab*”, commander of the book (9). He not only studies Homer’s poetry but also goes through “the Arabic translations of Herodotus, Aristotle, Galen, Strabo and Ptolemy” (10). Al-Idrisi is a geographer and a physician who maps the world, discovers new places and cures for diseases. The role of mapping played by the colonizers for centuries is inverted in postcolonial subversive discourse of Ali by assigning the role of a cartographer to the colonized. Al-Idrisi’s ambitiously expresses his desire of mapping the world in front of the Sultan “if the Sultan permits I would like to write a universal geography. I will map the world we know and seek out the lands still unknown to us” (10). Mapping, in postcolonial theory refers to a very subtle activity carried out by the colonizers that signified not only their power and authority over the lands of the *Others* but also their desire to explore and occupy more lands, particularly the ones rich in natural resources, and subjugate more people.

Maps and mapping are dominant practices of colonial and postcolonial cultures. Colonization itself is often consequent on a voyage of ‘discovery’, a bringing into being of ‘undiscovered’ lands. The process of discovery is reinforced by the construction of maps, whose existence is a means of textualizing the spatial reality of the other, naming or, in almost all cases, renaming spaces in a symbolic and literal act of mastery and control (Ashcroft *Key Concepts* 31-2).

Al-Idrisi’s desire to map the world and discover new lands makes him a very complex character. He is a Muslim, a representative of the Muslim empire, of a dominant culture and civilization of the time, yet living in a space ruled by a Christian King, though he is too

hybrid to represent Christianity of that time. Though King Roger II is a ruler, yet he wants Al-Idrisi to map the world, probably because he knows that the world beyond his small Palermo is controlled by the Muslim civilization and Al-Idrisi, being a Muslim, is most apt to do the job. Cartography provides Al-Idrisi a symbolic mastery and control of a colonizer, that the Muslim caliphs of the time objectively had. Through Al-Idrisi's cartography, Tariq Ali also accomplishes the task of disrupting the interpellated, re-inscribed image of Islam by suggesting that Islam has the capability to rule and lead the world of knowledge, research and exploration. Moreover, he suggests that there was a time when the Christian rulers relied on knowledge and research of Muslim scholars and cartographers and were so much inspired by the Islamic culture that they proudly spoke Arabic language, wore Arabic dresses and called themselves Sultans.

5.3.2. Interpellation, Interculturality and the Hybrid Space

Hybridity in the postcolonial discourse is associated with Homi K. Bhabha's of the relationship between colonizer and colonized. Bhabha stresses on the interdependence of colonizer and colonized and "mutual construction of their subjectivities". Bhabha also suggests that "all cultural statements and systems are constructed in a space that he calls the 'Third Space of enunciation'" (Ashcroft *Key Concepts* 118). *A Sultan in Palermo* is replete with hybrid characters that, perhaps, are deliberately introduced to highlight interculturality and the possibility of co-existence among people of different faiths, quite contrary to the interpellating ideology popularized by the contemporary neo-imperial powers that demonize Muslims and demean their culture. Tariq Ali, while telling the story, himself enters into the hybrid space of enunciation. Ali's hybrid inclinations, however, at times makes him oscillate between the roles of a colonizer and a colonized. Presentation of Al-Idrisi's sensuality is

more positions Ali at the place of an Occidental painter, looking at the Oriental as a place overflowing with sensuality. Characters like Al-Idrisi are present in every fictional work written by Ali, characters that are overcome by a passion for sensuality and making love with women. Presence of such characters in his fiction, makes Ali look more like an Orientalist author who interpellates the Eastern people for being overwhelmingly sensual, rather than intellectual. Al-Idrisi repetitively has a dream that he and his mistress Mayya—who is Rugari's columbine and his daughter Elinore's mother—are laying "naked in each other's arms after making love" (4). The elements of atheism also make Ali's fictional discourse hybrid, for instance, when al-Idrisi is thinking about various aspects of Christianity and Greek mythology and his vessel arrives near the shores of Palermo, he hopes that "Poseidon willing, they would reach Palermo without another storm" (4). While discussing astronomy with his closest friend Ibn Hamid, he expresses his atheistic fears "if what he thought was true then al-Quran was mistaken and if al-Quran was mistaken, who had made the mistake? Allah or his Messenger?" which makes Ibn Hamid fear that "his friend might be charged with blasphemy" (5). In an atheistic spirit, while thinking what he should write on the first page of his book, he questions himself "why should he start *In the name of Allah, the Beneficent...* just like every other scholar in his world" (5) and why not "in the name of Satan" (13). The indecisiveness remains there for a long time but in the end, he decides to put something non-religious on the first page of his universal geography, something that perhaps an atheist would write to begin a book, "The earth is round like a sphere, and the waters adhere to it and are maintained on it through natural equilibrium which suffers no variation". Yet he decides to put this on the first page of his personal copy; for a public copy,

“he would praise Allah, the Prophet, the Sultan and anyone else who had to be flattered” (17).

In *A Sultan* Ali presents hybrid characters of Sultan Rujari and Muhammad al-Idrisi to subvert the binaries of colonizer-colonize offered by the colonial discourse, mainly to disrupt the neo-imperial interpellation concerning Islam. The Sicilian leader is a Norman Christian but necessarily has characteristics mimicked from the Arab or Muslim culture; he can speak Arabic, enjoys hybrid titles of King Roger of Sicily and Sultan Rujari, and keeps a *harem*. His son Guillaume is so hybrid a character that the Sultan considers him to be someone who “feels and thinks like an Arab” and would “anger the nobles” for being “imbibed” in the Arab culture (40). He respects Muslim scholars like al-Idrisi and prefers “to ignore the Pope and rely, instead, on the loyalty of his Muslim subject” and advisors (*A Sultan* 11). Among the most venerated Muslim advisors was Younis al-Shami, his tutor and a sage scholar who taught him algebra, astronomy and Arabic.

Sultan Rujari, in a hybrid vein, expresses his thoughts, based on a desire for religious and cultural harmony, in front of Idris that he “would hate the Popes to take Sicily, or the English or the Crusaders” because he fears that “if they do, everything we have created will be destroyed” and that everything is nothing but the beauty of the cultural and religious harmony (40). Rujari’s hybrid nature in the last years of his life makes the barons and ecclesiasts of Palermo to doubt his loyalty with the Christian faith due to his unusual favours for the Muslims and their cultural values and they demand a proof for his loyalty to the Christian faith in form of one of his closest Amir, Philip al-Mahdia’s head. Sultan Rujari’s son William, Amer Philip al-Mahdia and Mayya are hybrid in their own way. William is Rujari’s son, a Christian prince, but “he has mastered” the “language of *al-Quran*” and “has

admitted to his tutors that he would like to convert” to Islam (58). Amer Philip al-Mahdia—sultan *al-bahr* or the naval chief and the most powerful person after the Sultan though he is brutally burnt later in the novel for being a Believer in secrecy— is a Muslim with all his sympathies with the believers though most people know him by the name Philip and many believers do not even know he is a Muslim. Mayya, Rugeri’s concubine and Idrisi’s wife, was a Muslim before she was brought to Rugeri’s palace to become his concubine. She converts to Christianity to please Rugeri but after her reunion with Idrisi, she converts back to Islam in order to marry him. These characters oscillate between the positions of the colonizer and the colonized throughout the narrative, much like Tariq Ali’s own position as a postcolonial diasporic author living in Britain.

A Sultan in Palermo ends with very meaningful thoughts of al-Idrisi who decides to go to Baghdad “the city that will always be ours. The city that will never fall”. Baghdad, thinks al-Idrisi, is a centre of civilization where “the Caliph was a patron of thinkers and poets” (6). Baghdad’s enlightened people and its grandeur provides a sharp contrast to the way the neo-colonial gaze of the Global Empire visualized Baghdad at the time of bombing the city after the 9/11. The Christian Sultan of Palermo believes in religious harmony, tolerance, and multiplicity of cultures, yet, before his death he is compelled to make a compromise with the extremist Christians and lets them burn the most powerful Muslim Amir of Palermo. Ali’s most significant postcolonial expression against neo-imperial allegory appears in the eleventh chapter of *A Sultan* which is in form of the last words spoken by Amir Philip before he is sentenced to be burnt in fire to satisfy the Christian Barons. Interestingly enough the last words of Philip seem to present an allegory of Saddam Hussain’s hanging after the fall of Baghdad and Amir Philip’s words seem to be Saddam’s address to George Bush before

he was hanged “We were your strength, we gave you the courage to be independent, our learning, our language, our culture enabled you to boast that you were superior in every way to your poor cousins in England, which was only the truth” (103).

This disruption of colonial allegory also successfully displaces the binaries of self/other, civilized/savage, and centre/margin and presents Islam as a paradigm or world view that is capable of guiding rational, pragmatic and modern theories and practices in all walks of life. The Arab researches on various epistemic areas including philosophy, mathematics, medicine and astronomy were taken to various parts of Europe that enlightened the European nations.

The Western allegorical images of Islam in the contemporary world represent Islam to be a religion based on extremism and intolerance. Ali suggests, through the character of al-Zindiq in *SPT*, that a political system based on Islamic principles can lead to social, cultural and political development of a state. Sentiments of group solidarity, loyalty and affiliation to a common cause leads a Muslim society towards progress and development. Contrary to the allegorical, stereotypical view of the colonial discourse, Ali presents the Islamic civilization as a powerful structure that has the power to bring social, cultural and political change to help develop a state. The stereotypical image of women and gender relations in Islamic civilization is based on colonial allegory and erased, eradicated and re-inscribed history. This Eurocentric version based in colonial discourse, presents the allegory of the Muslim female in form of an image that is suppressed, degraded, weak and inferior to men, having no role to play in social, economic, cultural or political levels, limited to the enclosed environment of the harem.

Tariq Ali, having a postcolonial background, has successfully appropriated the language of the colonized through cultural mimicry to subvert the colonial allegory and re-inscribed historical images of Islam and Muslim subjectivity. Appropriation is an important postcolonial strategy of articulating the cultural and social identities or asserting cultural values of the colonized/formally colonized people by taking over certain aspects of colonial language, literature, theatre or culture (Ashcroft *Key Concepts* 19). This strategy can also be used to subvert the cultural or political hegemony of the colonizers or neo-imperial powers. Appropriation of aspects of the dominant language and its various forms is an important anti-colonial strategy used by Tariq Ali in his fictional works which has helped him to spread the cultural values of the colonized to a wider audience. Ali has achieved linguistic hybridity and transculturality in his novels with an aim to equate the centre with the margin or intermingle them to enhance the value of the language of the colonized.

Tariq Ali's *A Sultan in Palermo* (2005) presents subversion of colonial allegory that either erased certain history of the Muslims or (mis)represented it in allegorical terms. The novel is an effort to revive avital moments of Islamic history in order to contest, subvert and re-present the image of Islam and Muslims through postcolonial allegory and revival of the erased or re-inscribed historical images by challenging the historical knowledge and archival documents of the colonialists. While dealing with historical events that relate to encounters between the Arab and European cultures, *A Sultan in Palermo* (*A Sultan*) offers a sight of cultural harmony and pluralism.

The novel also reveals Ali's own hybrid subjectivity where he can be located both at the colonized and the colonizer's space. His narrative contains heterogeneous multi-ethnic characters blended in the Middle-Eastern social fibre. His characterization blends-in ethnic

groups of Arabs, Asians, Europeans and Africans offering allegorical images that stem out of historical accounts of Islam, Christianity and Judaism during the Moorish rule in Spain and the conquest of Jerusalem by Saladin during the twelfth century. His attempt to restore the erased or misrepresented images and identities positions him as narrator who is retelling the historical accounts of the colonized in order to decolonize history and historical identities. Islam's mythical, allegorical and stereotypical image, which presents it as a religion that is a threat to the West having followers who are barbaric, extremists and uncivilized, is recovered through postcolonial allegory of Islam that puts it back to the position of a religion of peace and harmony.

A Sultan is also an attempt to contextualize the encounter between the neo-colonial empire and its Others in the Middle East in the backdrop of the contemporary clashes between the two. The hybrid nature of Ali's own subjectivity and that of his characters is revealed by the fact that the agenda of his historical project in the novels is to oppose both the fundamentalisms of the East and the West and to create a space for tolerance between the two.

5.4. Subversion of Interpellation in *The Book of Saladin* (1998)

The Book of Saladin provides the other side of the picture, where Muslim forces reconquer Jerusalem under the leadership of legendary Sultan Yusuf Salah al-Din after defeating the Crusaders. Salah al-Din's struggle to unite the world of Islam for reconquering Jerusalem from the Christian Crusaders has been narrated many times in the history but mostly from a Eurocentric view point. The postcolonial allegorical and nature of the work can be vividly seen through the pages where the author consistently disrupts the Eurocentric versions of interpellative ideology and allegorical images while presenting Europeans as invaders who are

barbaric, liars, murderers of women, children, Muslims and Jews and defilers of the holy places.

Tariq Ali, while writing *The Islam Quintet*, is clearly in picture of the interpellative image and mis-representation of Islam and Muslims in the West. Many other Western scholars, such as Feffer, are also conscious of the fact that the Western neo-imperialist power elites spread an interpellative image of the Muslims using various ideological state apparatuses, particularly, the ISA of media. Feffer points out, in this regard, that a false fear of a Muslim conquest of Europe in an effort to establish a worldwide Caliphate is deliberately spread by the neo-imperialist elites of the West to interpellate their masses in favour of a distorted image of the Muslims. Feffer compares the contemporary clash of Christianity and Islam with the Crusades that started after the conquest of Jerusalem by the Seljuk Turks in 1095. The Crusades remained continued in some form until the fall of the Ottoman Empire in 1924, a time when the Islamic Caliphate was also abolished. The second phase of the Crusade has begun which Feffer calls Crusade 2.0, in form of destruction of Iraq, and the longest war fought by the US forces in Afghanistan (Feffer 12). The difference between the two Crusades lies in the fact that during the eleventh century Crusades, hordes of necessarily barbaric European Christians were contesting a much-advanced Islamic civilization and in doing so, they prevented the possibility of developing a peaceful interrelationship. Likewise, the contemporary Crusade is also creating a gulf between the Muslims and the West while taking countless lives, wasting money and resources and distorting the worldview of the Western people through neo-imperial interpellative practices (30). Islamophobia is the strongest form of interpellative technique used by the Western media and political elite to make it easier for them to wage wars against the Muslim countries. Islamophobia, like any other phobia, refers to “an irrational fear of

Islam” and Islamophobes “see terrorist *jihad* under every Islamic pillow. They break out in a sweat at the mere picture of a minaret or *imam*” (19-20). This kind of interpellative (mis)representation enhances the intensity of Islamophobia among the publics of the West.

Tariq Ali, in his non-fiction too brought to light, the vivid contrast between the Muslim and the Christian attitude at the time of victory over each other, in his fictional and non-fictional works. Both in *The Book of Saladin* and *The Clash*, he disrupts the interpellated image of the Muslims by revealing that the Muslims behaved in a much more civilized manner during the conquest of Jerusalem, despite the fact that the Christian Crusaders killed every single Muslim and Jew living in the area, at the time of the Christian conquest in 1099. Ali describes the mass murder in the following words:

The Scale of the massacre traumatised the entire region. The killing lasted two whole days, the end of which most of the Muslim population – men, women and children – had been killed.... The Crusaders... made sure that every single Jew was burnt to death.... Exactly nine hundred years after these atrocities – among the worst crimes committed by religious fundamentalism – the Pope apologised for the Crusaders” (*The Clash* 40)

The re-conquest of Jerusalem by the Muslims, after 88 years of the Christian conquest, presented a stark contrast:

Saladin’s long march finally ended in victory. Jerusalem was taken in 1187 and once again made an open city. The Jews were provided with state subsidies to rebuild their synagogues. The churches were left untouched. No revenge killings were permitted. Like Caliph Umar five hundred years before him, Saladin proclaimed the freedom of the city for worshippers of all faiths.” (*The Clash* 42)

Tariq Ali, thus, successfully disrupts the civilized-savage binaries of the contemporary neo-imperial powers, that interpellate the Muslims as being savage, by going into the historical facts. The Crusaders were so much interpellated by their religious leaders that they considered Muslims and Jews to be the people who do not deserve to be left alive, as if annihilating them from the face of the earth was the greatest good assigned to them by their leaders. The conquest of Jerusalem by the Christians, posits Ali, was necessarily an imperialist agenda. After the Christian conquest, mass bloodshed hit the entire region, the assassination of Muslim men, women and children lasted for more than two days. The Jews and Muslims fought side by side, but when the Crusaders entered the city, there was chaos. They set fire and burnt all the Jews. The bloodshed revisited the peaceful territory during the twentieth century when the Ottoman Empire weakened in many areas of the Middle East including Jerusalem. This time the bloodshed was caused by the Zionists, proving once again that the followers of Islam were the most peaceful people who maintained peace in the holy land for more than seven hundred years. The Zionist, in the twentieth century, damaged Jerusalem again, as they fought to make it exclusively a Jewish territory. As a result, there was bloodshed and the people were carried away forcefully (*The Clash* 42-3).

The story of *The Book of Saladin* (1998) offers a moral to the contemporary leaders of the Islamic world that they should stop fighting over petty differences and work together for unification. While disrupting the Eurocentric allegory of the colonized Arabs and other Muslims being uncivilized, Ali re-establishes the image in form of a postcolonial allegory by presenting Saladin as a wise, tolerant leader who united people of the book including Jews, Christians and Copts under his tolerant leadership. Sultan Salah al-Din's scribe and historian Yakub is also a Jew who is asked by the Sultan to write a realistic history of his rule and

personal life which would provide a contrast to the official history written by the Muslim scholars. Yakub enters into close circle of Saladin's acquaintances and even becomes his advisor towards the end of the novel. Presence of a lesbian women in the *harem* and homosexual males in the novel suggest Ali's intended disruption of the interpellative and allegorical view of a Muslim society being intolerant towards sexual liberties.

An example of Islam's tolerance for other religions and vice versa is the creation of Israel in 1948 and its aftermath. Tariq Ali, in *The Clash* (2002), criticizes this unfortunate creation of the Zionist state in the heart of the Middle East. The event of creation of Israel was perhaps the greatest neo-colonial tool for controlling the whole Middle East through the Zionists. The Zionist operation in Palestine had an interpellative impact on everyone. Though the people from Egypt, Iraq, Saudi Arabia and Syria were not as strongly moved as the Palestinians but the grievance was felt by everyone. The earlier shared culture of Muslims, Christians and Jews in Arab was now a victim of severe rupture which later became identified as '*al-nakhba*', the disaster. Ali laments that "what till then had been a common culture for Muslim, Christian and Jewish Arabs had now suffered a serious fracture, a profound rupture" (87). The triumph of Zionists objected Arab modernity and it was even doubted by some authors whether the permanence of Arab prevalence in history was questioned forever. Tariq Ali came to Britain in 1960s and met many Marxist Jews including Ygael Gluckstein. Gluckstein once told Ali: "You know why does the West need Israel?" He would ask, and demand answering himself: "oil, oil, oil. Do you understand?" (88). The neo-imperial powers always portray a moral reason for being violent to other nations to interpellate people in favour of their imperial designs but in the core of their imperial adventures lies a lust for power and resources. In contrast, the ancient Muslim civilization behaved much differently.

In *The Book*, Saladin's enlightened and civilized identity, contrary to the neo-imperial interpellated image of Muslims, puts him into centre when it is contrasted with the barbaric killings of women, children, Muslims and Jews by Christians. Islam's interpellated, allegorical and stereotypical image, which presents it as a religion that is a threat to the West having followers who are barbaric, extremists and uncivilized, is recovered through postcolonial allegory of Islam that puts it back to the position of a religion of peace and harmony. Saladin takes steps against the evil of nepotism that destroyed the Umayyad and Abbasid Caliphates and introduces a new system based on wisdom of merit that could be controlled by an advisory body called Council of the Wise. He unveils his desire for establishing the council during a discussion:

I often ask myself how it has happened that strong rulers usually leave behind weak dynasties.... The dynasties established by the Umayyads and the Abbasids have led to disasters. Sultans and *vizirs* nurture the growth of kingdoms for their children, but what if their children are incapable of ruling.... I sometimes think we should have a Council of the Wise consisting of men like al-Fadil and Imad al-Din. (*The Book* 131)

The Western interpellative and allegorical images of Islam in the contemporary world represent Islam to be a religion based on extremism and intolerance. Contrary to this, Saladin's system of governance, which resembled democracy to some extent, resolved the complexities involved in the traditional system of hereditary succession by introducing a modern, wiser consultative method of determining succession and making important decisions.

Book of Saladin also asserts the value of women in Islamic societies unlike the historical accounts of colonial allegory and Palimpsest of erased or re-inscribed historical accounts that either ignore the presence of women or present it as an objectified sensual body enclosed in

the bounds of the harem. Ali explains in the “Explanatory Note” that “The women—Jamila, Halima and all the others—have all been imagined. Women are a subject on which medieval history is usually silent. Salah al-Din, we are told, had sixteen sons, but nothing has been written about their sisters or mothers” (*BS* xiv). Kalim, in *BS*, imagines Halima to be his objectified property who later becomes an object of sensuality for Saladin. Tariq Ali through presentation of such characters disrupts the ideological interpellation and colonial allegory inscribed in imperial Palimpsest in form of gender stereotypes of the Muslims. Ali accomplishes this by enriching Halima’s character through her relation with Jamila. Halima, whose mind is kept alive due to Jamila’s thoughts (*BS* 94), identifies the gap between a women’s image as an objectified individual and her mental faculties as an intellectual being. She admires Jamila for her enlightened views about women: “I was exhilarated when she started talking about us in a very bold way. Not us in the harem, but us women” (94-5).

The *harem* is not a boundary beyond which women cannot influence society; they are portrayed as individuals that can defy the patriarchal realms of the male dominance through their creative and intellectual faculties. Jamila’s rationality and modernist ideas are used as tool by Ali to disrupt neo-colonial interpellation by subverting female stereotypes of the colonial discourse and its Palimpsest. She studies Ibn Rushd and teaches his rationalism to her fellow women in the *harem*. She edifies Ibn Rushd’s understanding of the attributes of the female gender while quoting his remark:

One of the problems of our great religion is that we exclude half the population from enriching our communities. Ibn Rushd once remarked that if women were permitted to think and write and work, the lands of the Believers would be the strongest and richest in the world” (*The Book* 126).

She makes Saladin think about the dignity of usefulness of women outside the homestead so seriously that he says,

There are some who argued this during the time of the Caliph Omar. They told him that our Prophet's first wife, Khadija, was a trader in her own right and she hired the Prophet to work for her, sometime before she married him. After the Prophet departed, his wife Aisha took up arms and fought, and this was accepted at the time. (126)

Saladin believes that Jamila's person has defied the typical womanhood as her knowledge and understanding makes her look like a man.

Tariq Ali subverts the neo-imperial interpellation and colonial allegory by disrupting the self-other and centre-margin binary in *The Islam Quintet*. He defies the boundaries of the centre and the margin by intermixing and hybridizing the attributes of the self and other with the help of tools like genealogical mixing of multiple ethnic or religious hereditary lines; by doing this he dims and disrupts the very notion of self and other and introduces cultural pluralism. *The Book* offers a situation where believers of various religions and decedents of various ethnic families get united under the leadership of Saladin. Jews, Christians, Copts or the people of the book share many common cultural attributes which leads the way to tolerance and harmony and strengthen Saladin on his voyage for liberation of Jerusalem. Saladin also avoids attacking Tyre because he did not want to kill his friend Raymond of Tripoli who was hiding in a fort there. *Shadows* (1992) also offers hybridized genealogy like *The Book*, providing a good source of interculturality that can be used to brake the interpellative image of separation of the two great religions. The al Hudayl family, in *Shadows*, defies the monolithic cultural representation as it has an intensely hybridized genealogy having Jewish, Christian, Arab, and Muslim decedents in their family tree.

5.5. *Shadows of the Pomegranate Tree* (1992): A Subversive Text

Tariq Ali's fiction is necessarily anti-colonial and subversive in nature as he focuses on subverting the interpellated negative image of Islam in his fiction. Ashcroft's position on anti-colonialism and subversion truly applies to Ali's fiction: "anti-colonialist movements often expressed themselves in the appropriation and subversion of forms borrowed from the institutions of the colonizer and turned back on them" (*Key Concepts* 14). Tariq Ali while utilizing the colonial form of literary writing i.e. fiction, successfully appropriates the language and medium of fiction and uses it against the neo-imperial discourse to subvert the interpellative, stereotypical image of Islam, popularized by the colonial and neo-colonial ideology.

Shadows of the Pomegranate Tree, published in 1992, focuses on a significant moment in history, beginning seven years after the re-conquest of Grenada by the Christians and ends about twenty years later with an account of the same Spanish people planning to plunder Mexico. The novel deals with issue of how the Christians broke their promise of cultural, religious and linguistic tolerance which was made at the time of the conquest. Christians destroyed knowledge base of the Muslim civilization by systematically burning up their books and libraries and compelling the people to convert to Christianity.

Waterman (2016) introduces *Shadows* by saying that the novel relates "the struggle of those Muslims who were trying to preserve Islamic culture and their own material wellbeing in the face of the Inquisition" (153). The incidents of the plot surround a Muslim family of Banu Hudayl that had migrated to Moorish Spain from Damascus many centuries ago. The great culture they built during all this time is now being destroyed by the new Christian rulers Ferdinand and Isabella after their occupation of Granada. They face a critical situation where

they have two choices, both hard to accept; they must either convert to Christianity or leave Spain. The family head Umer is under pressure from his brother who is a Christian convert and wants Umer to convert too, in order to protect the property their family possesses. Nevertheless, most of the families are brutally murdered by Cortes who, later in the novel, goes to plunder America. The book contains plenty of Arabic words showing linguistic appropriation by the author. A glossary of Arabic words is also added in the end.

The novel covers large historical material and an exalted subject matter which makes it an epic and offers a view of history which is devoid of the colonizing European gaze. Ghani and Saeed (2016) have carried out a postmodern analysis of *Shadows*; they posit about *Shadows* that “on the one hand, it subverts the ‘us-them’ binary which accounts for the ‘writing-back’ it sets to achieve and on the other hand it also challenges the traditional historiography” (279). They further portend that *Shadows* “eulogizes Muslim cultural superiority and ends the tale on a note of moral victory of the Muslims population. The text attempts to undo the European historical constructs” (280).

Ali’s fictional works subvert the interpellative, re-inscribed history and Eurocentric allegory by claiming the right version of truth. Novels of the *Islam Quintet* contains multiple para-textual forms including Prologues, Epilogues and Author’s Notes which relate and perpetuate fact and fiction and add to the realism of the narrative. *Shadows* also includes the family tree of a Moorish family Banu Hudayl which contains names, dates and places matching the historical facts and figures. The prologue in the *Shadows* contains description of the historical events related to burning of the books in Granada in the end of 1499 which is an effort to exalt the status of Islam as a religion that promotes knowledge while challenges

the claim of the Europeans that Christianity is an enlightened religion and Christian people did go through phases of history when they were brutal and uncivilized.

Muslims, in the contemporary world, are subject to ideological interpellation and stereotyping by the imperial and neo-imperial powers. Muslim identity is linked with terrorism, mayhem and bombings, whereas, on the contrary, Muslims are the people who suffer the most both due to terrorism and the imperial wars. Tariq Ali strongly feels the need to disrupt this interpellation by presenting an alternative view of history. While quoting the Syrian poet Nizar Qabbani in *Bush in Babylon*, Tariq Ali points out the gravity of interpellation done by the West: “terrorism is the word used by oppressors to defame a national liberation struggle” in Palestine. He quotes lines from Qabbani’s poetry to subvert the interpellative image of the Muslims constructed by the neo-imperial powers:

We are accused of terrorism
 If we defended our land
 And the honor of dust
 If we revolted against the rape of people
 And our rape...
 If the US Senate
 Enacts judgement
 Decrees reward and punishment. (10-11)

Qabbani’s subversion of interpellation gets so strong that he goes on to say that he supports terrorism, giving the logic that the barbaric new world order has compelled the Muslims to defend their homelands from imperial aggression:

I am with terrorism

As long as the new world order
 Wants to slaughter my offspring
 And send them to dogs. (11)

The neo-imperial elites of the West have interpellated their own masses by promoting a negative image of Islam as a religion that was spread by the sword. Tariq Ali not only subverts this image but also presents historical facts that imply that in fact Christianity was spread by sword, not Islam. In *The Clash* (2002) Ali claims that history has many examples that show that the core of Islamic civilization brings peace to the people that are ruled by the Muslims and it attracts conquered people to embrace Islam. When the Muslim armies conquered various parts of India:

Mass conversions began to take place. Disaffection with the local religion and the simplicity of Islam must have played an equal part in this process. Muhammad's combination of a monotheist universalism and the equality of all believers before God was an attractive formula to those burdened with caste systems and religious hierarchies" (44).

Tariq Ali subverts the neo-imperial interpellation by suggesting that the Ottoman Empire too provided a great example of how the Muslim civilization supported an environment of religious tolerance and harmony in the territories under its control: "The Ottoman state, which lasted five hundred years, was a remarkable enterprise on many levels. It was a multi-religious state with the rights of Christians and Jews recognised and protected" (*The Clash* 46). Ali finds it ironical that the Jews that were forcefully exiled from Portugal and Spain were given refuge by the Ottomans who not only got settled in Istanbul but also served the Muslim Empire in Damascus, and Baghdad. It was not just the Jews who were provided a safe abode by the

Ottomans, “Germans, French and Czech Protestants fleeing Catholic revenge-squads during the wars of the Reformation were also given protection by the Ottoman Sultans” (*The Clash* 46). The subjects of other religions and ethnic groups were treated so well that “Circassians, Albanians, Slavs, Greeks, Armenians and even Italians often rose to occupy the highest offices of the empire” (47).

In *Shadows*, the acts of barbarism and savagery, contrary to the neo-imperial interpellation, are linked with the Christian conquerors who remorselessly exterminate their enemies, force them to convert, and burn their books and libraries publicly. Historical figures exalted by the Western historians are reversed to be everyday people, unworthy of being exalted. The best example of Postcolonial allegory is presented in *Shadows* where Juan, the carpenter entertains Yazid Ibn Umar by carving caricatures of historical Spanish figures on chest showing them as black and monstrous. Ferdinand appears like a satanic figure with a pair of horns on his head and Isabella is painted as a blood sucking creature with red lips. Inquisition monks, famous for their barbaric punishments, together with Spanish knights are demonized and caricatured through allegorical signs and figures.

Ali’s fictional works subvert the neo-imperial interpellation carried out through re-inscribed history and Eurocentric allegory by claiming the right version of truth. Novels of the *Islam Quintet* contain multiple para-textual forms including Prologues, Epilogues and Author’s Notes which relate and perpetuate fact and fiction and add to the realism of the narrative. *Shadows* includes the family tree of a Moorish family Banu Hudayl which contains names, dates and places matching the historical facts and figures. The prologue in *Shadows* contains description of the historical events related to burning of the books in Granada in the end of 1499. In *Shadows* and other four novels of the series, Ali disrupts the Eurocentric stereotypes

using subversive strategies of reversing the binaries, valorising the marginalized and in some cases even hybridizing the centre and the margin. By presenting the Islamic version of the history, Ali successfully disrupts the interpellative myths and allegories of colonial hegemony by recovering the re-inscribed identities and representations in the cultures of Jerusalem and the Moorish Spain at carefully and meaningfully chosen points of time in history. The native narrators are given voice and the marginalized characters are empowered to reverse their marginalized position. Ali methodically reverses centre-margin and self-other binary by recovering the true identities and allegorical images of the two sides in *The Islam Quintet* novels. Disruption of colonial allegory also successfully displaces the binaries of self-other, civilized-savage, and centre-margin and presents Islam as a paradigm or world view that is capable of guiding rational, pragmatic and modern theories and practices in all walks of life. The Arab researches on various epistemic areas including philosophy, mathematics, medicine and astronomy were taken to various parts of Europe that enlightened the European nations and “paved the way for the Renaissance” (*Shadows 2*)

The conversation between Umar and Don Inigo very well disrupt the self-other binary of the neo-colonial interpellative discourse. Umar asks Inigo “I came, if you want the truth, to discover what your plans are for dealing with us” (68). Don Inigo quite honestly responds that, contrary to the agreement made at the time of the conquest, the Court and the Church have ordered aggressive action against the Muslim population; hearing this, Umar regretfully says “If we had used our iron fists to deal with Christianity the way you treat us now, this situation might never have arisen,” Don’s response to this puts Muslims at a higher moral pedestal providing a good example of disruption of the colonizer-colonized binary: “Instead you attempted to bring civilization to the whole peninsula regardless of faith or creed. It was noble

of you and now you must pay the price” (68). Don Inigo also tells a priest that Muslims deserve a better treatment because they treated the Christians and Jews well when they were the rulers of Spain:

They have ruled over a very large portion of our peninsula. They did so without burning too many bibles or tearing down all our churches or setting synagogues alight in order to build their mesquitas. They are not a rootless phenomenon. They cannot be wiped out with the lash of the whip. They will resist. More blood will be spilled. Theirs and ours. (*Shadows* 62-63).

Shadows offers cross-cultural friendships in Ibn-Farid and Don-Alvaro and Don-Inigo and Umar-bin-Abdallah. Count Don Inigo’s hybridized character epitomises plurality of culture and cross-cultural harmony. While talking to Umar, he emphasizes the inevitability of Moors and Jews for Spain by saying that:

My entourage consists of Jews and Moors. For me, a Granada without them is like a desert without an oasis. But I am on my own. The Church and the court have decided that your religion must be wiped out from these lands forever. They have the soldiers and the weapons to ensure that this is done. (*Shadows* 68)

He also claims that he was against the burning of the Moorish heritage of books but despite being Captain-General of *Gharnata*, he could not stop the act since he could not “challenge the will of Queen Isabella” (*Shadows* 68) Umar bin Abdallah passes a frustrating remark by saying, “If we had used our iron fists to deal with Christianity the way you treat us now, this situation might never have arisen.” Inigo did not deny this, instead he exults the role of the Moors to the next level by saying that “Instead you attempted to bring civilization to the whole peninsula regardless of faith or creed. It was noble of you and now you must pay the price”

(68). The conversation not only hybridize the colonial and the colonized but also subverts the image of Islamic world being uncivilized.

The Muslim conquerors had behaved in a much more civilized manner than the Christian conquerors. They, in fact, brought civilization to the uncivilized European world and instead of banishing them from their land or compelling them to convert to Islam, allowed them to live with peace, dignity and religious freedom. When the whole family of Yazid, a young boy, is brutally killed by the Christian forces, the boy regretfully says, “I wish now that many centuries ago, we had treated you as you have treated us” (*Shadows* 235) which implies that, unlike Christians, the Muslim had treated the Christians in a civilized manner. He imagines his father’s head, which was impaled on a spike, saying to him “Remember, my son, that we have always prided ourselves on how we treat the vanquished. Your great-grandfather used to invite knights he had defeated to stay in our house and feast with him” (235).

Later, Yazid is also brutally killed by the captain who killed his family and burned their bodies. This way, the binaries of civilized-savage are inversed, in order to subvert the neo-colonial interpellation, both in *Shadows* and *The Book* where Muslim conquerors behave in civilized manner while the Christian conquerors savagely and indiscriminately kill their conquered subjects and spill streams of blood. Waterman has analysed the intent of the Christian rulers of Spain very well by suggesting that the reason behind brutal annihilation of the Muslim population in the hands of the Christian rulers was unnecessary fear and greed:

Shadows laments not simply a Muslim defeat in Granada, but in a much larger sense grieves for humanity as a whole at the losses which are incurred when war is waged on the basis of unwarranted fear, greed and an over-valued sense of honor, when a higher

premium is given to ideological purity and order than to peace, justice and the respect of the social covenant. (Waterman 163)

The attempts to erase history and re-inscribe the Palimpsest in favour of Christianity and against Islam has its roots as old as the re-conquest of Spain. The Archbishop in *Shadows* orders the Christian forces to kill all the Muslim inhabitants of al-Hudayl village but when he realizes that killing the Muslims “is not enough to erase cultural memory; he intends to wipe al-Hudayl off the map” that his cartographers were preparing (Waterman 163). This kind of acts of erasure strongly supported later historians to interpellate Muslims as a nation that does not have any culture, though the Archbishop was not completely successful in his attempt to erase the cultural memory of the Muslims as “some have survived, as have a few of the books rescued from the flames, and will suffice to keep cultural memory alive in spite of conversion, exile and even death” (Waterman 163).

Ali’s historical fiction of the *Quintet* series is revisionist in nature because he strongly feels the need to subvert the interpellated image of Islam by recovering the dignity of Islamic culture and civilization through a revised, more realistic version of history that is devoid of the neo-imperial gaze. His fictional works characterize postcolonial inscription of the erased and inscribed history of the colonized in order to restore the reverence of a culture that is no more seen as something worthwhile among the neo-imperial interpellative powers today.

5.6. Subversion of Interpellation through Appropriation

Tariq Ali, being citizen of a former colony, can be considered a postcolonial writer. In this capacity, he successfully appropriates the language of the colonized through cultural mimicry to subvert the image of the interpellated subject by confronting the colonial allegory and re-inscribing historical images of Islam and Muslim subjectivity in his fictional works.

Appropriation is an important postcolonial strategy of articulating the cultural and social identities or asserting cultural values of the colonized/formally colonized people by taking over certain aspects of colonial language, literature, theatre or culture (Ashcroft *Key Concepts* 19). This strategy can also be used to subvert the cultural or political hegemony of the colonizers or neo-imperial powers to shatter their interpellative ideology. Appropriation of aspects of the dominant language and its various forms is an important anti-colonial strategy used by Tariq Ali in his fictional works which has helped him to spread the cultural values of the colonized to a wider audience which provides a contrast to the interpellated image. Ali has achieved linguistic hybridity and transculturality in the *Islam Quintet* series with an aim to equate the centre with the margin or intermingle them to enhance the value of the language and culture of the Muslims. He added glossaries and explanatory notes in *The Book of Saladin*, *Shadows of the Pomegranate Tree* and *A Sultan in Palermo* which is an attempt to present the Muslim culture in the language of the neo-colonizing powers and hybridizing the self and the other. In the *Author's Note*, Ali describes the cultural Arabic tradition of naming children by adding father's name as a suffix and the way they add *bin* for boys and *bint* for girls between the first name and the family name. At times, the Arabs call people by taking names of their fathers such as *Ibn* Farid, meaning son of Farid. Using the glossing technique for hybridizing and appropriation purposes, Ali has added a Glossary (*Shadows* 242, *A Sultan* vii) of the names of cities and other proper and common nouns—such as *Gharnata* for Granada, *Ishbilliya* for Seville, *Iskanderiya* for Alexandria, *Jihad* for holy war, *Kashtalla* for Castile, *qadi* for magistrate, *ummi* for mother, al-Hamra for the Alhambra—that were given by the Moors and later altered by the Spanish or became subject to linguistic change. The textual glossing technique is used within the texts of the novels as well whereby the original Arabic names are

explained in English such as many crafts well known in the Arab culture *al-Tawwabin*, *al-Fajjarin*, i.e. brick makers and potters, are introduced to highlight the transculturality of the postcolonial fiction. In case of *Shadows*, certain Arabic words like *Faqihs* (77) *harissa* (100) *madresseh* (104) and *sura* (111) are used within the text but their meanings are not mentioned which suggests that the English readers should be familiar with these basic common nouns which are appropriated by the author. This may also suggest that the Arabic language is superior in terms of the vocabulary used by the author and using the English alternatives would decrease the richness of the text.

Tariq Ali also uses allusions from the Arab culture, instead of the Western culture, in an effort to recover the interpellated image of the Islamic culture. He alludes to certain figures of Arabic mythological tradition, known only to the Arab culture such as *Udar* i.e. “a monster who rapes men and leaves them to roast in the desert” (180) and the culturally specific sexual term *al-Azl* or “withdrawing at the critical moment and spilling...seed on...stomach” (123). He also utilizes expressions like *Diwan al-insha*, the chancellery of the state and *Misr* instead of Egypt in *The Book*. Names of people and places in the *Quintet* novels are mostly Arabic, rather than their contemporary European or English versions.

Ali's fiction, particularly *Shadows*, also manifests instances of postcolonial orality by quoting several pieces of oral poetry, songs and stories that were preserved by the Moorish people, even after the mass burning of their books in Granada. The use of orality also provides a good opportunity to present richness of the Muslim culture, providing a contrast to the interpellated representation of the Muslim culture. *Ibn Hazm's* optimistic poetry, in this regard, is read by one of the characters at a time of pain and grief which seem to make the event of burning of the books at Granada somewhat bearable:

“the paper ye may burn
But what the paper holds ye cannot burn;
’tis safe within my breast.
Where I remove, it goes with me;
Alights when I alight,
And in my tomb will lie.” (*Shadows* 24)

The poetry not only exalts the Islamic culture for having a rich knowledge base and a literary tradition but also disrupts the image of the Western civilization which was at that moment of history not enlightened and civilized enough to keep the treasures of the Muslim scholarship and decided to burn their books. The figures of legendary and mythical nature such as *Ibn Farid*, who was an extraordinary soldier, feared by the Christian knights, form a strong part of the oral tradition that is transmitted through generations. Don Inigo’s memory of Umar’s grandfather consists of an Arabian proverb that he had told to his own grandfather, “When the eye does not see the heart cannot grieve” (*Shadows* 67).

The Arab tradition of transmitting wisdom through proverbs and orally transmitted traditional stories can be witnessed in the *Quintet* which subverts the contemporary interpellative image of Islam being devoid of culture. There is a mention of the Arab traditional romance characters Qays and Laila (*A Sultan* 52) which points to the rich orality of the Arab culture. Proverbs and individuals represent morality, customs, values and traditional history of the Muslims and help disrupt the master-slave and colonizer-colonized binaries offered by the colonial discourse.

A Sultan contains plenty of Arabic expressions that make it a culturally and linguistically appropriated work of postcolonial fiction, meant to disrupt the interpellative representation of

the Muslims. Apart from several Arabic proper and common nouns, there are many Arabic expressions that are used either with or without translation. The central character al-Idrisi writes a book entitled “*al-kitab al-Rujari*” or “the book of Roger” which was previously named as “*Nuz’hat al-Mushtaq*” or “The Universal Geography” (*A Sultan* 15). When al-Idrisi arrives at Palermo after a long journey, the sailors chant ““*almadina hama-hallahu*’ or Allah protect this City””, they also say “*Siqilliya sana-hallahu* or Sicily, may Allah preserve her!” (19).

The Arabic expressions contain rich cultural contexts and successfully subvert the colonial hegemony through the means of abrogation and appropriation. Throughout the novel, characters, Muslim or Christians, greet others with *Wa Salaam* and appreciate things by saying *wa-allah* (56), King Roger of Sicily is called *Sultan Rujari of Siqilliya* and his palace is frequently called the *qasr* and the *Diwan*, some characters have hybrid names such as Thawdor *ibn Ghafur* has half-Greek-half-Arabic name while Amir Philip *al-Mahdia* and Elinore *bint Muhammad* (*A Sultan* 213) have half-Christian-half-Arabic name. Several times Ali has written Arabic expressions and vocabulary without giving its translation which is more of an act of abrogation than appropriation; these include *Khutba* (sermon), *Jibril* (Gabriel) (46) and *Allahu Akbar*. Arabic common nouns are also used without giving their translations: Idrisi’s grandsons always call him *Jiddu* instead of grandpa and children say *Abi* and *Ummi* instead of father or mother. Certain designations are also kept original instead of using their English versions such as *Sultan*, *Amir*, *Amir al-bahr*, *qadi*, and *muezzin*.

Mayya compares herself and al-Idrisi with Arabic folk-lore characters of *Qays* and *Laila* (52), there are discussions about Muslim philosophers like *al-Ghazali* and *Ibn Rushd* (181) and a mention of *Aflatun* (Plato) (203). The Muslim leaders hold *mehfil* (meeting) at the *Ayn al-Shifa* mosque, original Arabic names of cities are used such as *al-Andalus*, *Ishbilialia*, *Gharnata*,

Qurtuba and *Allah* always used instead of its English equivalent God. Thawdor's son wishes to go to the *madresseh*, not school (62) and characters go to *hammam*, not bathroom; Idrisi refers to a *sura* in al-Quran, not a chapter (95). Books like al-Kindi's *Aqrabadhin* and Ibn Sina's *Kanun* appear with original names. Likewise, Idrisi drinks his herb infusions without noticing the *shahdanaj al-barr* and experiences *Ishq khumari* or "Bacchic love" (139) and Mayya calls him *Habibi* instead of sweetheart (170). All these words, expressions, proverbs, and allusions are deliberately used by Tariq Ali yet they are so skilfully embedded in the English text that they do not look awkward or out of place. The use of these appropriated expressions successfully aborts the interpellative misrepresentation of Islam and Muslims and recovers the original writing of a re-inscribed colonial palimpsest.

5.3. Conclusion

The Islam Quintet is an effort to revive some vital moments of Islamic history in order to contest, subvert the neo-imperial interpellation and re-present the exalted image of Islam and Muslims. The image of Islam is recovered through postcolonial allegory and revival of the erased or re-inscribed historical images by challenging the historical knowledge and archival documents of the colonialists that interpellate Muslims to be uncivilized. Three of the Islam Quintet novels, *Shadows of the Pomegranate Tree* (1992) *The Book of Saladin* (1998) and *A Sultan in Palermo*, analysed in the chapter are significant fictional works as they offer the opportunity for a postcolonial critique due to the fact that these texts offer cultural pluralism and deal with historical events that relate to encounters between the Arab and European cultures. All the three fictional works contain a significant amount of deliberately used Arabic expressions that make it a culturally and linguistically appropriated work of postcolonial fiction that successfully subverts the neo-imperial interpellation.

The narrative offered in Ali's fictional works also reveals his own hybrid subjectivity where he locates himself both at the colonized and the colonizer's space. His narrative contains heterogeneous multi-ethnic characters blended in the Middle-Eastern social fibre. His characterization blends-in ethnic groups of Arabs, Asians, Europeans and Africans offering allegorical images that stem out of historical accounts of Islam, Christianity and Judaism during the Moorish rule in Spain and the conquest of Jerusalem by Saladin during the twelfth century. His attempt to restore the interpellated, erased or misrepresented images and identities positions him as a narrator who is retelling the historical accounts of the colonized in order to decolonize history and historical identities, interpellated by the Western neo-imperial discourse. *The Islam Quintet* is also an attempt to contextualize the encounter between the neo-colonial empire and its *Others* in the Middle East in the backdrop of the contemporary clashes between the two. The hybrid nature of Ali's own subjectivity and that of his characters is revealed by the fact that the agenda of his historical project in the novels is to oppose both the fundamentalisms of the East and the West and to create a space for tolerance between the two.

CHAPTER 6

“DOMINATION BY CONSENT”: NEO-IMPERIAL INTERPELLATION AND HEGEMONY IN *THE OBAMA SYNDROME* (2010) AND *THE DUEL* (2008)

6.1. Introduction

Meaning of hegemony can be understood through the slogan ‘peaceably if we can, forcibly if we must’ (Easthope and McGowan 35)

This chapter focuses on the construction of the interpellated neo-colonial subjectivity in Tariq Ali’s writings. The idea of interpellation is deeply rooted in the broader concept of ideology, which in turn is related to other concepts that deal with human subjectivity, such as Foucault’s notion of discourse, and Gramsci’s notion of hegemony. It is, therefore, imperative to explore and problematize the notion of interpellation by putting it parallel to the notion of the hegemony. Stoddart in this regard has put together the concepts of ideology, hegemony and discourse to explore “why those who lack economic power consent to hierarchies of social and political power” (191). He postulates that social theorists “have used ideology, hegemony and discourse as key concepts to explain the intersections between the social production of knowledge and the perpetuation of power relations” (Stoddart 191).

Interpellation can take form of hegemony since hegemony too has the power to influence human subjectivity through domination by consent. Hegemony, thus, is not a point of departure here in this chapter, rather it provides a different dimension to explore interpellation. The term “domination by consent”, alternatively used for hegemony, was “coined and popularized” by Gramsci to refer to the “power of the ruling class to convince other classes that their interest

are the interests of all” (Ashcroft *Key Concepts* 116). The dominant classes promote their ideology through the resources they have at their disposal by influencing subjectivity of the rest of the society. The concept of human subjectivity is closely linked with identity formation in colonial and postcolonial discourses. The colonized subjects identify themselves through the ideological discourses of the colonizers and later learn to resist the colonial domination, subjugation, or subjection. Human subjectivity is based mainly upon the thinking processes and conscious and unconscious processes of human mind. The concept goes back to the theories of humanism, Enlightenment philosophy and Descartes’ assertion that we think therefore we are. The philosophical assertions of humanism and Enlightenment placed human subject and its autonomous nature in the centre of the world view and parted human subject from the objected world and separated outer reality from thought processes. The humanists saw human self as something autonomous instead of being influenced or shaped by the divine will or inexplicable cosmic powers.

The Cartesian individualism saw “the autonomous human consciousness” to be the “source of action and meaning rather than their product” (Ashcroft *Key Concepts* 220). Later in the history of human thinking, nineteenth century European philosophers focused on subject-centred world views which culminated in philosophies of Nietzsche, Carl Marx and Sigmund Freud. Freud’s theory of human mind and its division into conscious, subconscious and unconscious portions brought revolutionary shift into thinking of human subjectivity as through his concept of unconscious mind he postulated that there are certain courses of individual’s formation that could not be accessed by thought which in turn mystified the boundary of human object and subject. Carl Marx, on the other hand, conceived human subjectivity to be based on economic and social structures that divided the human societies into

strata of working and elite classes. He, contrary to Freud's concepts, asserted that it's the social existence of people that regulates their consciousness. Theoretical assertions of Freud and Marx put a question mark on the earlier philosophical assertions about the autonomy of human thought or action. The conception of human subjectivity thus problematizes the human relationships and the role of language among different humans or social groups. The concept of individual autonomy postulated by proponents of the Enlightenment is disrupted by the proponents of ideology, post-structuralism and psychoanalysis.

Luis Althusser developed the ideal of individual as a social-being brought forward by Carl Marx by further complicating the Marxist notions of ideology and ideological state apparatuses and by introducing the concept of interpellation. Marx's notion of ideology refers to a system of ideas that interprets the working of a society and social relations—predominately unequal—of the individuals living in it. The proletarians are ruled by the bourgeoisie and the ideological fabric of the society is controlled by the bourgeoisie who—having the power and tools to do so—produce/control the ideas that prevail in a society and as a result influence human subjectivity. The social identity thus constructed is a misrepresentation of social relations and social meanings which is considered 'false consciousness' in Marxist terms. The human subjects in a society are made to have a false view of their true social condition; this situation allows the ruling/elite class to have power over the proletarians.

The social conditions generated by ideology also provide social meaning to the subjects. Ideology is made perpetual with the use of ideological state apparatuses—religion, education, and media—that provide the contexts and the conditions for creation of subjectivity. The apparatuses are used by the hegemonic elite class of a society to interpellate subjects and as the subjects obtain their subjectivity under the influence of the apparatuses. Interpellation,

according to Althusser, can be explained through the example of a policeman who hails someone by saying ‘Hey you!’, and the moment that person turns around to acknowledge that he/she is the object of the police man’s attention, that person is interpellated as a specific type of subject. The subject, in Althusserian sense, is the consciousness constructed by the ideological state apparatuses. Human subjectivity created as a consequence of ideological practice meets the need of the elitist classes as “Ideology consists of ideas in the service of class interest” though it is very hard to realize by the subjects that Ideology is in reality a “gigantic masquerade” or a great deception (Easthope and McGowan 34). The conceptions of ideology and interpellation are extremely helpful for understanding how human subjectivity is constructed by discursive and ideological discourses like colonialism and neo-colonialism.

6.2. *The Obama Syndrome* (2010): Interpellative Designs of the Empire

The focus of *The Obama Syndrome* (*OS*) is on the interpellative, hegemonic and ideological strategies of the Global Empire of the United States which, in its own right, is on the mission of exploiting the world in the guise of civilization, under the influence of the imperial impulse. Tariq Ali’s narrative establishes the significance of the power of elitist ideology and its interpellative impact on the rest of the society, even before the book begins, by quoting Malcolm X’s words about the 36th US President:

When a man is running for president of the United States, he is not running for president of the United States alone; he has to be acceptable to other areas of the world where American influence rules ... The only thing that made him [Lyndon Baines Johnson] acceptable to the world was that the shrewd capitalists, the shrewd imperialists, knew that the only way people would run towards the fox would be if you showed them a wolf. So, they created a ghastly alternative (*Obama Syndrome* xi).

America's neo-colonial design of establishing hegemony over the rest of the world includes a shrewd ideological misrepresentation of facts, interpellation of people at home and abroad to make them believe that there is an enemy who wants to destroy America and, before the enemy could do that, it must be destroyed, hence the pre-emptive strikes paradigm. These ideological falsehoods are spread so strongly through ISA of media, funded mostly by the capitalist bourgeoisie, that their ideology becomes a part of the hegemonic common sense of the rest of the society. The concept of hegemony coupled with the notion of hegemonic common-sense was introduced by Antonio Gramsci who, being less satisfied by the Marxist notion of ideology, wanted to further enhance the idea to incorporate broader understanding of workings of ideology.

The concept of hegemony refers mainly to the distinction Gramsci made between the notions of coercion and consent that he considered to be the apparatuses of social power (Gramsci 1992, 137). Coercion refers to a state's capability to inflict violence against the individuals residing in the state who are not ready to contribute to relations of production created by capitalism. The hegemonic power controls the means and relations of production by convincing the social classes to follow the norms and values of system that is inherently exploitative. Unlike the Althusserian concept of repressive state apparatuses, hegemony denotes a type of social power that depends less on the threat of punishment and more on participation and voluntarism. Hegemony provides a world view that guides a society's routine, everyday life through a "common sense" which is inherited from the past and accepted and absorbed without questioning. The hegemonic aura leads to "moral and political passivity" (Gramsci 1971, 333). However, the state uses the coercive power in exceptional circumstances only. In capitalist societies, Gramsci considers the cultural superstructure to be more important

as compared to Marx. In Gramscian sense, the economic base is not always reflected by the superstructure as the two strata have a considerable degree of autonomy.

6.2.1. Interpellative Strategies of the Global Empire

The neo-colonial nature of the US Empire is emphasised by Tariq Ali through Malcolm X's quote "it isn't a president who can help or hurt; it's the system. And this system is not only ruling America, it is ruling the world" (xi). The words spoken by Malcolm X in 1964 are still relevant and fully applicable to the contemporary international relations where the election of a mixed-race president cannot make any difference because it's the system, not the president that needs to be changed.

The Obama Syndrome starts with discussion of a new form of ideological discourse that emerged three decades before Obama's presidency began. The militarism of the US and a fiercer control of the capitalist elites over the power centres in the recent history began with election of Ronald Regan. The rise of Ronald Reagan brought with the Reaganism which, in words of Mike Davis, "like the beast of the apocalypse...slouched out of the Sunbelt, devouring liberal senators and Great Society programs in its path...indisputably a seismic shift rightwards is taking place at every level of American politics." Reaganism started its ideological journey with cutting down spending on social welfare and "the biggest and most ominous escalation of arms spending in history" (OS 1-2). The so-called reforms and the ideological shift towards warfare was later embraced by Clinton administration. Bush, the next president in line, followed the same policies driven by capitalism which widened the gap between the rich and the poor, the elites and the working classes and a "neoliberal Malthusianism" became prevalent as the order of the day (2). Ali suggests that the ideology of

Reagansim, was strongly supported and propagated by the ISA of media, he calls “Orwellian media sphere” that continued to interpellate its audiences in the US and the world over by proclaiming “peace is war and war is peace” (2). The hegemonic political forces backed by the “predatory capitalism” (4) in the US spread their hegemonic design to the whole world and subjugate nations to satisfy their oil hungry corporations and institutions. The neoliberal, capitalist strands of politics in the US have given liberties to corporations and the “corporate criminals”—especially those who fund politicians during the elections to form the “Democracy Inc.”—to accumulate money through “force, deceit, fraud, bribery, gross illegality, intimidation and terror” (3-4).

Imperialism and capitalism coexist to support each other and look for hegemonic control of the world together; the United States, therefore, in its outlook is “flagrantly imperial” while being “openly connected to a doctrine that expresses the broader purposes of establishing neoliberal capitalist order on a global scale” (Panitch and Gindin 20). This hegemonic control of the rich oil companies over the rest of the society led to horrendous wars abroad and a collapse of local economy in 2008 and beyond. The public opinion is silenced in favour of the state policies through hegemonic and ideological apparatuses of media, education and law and by influencing peoples’ subjectivities through interpellation. The priority given to businesses over social welfare continued during the Obama era ceaselessly. The corporations rule the country by buying influence through their representatives among the law drafting companies, to ensure that no law is made which hamper the growth of their profits. Companies like Google, Yahoo, Microsoft, and Apple spend millions of dollars on politicians to buy influence in various spheres of governmental decision makings. The Obama administration also has relations with the rich CEOs of the Wall Street which has continued to give way to the US

capitalism to turn everything, including the politicians of the country, into a “commodity” though with one difference that “the human commodities knew who owned them, and they behaved accordingly” (5). The dreams of progress, change and prosperity shown by Obama during the election campaigns seemed optical illusions, though the liberal pundits refused to accept this reality. Obama and his capitalist campaigners spread false hopes that were ideologically grounded and interpellative to the publics of the US and the rest of the world. The slogans of change and “Yes, we can” which created “Obamania” or “the Obama effect” and caused Obama’s victory (8). The media that sets ideological trends and helps maintain the hegemonic common sense, such as “Fox TV and the crazed bigots of radio talk shows” who were initially not very happy on signs of Obama’s election (9). Obama is no more than “just another steward of the American empire” (OS 56) whose policies on Iran, Iraq, Palestine, Pakistan and Afghanistan are hegemonic and imperialist in nature. Obama has gone even a step forward in escalating the borders of the “imperial aggression” (57) by increasing violence in Afghanistan and drone attacks in Pakistan. Despite the fact that the US drones kill more women, civilians and children than any terrorists, the US officials spread their ideological propaganda saying that these attacks are lawful because they are “necessary to defend US national security” (OS 57).

Ideology can have strong impact on its subjects and can cultivate grave consequences for them, as they are born into ideology and live by it without many chances of thinking out of it. Althusser problematized the notion of ideology by postulating that ideology is not just an issue of the powerful imposing their thoughts over the weak; subjects are in fact born into ideology, their subjectivity is formed in line with the expectations of their parents, teachers, religious leaders, politicians and the society in general; they approve the ideology promoted by the

bourgeoisie as it gives them a sense of security and helps them acknowledge their identity. The media ISA, in the contemporary digital world, is so strong that even the most liberal TV and newspaper networks avoid the news, such as the killing of a Peshawar based journalist's family in a drone attack in 2010, in fear of facing anti-Americanism. The neo-imperial ideology either justifies the wrong-doings of the empire or makes people believe that the injustice will come to an end soon.

The false hopes or the ideology spread by Obama's speeches and his sponsors made the interpellated people believe that the "corruptions of the Empire, the officially sanctioned torture, the imprisonment without trial in foreign lands" (9) would come to an end. Considering the first two years of Obama's presidency, Ali raises the question "how has American empire altered?" (OS 35). Taking an anti-right-wing and anti-capitalist stance, Ali asserts that before Obama it was thought that "the United States had fallen under an aberrant regime, the product of a virtual coup d'état by a coterie of right-wing fanatics—alternatively, ultra-reactionary corporations—who had hijacked American democracy for policies of unprecedented aggression in the Middle East" (37). Ali rightly portends that the dominant capitalist bourgeoisie influence the state power and make use of its hegemonic potential to exploit people and their resources both at home and abroad. The design and nature of the American hegemonic empire and its impact on the whole world is one of the most significant issues of our age. The first two to three years' time cannot encompass Obama's whole presidency yet it is helpful in understanding the mind working behind the actions of the Global Empire that is imposed its ideology and secured domination on most of the world either with or without the consent of its inhabitants. Election of Barack Obama as President of the United States was taken by many as a significant change that will improve the image of the US in the world. Obama's election was

in fact welcomed with a “wave of ideological euphoria not seen since the days of Kennedy” (OS 35). There was a great number of people in the left and the centre who lauded this as a significant change both in the US and abroad, “mainstream centre and left believed that the White House had been liberated, by a “mixed-race Democrat”, from a “coterie of right-wing fanatics.” Considering the fact that Obama’s wife was of slave ancestry, his success was visualized as success of the Civil Rights movement, a movement that was an epitome of the demand for social justice. Till the time of the mid-term elections, Ali recons, the disillusionment of all such hopes has taken place and Obama has given way to the existence of the hard-line right. Critics of the Obama administration believe that there is a need for a new strategy to harness the dogma of the national-security by the state. The imperial desire for domination of the Globe has not abated after Obama’s election as there is no scarcity of the liberal imperialists in the Obama administration who are committed to efforts of making the US a state that can govern the whole world (Mearsheimer 2010).

Ali critically assesses the post-election days of Obama and sees little change in the intents of the imperial power even after the apparently revolutionary change in form of Obama’s election. Obama’s “self-interested mythology” exposed very soon and it became apparent that “the strategic goals and imperatives of the US imperium remain the same” (OS 38). While considering Obama to be an intelligent leader, Ali believes that he “is not a progressive leader by any stretch of the imagination” (33) as he has maintained the status quo by walking on the footsteps of his “recent predecessors”. He further portends that hopes attached with the rise of Obama were false as the imperial impulse for domination has not altered; it has rather made the propaganda, covering and justifying the US domination, become ever more successful (71). The geopolitical reach of the US Empire remains enormous and widespread due to its

successful use of ideological and repressive state apparatuses and the mechanics of hegemony utilized by the White-House-Pentagon axis. Ali satirically asserts that efforts of the Global Empire to solve the issues related to the Middle East and its surroundings have hardly resolved any issues. The state of affairs between Israel and the Palestinian Authority remains the same. The sufferings of the people of Palestine have not decreased by any degree and the Palestinian authority remains as venal, in the hands of the West, as ever. The subjects of the US Empire remain subject to marginalization and inhuman treatment including torture and killing.

The neo-colonial US ideology continues to interpellate its subjects and those who are under suspicion of defying the imperial ideology are tortured and murdered, being uncivilized savages who deserve to be eliminated without any regret. Weiss, in this regard, points out that the election of Obama had brought hope to the intellectuals of the left that the new president will undo the Bush-Cheney national-security mischief by taking steps like putting an end to the war in Afghanistan, withdrawing military forces from Iraq, shutting down the Guantanamo facility and abolishing the anti-civil-liberties Patriot Act; some even hoped that the US officials who were involved in activities of torture, warfare, and illegal detention against the US and the international laws, will be prosecuted (1). But unfortunately, the Guantanamo bay together with other torturing places such as the jail at Bagram Air Base in Afghanistan are still torturing people under the guidance of psychologists appointed by the US (Soldz *Black Jail*). The Bush-Cheney so called war on terror in the world, particularly in the Middle East, was further escalated by Obama as he doubled the military expenditures to Yemen in 2010 with the support of the neoconservatives. The Obama administration, following the footsteps the Bush-Cheney group, continues to manage the so-called enemies of Israel in the Middle East. There is hardly any serious condemnation, apart from soft diplomatic reaction, of Israel's continued land grabs

and assaults on the Gaza strip, by the US authorities. The imperial expansion and occupation go much beyond ideological domination and becomes imperial instead before becoming neo-imperial in case of the US Global Empire.

The US imperial wars in Afghanistan and Iraq prove to be the most striking example of the contemporary domination through Repressive State Apparatus of military power. While quoting Ali, Weiss suggests that the use of force, directly or indirectly, has not abated during the days of Obama as he has shown his determination to maintain ten thousand will stay back in Iraq to an undisclosed period of time (3). The violent machinery of war that kills millions of people in discriminately or indiscriminately, is justified by the ISA of media. The media interpellates the people being killed and shows them, in their hegemonic discourses, as savages who are meant to be killed. The military adventures of the Obama administration in Afghanistan provide a typical example of continuation of imperial policy of the US government and “if a textbook illustration were needed of the continuity of American foreign policy across administrations, and the futility of so many softheaded attempts to treat the Bush-Cheney years as exceptional rather than essentially conventional, Obama’s conduct has provided it” (*OS* 68). Ali calls it the “Palestinian theatre of the American system” (40) of hegemony, occupation and domination-by-consent of a puppet comprador class.

The repressive state apparatuses remained strongly at work in Afghanistan and Iraq but the RSAs are systematically been replaced by the ISAs that propagate an ideology that best suits the Empire and its allies and interpellates the masses in the best interest of the imperial or neo-imperial elites. Ali suggests that Obama has proved to be another addition into the line of the Imperial presidents. The silence of Obama upon Israeli atrocities in Palestine is again a result of the hegemonic power of the Israeli lobbyists in the US as “pro-Israel money plays a

significant role in US elections”. United States’ presidents find themselves so much obliged to favour Israel that the only choice they have is a “blind loyalty to Israel and blind denunciation of those who are critical of its policies as bigots and anti-Semites.” (*OS* 42). Ali suggests that Israel forms part of the Global Empire which was evident from the behaviour of the Israeli administration after the Israeli military’s attack on a peaceful Turkish ship Mavi Marmara, carrying medicines and humanitarian aid to Palestine. The aftermath of the incident proved that just like the international law is not applicable to the US, “it doesn’t apply to Israel either” (43). The role of BBC television in this regard, remained of an apparatus of the Empire as it served as an “unfiltered vehicle for Israeli propaganda” (43).

6.2.2. Contemporary Neo-Imperial Collaborations

The US-Israel collaboration has resulted into an ideological and hegemonic complex where the US interests are mingled with Israeli interests and together they impose an ideological discourse on the Middle East and the rest of the world to maintain their neo-colonial hegemony over the world. Their collaboration on international affairs and towards strengthening each other’s hegemony over the world is so strong that the Israeli policy “objectives have long been internalized as little less than second nature by the US policy makers” (*Obama Syndrome* 49). Both the nuclear powers remain on one page when it comes to enforcing Repressive Apparatuses on Palestine, Syria, Lebanon or any other target in the Middle East. There are however, many faces of the neo-colonial ideological complex which is clearly based on Machiavellianism. The ideological images spread through international media by the US-Israel hegemon, represent weaker nations like Iraq, Libya, Afghanistan, and Iran to be the ones that are harbouring and promoting fundamentalism, terrorism and anti-western/anti-Semitic ideology but when it comes to the interests of the US, they can shake hands with any of the so-

called enemies of the international peace. Ali presents Iran as a striking example in this regard which “has long been posed a conundrum: an “Islamic republic” publicly breathing fire against the Great Satan while quietly extending assistance to it wherever most needed, be it collusion with counterrevolutionaries in Nicaragua, invasion of Afghanistan or occupation of Iraq” (*Obama Syndrome* 49). The Machiavellian mind behind the Eurocentric ideology of the Global Empire dictates its own terms to the world, ignoring all moral considerations and the obligations imposed by the international law. To establish its hegemonic control over the Muslim World, the US successfully exploits the Sunni Shia rift by joining hands with Iran where a Sunni state is to be destroyed; this was evident in case of the US attacks on Iraq and Afghanistan. Iran favoured the Imperial intents in hope of establishing Shia dominant governments in Iraq and Afghanistan. Iraq is given a Shia government and a “predominantly Shia army” to overpower Sunni resistance and guard the oil wells utilized by the US corporations (45-6). When, on the other hand, the Iranian nuclear program threatened “Israel’s monopoly of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East” (49), the US turned all its Ideological Apparatuses against Iran to stop the Iranian nuclear intents at all costs. To establish neo-colonial control over the weaker nations to exploit their resources, the Global Empire starts with a military action, in case these nations deny to subdue to the will of the Empire on political level.

After establishing occupation through military, the Empire promotes a compliant comprador class of politicians and intellectuals to rule the country, after military forces leave the area. Both in cases of Iraq and Afghanistan, after militarily crushing the resistant forces, the countries were given “pro-Western, even democratic” (44) “puppet” or “client” regimes (47) that allowed the establishment of a neo-colony where the neo-colonizers can watch their

interests in the comfort of their home, with least expenditures, minimal military presence and even least moral obligations. Establishment of a pro-Western government by the US empire was a clear re-enactment of the establishment of a pro-Western Hashemite dynasty by the colonial Britain in 1920s that gave a compliant comprador ruling class through which the Imperial Britain ruled the country “as an imperial dependency” (*Obama Syndrome* 47). The worst example of the implantation of a compliant comprador class was observed when Alyad Allawi, who remained Interim Prime Minister and Vice President of Iraq, was a “CIA agent who was accused of personally executing political prisoners soon after the occupation of the country” which suggests the double standards of the US politicians who replaced a Saddam Hussain with another cruel, despotic leader.

Tariq Ali is surprised to see the way the US-Iran cooperation is strengthening the Global Empire. Iran’s open opposition of the US global policies and its leaders’ outrage against the US hegemonic and expansionist foreign policy is very well known to the world, yet, its role in assisting the US elite in strengthen the Global Empire “has long posed a conundrum” (48) due to the strong irony of the situation. The double standards are on both the sides as both the US and Iran are on one page when it comes to their mutual interests. Considering itself an Islamic republic, Iran is “publicly breathing fire against the Great Satan while quietly extending assistance to it wherever most needed, be it collusion with counterrevolutionaries in Nicaragua, invasion of Afghanistan or occupation of Iraq” (48). The US Imperial elite, however, has to put pressure on Iran when it comes Iran’s nuclear programme, mainly due to the Israeli pressure, as “Israeli objectives have long been internalized as little less than second nature by US policymakers” (49). This suggests that Israeli influence on the US policymakers is so deep rooted that it has become part of their hegemonic “common sense” in Gramscian sense of the

world. Ali however seems to favour Obama's "forgive-and-forget dialogue with Tehran" (49) which did not bear much fruit though, till the publication of *The Obama Syndrome* and the threat of an air strike on Iran's nuclear facilities by Israel or the US remains a long-lasting option. The triangular relationship of the US, Israel and Iran are manipulated mostly by the US in favour of its hegemonic grip on the region. The Marxist notion of ideology explains how the ideas and world view of the bourgeoisie or the ruling economic class are imposed and perpetuated among the rest of the social classes. To understand the notion of interpellation and human subjectivity so to say, understanding of the Marxist notion of ideology is an essential starting point. Ideology, however, is a problematic conception as the exponents ideology have taken it as a steady body of knowledge transmitted as a whole to the subaltern classes by the bourgeoisie. Gramsci's notion of hegemony provides a reinterpretation or extension of the Marxist notion of ideology and focuses on how the state or the ruling class manufactures and maintains the consent to other classes of a capitalist society (Hall 277-9).

Ideology suggests a flow of power that is unidirectional, whereas hegemony connotes that there is an inherent conflict involved in the construction of power, thus suggesting the prevalence of multiple ideologies at the same time. Discourse, ideology and hegemony are quite intertwined sister concepts but we cannot say clearly which concept comes first. Discourse post-structural in its roots but in it contains the concept of ideology in its essence because when discourse is utilized to support power, it becomes ideological. The model of ideology postulated by Marx and the Frankfurt School theorists appears to be "too unitary, too totalizing, and too abstracted from the everyday social interaction of individual actors" (Stoddart 200). While struggling to transform the Marxist notion of ideology, the Gramscian theory remains grounded in the notion of ideology postulated by the Marxist theory.

The Althusserian notions of interpellation & ideology and Gramscian notion of hegemony have many common grounds including the capitalist mode of production, the division between the base and the superstructure, and the class categories. The difference between the two theories lies mainly in the fact that Gramsci takes hegemonic power to be a kind of unarticulated common sense that prevails in the society rather than an articulate body of thought (Stoddart 202). The consent of the subaltern classes is secured through routine activities related to education, family, religion, and work. The Empire plays well when it comes to the differences of the Sunnis and the Shias and successfully interpellates Iran and Saudi Arabia against each other and in favour of the imperial expansion. The hegemonic discourse of the Empire is so strongly propagated by the ISAs that countries like Iran and Saudi Arabia think that it's in their own benefit to assist the Empire while the Empire successfully acquires its domination by consent. Even Turkey is interpellated by the neo-colonial ideology as a "Sunni-NATO detachment of the empire" (*Obama Syndrome* 52) that supports the Saudi stance on helping Syria break away from Iran. The hypocrisy and double-standard of the US imperial elite is evident through its policy of criticizing minor violence in the Muslim world and inflicting strong violence around the world itself. Obama, believes Ali, would not let go any opportunity of "ideological posturing" by lamenting "with moist-eyed grief the death of a demonstrator killed in Tehran" while on the same day allowing the killing of sixty villagers, including women and children, in Pakistan through drone attacks (50).

6.2.3. Compliant or Subversive? Ambivalence in Tariq Ali's Writing

Tariq Ali's diasporic identity has left a deep mark on his writings which make him necessarily a hybrid person, shifting positions between a compliant and a subversive author. Marxist literary theory's stance that, "a writer's social class, and its prevailing 'ideology'

(outlook, values, tacit assumptions, half-realised allegiances, etc.) have a major bearing on what is written by a member of that class” (Barry 158) applies to Ali and his writings quite well. In postcolonial theory, this phenomenon is described more deeply by Homi Bhabha who believes that at times there exists a complicated blend of attraction and repulsion among the colonized subjects and they fluctuate between being “complicit” and “resistant”. Ambivalence has the power to disrupt the colonial domination and authority by disrupting the relation between colonizer and colonized (Ashcroft *Key Concepts* 12). Tariq Ali’s fictional and non-fictional works have the element of ambivalence and hybridity where he fluctuates between being complicit and resistant, though the element of resistance dominates his texts more often.

While criticizing the role of the US in exploiting the religious friction among the Muslim states, Ali seems to shift positions between the Colonizer and the Colonized by his Eurocentric, interpellative stern criticism of the Iranian and Saudi leadership and policies; instead of subverting interpellation, he appears to be interpellating the other himself. Saudi monarchy, he asserts, is “sui generis confessional dictatorship” (*Obama Syndrome* 51) while on the Iran’s side, he criticizes Rafsanjani’s presidency by calling it “corrupt and brutal” (52). He also suggests that the Axis of Evil rhetoric of Bush was Iran’s bad foreign policy just as “Gorbachev’s similar attempts prompted Reagan’s “Evil Empire.”” (52). He goes on to claim that Iran, “a directionless clerical state” (53), does not even take good care of the rights of the student demonstrators or the newspapers and violates civil rights in general. He portrays a bleak image of Iran by asserting that Iranian leaders, after Shah, including Khatami and Rafsanjani have destroyed the country’s economy and have created such a “mess” that is very lucrative for “every kind of domestic and imperial intrigue”. Apart from this the “students are dissatisfied, labour is rebellious, and the Arab southwest, the Kurdish and Azeri north, and the

Baluchi southeast are simmering” (53). Ali, while sternly criticizing the Iranian leadership suggests that they are incapable of dealing with the “imperial arrogance” due to their “hydra-headed incompetence” (56).

Ali’s critique of the West suggests that the hegemonic and ideological control of the Empire and its western allies on media and education is so strong that there is hardly any mention of the thousands of nuclear weapons possessed by the European and American powers whereas Iran’s “little more than primitive groupings toward the technology needed for nuclear self-defence” (*Obama Syndrome* 55) are shown to the world in magnified form. Ali believes that Iran may anytime withdraw from the Non-proliferation Treaty and calls it to be “the most brazenly naked” agreement as the countries having the status of nuclear powers are extremely hypocritical, not only about their own nuclear assets but also about Israel. They do not even mention Israel’s name in this regard while the country has 200 nuclear warheads.

Tariq Ali suggests that the contemporary Afghan resistance is much different as compared to the Taliban resistance that, backed by the US, Saudi Arabia and Pakistan, overpowered other forces in 1990s; it is “anathema not only to Washington but also to Moscow, Beijing, Dushanbe, Tashkent, Tehran” (*Obama Syndrome* 66) which makes it an indigenously grown genuine movement. The ideological western media hyped the ground victories of the US and the NATO forces in Afghanistan yet the ideological hegemony does not work completely at home and most citizens of the Europe and the US oppose war and demand withdrawal of the US and NATO forces from Afghanistan. The ideological propaganda spread by the neo-colonial powers regarding terrorism questioned by Ali when he suggests that a more lucrative agenda for these powers was to control the “lithium reserves” (67) as on request of Karzai, the US is considering removal of Mullah Omar and other Taliban leaders from the list of terrorists.

The titles given to the war by the US like “the War on Terror” or “Evil” interpellate the people invaded by the neo-colonial power and render them liable to be attacked and destroyed by the hegemonic forces of the imperial alliance. They discover the terrorist threats from some unknown sources, in places like Iraq, Afghanistan, and Yemen, and decide in their own right that “an intervention” has become necessary (68-9). They interpellate these nations, attack them, occupy them and exploit their resources. The hegemonic agenda of the US Empire is not limited to the Muslim, oil rich world, it extends to the Far East and encompasses countries like Japan into its fold, which is not considered more than a “client state” by the “imperial bosses in Washington” (69). Giving example of the US base in Futenma and the movement demanding dismantling of the base, Ali suggests that Japan, being a client state, is helpless against the US hegemony. All those world leaders, such as Chavez of Venezuela, who oppose the policies of the Empire become enemies, interpellated as “crazy” and toppled through unfair means (*Obama Syndrome* 70).

Ali considers the neo-colonial control of the US to be “occupation of Japan” that is compelling the Japanese to pay millions of dollars every year in terms of the costs of the US base in Okinawa (71). This hegemonic control of over Japan through Okinawa military base, Ali suggests, is continuity of the gigantic atrocity that began with atomic attack on Hiroshima and Nagasaki; the “imperial dominion” continues even under the rule of Obama (71).

The neo-colonial nature of the contemporary empire cannot be countered or criticized in its proper context until it recognizes itself as an empire. The hidden, invisible imperial and neo-colonial agenda of the Global Empire makes it difficult to recognize, criticise or even resist its violent force. Ludden in his article *America’s Invisible Empire* (2004) asserts that the US has never declared itself as an empire and its public mostly remain unaware of the fact that it has

been acting like one invisibly for a long time (4776). He believes that the American people cannot realise the cost of the empire, effectively criticise it or make it accountable for its deeds worldwide until it is officially placed on the public agenda. Conservatives, Liberals and even feminists equally back the American empire, without even mentioning its name in the public, whereas, the people living under the empires before the Second World War clearly knew that the empire existed and could debate and discuss its various actions. Ludden further informs that the meaning of empire became archaic after 1945 because after that time it had become difficult for a country to administer another country by occupying it geographically. A part from that, America had itself come into being out of an anti-imperial struggle so the title of an empire could not be assigned to it very conveniently, though it acted like one in a novel format (4776). The cold war era provided great opportunity to grow militarily, economically and politically around the globe, in animosity of the communist expansion. The end of the cold war in 1989 could not bring a halt to the expansionist agenda of the US it engaged itself into the war on terrorism to justify its hidden imperialist agenda. America thus is influencing the whole world through political, economic and military power, without formally deploying the imperialist discourse. This allows America to use the international institutions such as the UN, World Bank and International Monetary Fund to control other nations and attacks countries like an empire or on its own, when it chooses to do so. Ludden rightly suggests that the US has protected itself with the edifice of its own law as it gives itself a right to interfere anywhere in the world, without any consideration of the international laws but does not allow the international law to step into its land unless it conforms to its national law (4776). This one-sided, self-empowering, hegemonic style makes the US a typical neo-imperial power, yet the US public sees their country as a global superpower that has a natural right to do what it does.

The ideological and hegemonic propaganda of the neo-colonial empire is spread so successfully through the ISA of media that Ludden rightly asserts that “Americans wear ideological blinders” (4777) and “US voters will never see in the news the vast suffering in Iraq caused by American empire; instead they will see security threats and policy options. The cost of empire at home is not open for discussion.... The empire continues to operate out of public view” (4776). Ludden’s view point clearly resembles Tariq Ali’s standpoint regarding the change. He believes that the empire cannot be challenged on the battle field or through the suicide bombing attacks, it can rather be challenged through public awareness and debates when if it becomes a focal point in newspapers, books, emails, blogs, schools, chat rooms, drinking halls, dinner parties and churches and through all these places becomes part of the election campaigns.

The neo-colonial US creates the threats to its security and magnifies them with the help of the media ISA to make people believe that their military adventures are necessary for their protection. Ludden argues that these threats together with the scenario created by the 9/11 incident are a blessing in disguise for the American imperialists as 9/11 successfully “buried the empire out of sight under the iconic rubble and dust of the Twin Towers” (4777).

6.2.4. Obama’s Speeches: Interpellation through ISA of Politics

Tariq Ali quotes several chunks taken from various speeches delivered by Obama that clearly send strong ideological messages to the world that the US neo-colonial Empire is on a “glowing mission” of civilizing and educating the world. The tone and texture of these speeches clearly are an attempt to establish the ideology and translate it into a hegemonic common sense, a justification of the neo-colonial invasions and killing of innocent people around the world: “Our country has borne a special burden in global affairs. We have spilled American blood in

many countries on multiple continents. We have spent our revenue to help others rebuild from rubble and develop an architecture of institutions—from the United Nations to NATO to the World Bank—that provide for the common security and prosperity of human beings.” (72). America does rebuild but only after destroying the whole countries, it does spill blood of its soldiers but only after killing millions of innocent civilians. The US serves its own interests but spreads hegemonic, propagandist ideology around the world, making people believe that it is doing all the violence in the world for the common good of the human race. There are plenty of ideological statements that interpellate the people, mostly of the Muslim regions:

“The struggle against violent extremism will not be finished quickly, and it extends well beyond Afghanistan and Pakistan...Our effort will involve disorderly regions, failed states, diffuse enemy.”

“Our cause is just, our resolve unwavering. We will go forward with the confidence that right makes might”

“the Palestinians must renounce violence”

“Resistance through violence and killing is wrong” (72-73)

These extracts from the speeches of the Global Empire’s president has clear dichotomy as they interpellate the people of Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan and Palestine to be worthy of being destroyed even when they are resisting the enemy that has attacked and destroyed their homelands, whereas, “if the US and Israel wage war or pump off leaders they dislike, it is a regrettable moral duty” (73). Such interpellated images of the people of the invaded countries is spread so much that the public back in their homelands remains convinced that destroying

Iraqis, Afghans or Pakistanis is in their favour, they “daily imbibe information filtered and fed by media barons, politicians, scholars and educators who collaborate in imperialism for different reasons” (Ludden 4777).

Fourth chapter of *The Obama Syndrome* is titled “Sheriff of the World” which symbolically represents the US President as a self-appointed policeman of the world whose actions are beyond legal implications. The chapter begins with the description of how Obama’s re-election campaign was given a dramatic boost by killing of Osama in Pakistan on May 2, 2011. He calls it a “revenge killing” (119) which provided Obama an opportunity to arouse excitement among the voters. He further enhanced the impact by delivering a “carefully crafted speech” (120), which Ali suggests carried a better imagery of the 9/11 incident, particularly when he mentioned “The empty seat at the dinner table” (120) to describe the plight of the children who lost their fathers in the 9/11 incident.

The global media, serving as interpellative ideological apparatus, exulted over the news of the kill-mission. The irony of the situation was, suggests Ali, that apart from European and many other world leaders, the comprador prime minister of Pakistan also congratulated Obama for the killing. Young American liberals come out on the streets and rejoiced over the assassination, chanted against Osama and danced. A US fire-fighter Frank O’Connor, on the other hand quite pungently asks what if an Iraqi had assassinated Bush and the Arabs had screamed and danced with joy. But the US media, politicians and even educational institutions serve the neo-colonial ideology so well that the killings of Arabs or any Muslims are received either indifferently or as something to be rejoiced, violating the very basics of human dignity. When Obama mentioned the empty seat at the dinner table, he completely ignored the killings of millions of people in Iraq during the so-called war-on-terror that “emptied around five

million dinner tables” (124). There was not a word or regret uttered by the Obama administration for killing five million Iraqis, rendering millions homeless, or 2000 civilian deaths in Pakistan caused by Obama’s drone attacks or even countless killings of the innocent civilians in Afghanistan that are many times more than the people killed on 9/11. Quoting Douglas Macgregor, a retired colonel, Ali suggests that the military interventions of the US forces have proved to be unnecessary and they have caused disastrous consequences for the American national security interests (124). Ali also asserts, while quoting John Mearsheimer, a realist thinker, that the wars waged by the US Empire abroad also destroy civil liberties at home as countries that wage wars for longer periods of time “build powerful national-security bureaucracies that undermine civil liberties and make it difficult to hold leaders accountable for their behaviour, and they invariably end up adopting ruthless policies normally associated with brutal dictators” (125).

6.3. *The Duel* (2008): Interpellation and the Comprador Class

The notion of comprador class exists both in the Marxist and postcolonial theories; Marxist use it to refer “to those local bourgeoisie who owe their privileged position to foreign monopolies and hence maintain a vested interest in colonial occupation”, whereas, postcolonial theorists use it for

The intelligentsia...whose independence may be compromised by a reliance on, and identification with, colonial power...a relatively privileged, wealthy and educated elite who maintain a more highly developed capacity to engage in the international communicative practices introduced by colonial domination, and who may therefore be less inclined to struggle for local cultural and political independence.” (Ashcroft *Key Concepts* 55).

Tariq Ali's non-fictional works including *The Duel* point out that the contemporary neo-imperial powers do not colonize geographical entities directly; they occupy territories, install a compliant, interpellated comprador class to rule the entity and leave. Later, they interpellate the masses of that place through the comprador class and enjoy their indirect authority and control from the comfort of their homeland.

Interpellation forms the core of Louis Althusser's notion of Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs). Ideology and ISAs function through the medium of interpellation. Ideology recruits the subjects and transforms them all by interpellating them. Interpellation helps the ruling classes to seamlessly produce a subjectivity of their choice among the masses by making them internalise the ideological thoughts, without letting them notice what is happening. Althusser gives example of the religious ideology of Christianity which generates its subjects by telling them that God created all human beings, they should do what God wants them to do and live in this world the way He wants them to live, if they live life according to his laws, they will have their salvation (Krips 83). Althusserian "subject does not develop according to its own wants, talents and desires, but exists for the system that needs it. Its only public reality is determined for it by the social apparatus that calls it into a certain kind of being" (Mansfield 53).

The researcher, in this section, portends that the Althusserian model does not just apply on a state, it expands beyond the bounds of an individual state when it is seen in terms of neo-imperial ideology. The neo-imperial powers, just like the ruling elites in a certain state, need a certain kind of complying subjects that can fit into their needs and "larger political imperatives"; the neo-imperial hegemon like the United States interpellates the ruling elites

and the publics of the countries they control and requires them “not only to behave in certain ways, but to be certain types of people” (Mansfield 53).

Tariq Ali has provided a nicely woven historical overview and critique of Pakistan’s continuous shifts between military dictators and incompetent civilian governments in his non-fictional work *The Duel: Pakistan on the Flight Path of American Power*. Ali offers a correction of the misconceptions that prevail in the West about Pakistan. The first misconception is that Pakistan is a country full of extremists and sooner or later the radicals will steal its nuclear assets. Ali also suggests in the book that the US foreign strategy on Pakistan has been a great impediment on the way to development of democracy. The US has deliberately strengthened the military institutions more than any other institutions that play role in decision-making for Pakistan.

The Duel is a statement on Pakistan’s political history, since its independence from the British in 1947, where everything seems to be crumbling because of its political instability and the ongoing war in the neighbouring Afghanistan where Obama seems determined to prolong the presence of the US imperial military together with hegemonic drone attacks across the border of Pakistan. These challenging circumstances are too hard for a fragile state like Pakistan but it seems to endure the situation somehow. There is lack of harmony in the US Pakistan relationships which has increased the problems of Pakistan. Tariq Ali claims that the lack of harmony is based on the fact the US always makes short-term policies concerning Pakistan and once its imperial, neo-colonial targets are attained, it leaves Pakistan on its own, as if there was nothing between the two countries. The imperial designs of the US have deep impact on Pakistan’s dangling policies and its deformed history. America has always established its relations with Pakistan through its interaction with the military command of the

country which has made the military of Pakistan a dominant power in the country. The neo-colonial control of Pakistan, thus, is maintained by the US through its interaction with Pakistan's military.

Tariq Ali's sees Pakistan as a postcolonial state where the roots of its ongoing problems and challenges can be traced back to its formulation days, the way it came into being after a prolonged struggle against the colonial British rulers through mass movement. To Ali, the statehood of Pakistan was not achieved or run by the masses; it was instead achieved and run by a bunch of aristocrats who undermined the struggle for independence by collaborating with the British. These elitists, essentially a comprador class, never looked for support of the masses for their agenda either before or after the independence. Ali considers Jinnah to be the sole leader of stature among the ruling elites of Pakistan, but he died soon after the independence, leaving behind a bunch of mediocre elites. Ali clearly suggests that the civil servants and the generals trained and educated by the empire served as comprador class established their control over the new country.

6.3.1. Interpellation and the Ideological State Apparatuses in *The Duel*

Althusser's notion of interpellation is directly linked with the notion of Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs) and depends on it when it comes to formulation of the interpellated subjects. Althusser argues in this regard, "we are all 'subjects of ideology which operates by summoning us to take our places in the social structure. This summoning (or 'interpellation') works through the discursive formations materially linked with 'state apparatuses' (religious, legal, educational and so on)" (Selden *et al.* 148). *The Duel* provides a significant site for exploration of Althusserian notions of Interpellation and ISAs as Pakistan's public and the elites have been under indirect subjugation of America and the Western world as hailed

subjects whose subjectivity has been modified through decades through creation of a compliant comprador elite class in the country which safeguards the interests of the Western world and enjoys power and the comfort of filling their pockets with corruption money.

In *The Duel*, Tariq Ali suggests that the US imperialism exploited Pakistan and its people by pouring aid money into Pakistan to impose its interpellative ideology through the ISA of economics, particularly during the reign of General Musharraf, when the US waged war against Afghanistan, “The thunder of money drowned out all other noises. Most of the mainstream political parties, like their Western cousins, no longer subscribed to programs rooted in ideology, but instead became dependent on cronyism, clientelism, and soulless followers” (*The Duel* 1-2). Money interpellated them to the highest degree and they acted like a compliant comprador class, in favour of the neo-imperial discourse. The flooding in of money in form of aid made the distribution of wealth in the country even worse as the rich elite class including the military and civil ruling class got richer and the poor masses got poorer, though the deceptive economic figures kept of simulating the signs of prosperity in the country. Corrupt ruling elites are left on their own, no matter how much they plunder the country’s resources, till the time they remain the compliant subjects of West and do not decide to resist their hailed, interpellated subjectivity. Ali, while talking about the evil of corruption in Pakistan, claims, “Corruption envelops Pakistan like a sheet of water. The late Benazir Bhutto and her widower, Asif Ali Zardari, had, after two terms in office, accumulated assets of \$1.5 billion. The twice prime minister [now thrice] Nawaz Sharif and his brother, with their intimate knowledge of the business cycle, probably netted double that amount” (5). The policy making process does not benefit the masses who are interpellated by the ruling elite to be nonentities that neither matter nor can resist the situation provided by their rulers. American aid does not come for

free, it makes the ruling elite to submit their will in front of the Empire and neo-colonial rulers of America by running the whole country according to their dictates, defying the ideology and constitution of Pakistan.

Alas, the Empire, whose fundamental motivation today is economic self-interest, may sometimes disappoint the more recent converts to its cause. They feel betrayed, refusing to accept that what has been betrayed is their illusions.... An argument often deployed is that one must back the United States because 'it's the only game in town' and more enlightened than those it seeks to destroy. (*The Clash* 283)

Pakistan was forced into cooperating in war on Afghanistan through a complicated neo-colonial process wherein the country's top leadership as well as general public was first threatened and then interpellated into the necessity of the cooperation. The country was given aid as price for selling and surrendering its will to the United States. The ruling elites convinced the people by showing true or false statistics that the economy had improved. Tariq Ali raises questions about what will become of Pakistan after the imperial aims of the United States would be fulfilled and there would be no aid coming into Pakistan "How would it function in the absence of imperial parent?" (*The Duel* 40).

The chapter titles of *The Duel* also symbolize American neo-colonialism quite vividly. There are four chapters that begin with the words "The Washington Quartet" (viii) and each one of the chapters relate the story of an army dictator who ruled Pakistan; the titles suggest that all these generals, who acted like interpellated comprador elites, were brought in power and even removed from power with the American consent. This reality is then discussed and analysed by Ali with several incidents that further enhance the neo-colonial outlook of the United States regarding Pakistan. The indirect influence of the neo-colonial American was not

just on the army generals who ruled the country, more than the civilian politicians did, it was evidently asserted on the civilian governments as well. Ali in this regard suggests that the US president Bill Clinton compelled Pakistani prime minister Nawaz Sharif “for a rapprochement with India” (140) and Sharif, like an interpellated subject who had sufficiently internalized the US hegemonic superiority, agreed to it; though Sharif had found out that trade agreements with India will also flourish his businesses across the borders. The 9/11 incident, which was necessarily a false-flag operation, provided the US Empire to unleash its crude wrath upon the world, particularly in the regions that had strategic significance or were rich in natural resources. Pike (2011) argues that the possibility of moving the world to a collective responsibility system as idealized by Roosevelt was obscured by the Bush’s decision to attack Iraq and Afghanistan, after the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Centre. He assumes that the threat posed by Al-Qaeda, though, was quite minor as compared to the threat posed by “the now discredited Marxist-Leninism states” (Pike 746).

The reason why all the major imperial powers of the world are on one page in destroying the Muslim countries taking plea of the terrorist threat, which Pike considers to be minor, rests in the fact that world’s major imperial powers “share a vested interest in containing the threat of Muslim terrorism” (746). That is why most of the world powers including the US, European Union, Russia, China, and India voted in support of the United Nations’ resolutions against Iraq’s assumed Weapons of Mass Destruction. Pike assumes, contrary to Feffer (2012) who sees a strong ideological content in the contemporary wars waged by the Global Empire, that “ideological divisions of the Cold War have all but disappeared” (746) as he assumes that the new leaders of Europe are now more inclined towards a pro-American stance in the world politics. Pike’s assumption that the defeat of the Soviet Union at the end of the Cold War has

“set in train the dissolution of its own Asian Empire” (747) is also contrary to the reality as the United States’ invasion and occupation of Afghanistan, its drone attacks in Pakistan and the US imperial policies in Asia clearly indicate that the concept of US Empire is gaining further momentum instead of fading away. Pike rightly suggests that Asian giants China and Russian are systematically decreasing their dependency on the US dollar which is making the US hegemony in Asia less effective; he refers to the American credit crisis of 2007-09 in this regard claiming that the US financial crisis has speeded up “the diminution of American hegemony in Asia” (749), yet, the presence of the US forces in Afghanistan and the Central Asia present a different picture which presents an American resolve to sustain its role as a Global Empire through violence, if not through economic might. Contradicting his own stance regarding end of Empire, Pike argues that the end of Cold War allowed the European Union, supported by the United States, to become “the most aggressively expansionist of the power blocks” by spreading its influence among the Eastern European nations that were formerly under influence of the Soviet Union; among these were Latvia, Slovakia & Slovenia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic while the rest of the Balkan states are also likely to be added in the Union to make it “by the standards of any age”, an act of “empire building” (Pike 750). The European Union may not like to be called imperialist arguing that they are only cultivating the fruits of the American victory of the Cold War and also because they have not exerted their hegemony over the Eastern Europe through force or military might. Pike (2011) rightly contradicts the EU’s stance by saying that the expansion of the EU was achieved necessarily through military might, though there was very little portion of EU’s own military might that was used to gain that expansion as most of the part was played by the US military being part of the NATO: “The European Union clearly took advantage of

its economic strength and military alliance with the USA in the 1990s to expand its empire” (Pike 750).

Pakistan was dragged into the whole affair through Ideological State Apparatuses of media and politics. The then ISI director general, General Mahmud Ahmad was in Washington along with Ambassador Maleeha Lodhi, having meetings with the US officials in the Pentagon, when the twin towers were destroyed. The two representatives from Pakistan, according to General Musharraf, were threatened by Richard Armitage in the most notoriously threatening and interpellating words: “you are either with us or you’re against us” and if you are not with us “we’ll bomb you into the Stone Age” (*The Duel* 145). Though Bush and Armitage later denied the use of these words, Musharraf claimed that he had sources that confirmed the use of these word. The important thing is to examine the use of threats by the US neo-colonialist power to harness other nations in order to achieve their objectives that are neither just, nor incited by a real enemy. The imperial ministers build up an ideology before embarking upon their imperial journeys and then hail the targeted persons to interpellate them into compliance.

Althusser’s concept of ideology significantly elaborates the operation and power and the relationships of various groups of society in terms of power struggle or power politics. Althusser elaborates how identity of individuals in a society becomes a social construct, how they forget or cease to understand their true identity, how they are made to misread reality and are subjectively modified and align themselves with the identity installed by the power elites. Ideology and ideological apparatuses also enlighten us about how the neo-colonial, neo-imperial powers of the contemporary world seamlessly establish their hegemony in terms of formulating the interpellative and hailed identity of the colonized or neo-colonized subjects (Barua 2014). Just as the bourgeoisie control and manipulate many aspects of the lives of the

proletariat, the neo-colonizers establish their hegemony over many aspects of the subjective and objective existence of the colonized or neo-colonized people. The capitalist elites want individuals who do not “question their masters or owners under the banner of loyalty and docility” (Barua 50) which is possible only when the masses working for the prosperity of the elite classes are interpellated through ideological state apparatuses, making them believe that what happens is in their own interest. The same thing happens on bigger level when the imperial nations suppress the weaker nations through ideological and interpellative means to make them realize that the policies chalked out by the powerful nations are in the best interest of the weaker nations as well. After 9/11, Pakistan too was made to believe that its full support to the United States in the invasion of Afghanistan is in the best interest of Pakistan.

The ideology fabricated by the US, after the 9/11 incidents, was reflected in the remarks of Richard Armitage, quoted by Ambassador Maleeha Lodhi, “This is a grave moment. History begins today for the United States” (145). The demands handed over to Pakistan by the US soon after 9/11 were very arrogantly composed as if something imposed by an Empire to its loyal subjects. Many of these demands defied the sovereignty of Pakistan e.g. giving rights to the United States for blanket over-flights for its military operations in Afghanistan, providing territorial access to the United States for conducting against Al-Qaeda, and to break relations with the Taliban government. Another strong demand which, according to Ali was asked secretly, was United States’ access to Pakistan’s nuclear facility. Musharraf later claimed that he did not agree to at least a couple of demands of the United States. Once the demands were presented to them, the Pakistani military officials found it difficult to decide whether to agree to the demands or not. The neo-colonial America had many tactics in hand if Pakistan had not accepted the demands. They could make an anti-Muslim deal with neighbouring India that was

led those days by a religious extremist elite. But in case they decided to agree, the outcome could have been disastrous since Pakistani premier intelligence agency ISI had been supporting the fundamentalist groups for a long time. However, Musharraf and his advisors took the decision in favour of the Empire and started pulling their personnel out of Kabul. They also asked the Taliban not to resist the invasion by the United States (*The Duel* 147). These circumstances led Tariq Ali to claim that Musharraf did not always accept every demand of the United States which makes him a something less than a compliant subject or a partially interpellated subject who had the knowledge of being converted into a subject and necessarily had the courage to partially defy the will of the neo-colonial master; though his apparent interpellated subjectivity and comprador status was so vivid for some critics that they even started calling him “Busharraf” (148).

The neo-colonialist America needed a compliant subject which was available to them in form of General Pervez Musharraf who was not only ready to support the US in its war-on terror but also represented a “regime committed to enlightened moderation” (Ali *The Duel* 191). Colonial masters around the globe install a comprador class when they leave the occupied areas and provide a simulated form of independence to the people of that area; they however keep on controlling the former colonies through that comprador class. The neo-colonial power of America also uses similar but more complicated ways to establish their direct or indirect influence over the weaker nations. They either occupy countries for a limited period of time, as they did in case of Iraq, or carry out surgical strikes or a very limited military action within that country to change the regime, as they did in case of Libya. They also control some state through providing aid money to the ruling elites and through threats of stopping the aid or attacking the country in case it does not comply, as they did in case of Pakistan. The ruling

elite thus become interpellated, compliant subjects of the neo-colonial power. General Musharraf, like his predecessors General Ayub Khan and General Zia-ul-Haq, did the same. However, we cannot apply Althusser's notion of Ideology in case of these comprador classes, or puppet regimes as the Althusserian notion of Ideology does not leave any scope for resistance or in-compliance, as in Althusserian system of Ideology and interpellation, the interpellated subject does not have the scope of negating or recovering out of the ideology since it does not have the consciousness of being interpellated. Unlike Althusser, Gramscian notion postulates the possibility of co-existence of more than one ideology at a time and in Gramsci's view the elitist class cannot always impose its ideas on other classes in totality. Rather, hegemony is created and reproduced by the ongoing social action which involves the tension and contestation between the rulers and the ruled. The ruling classes make sure that an "ideological unity" exists among the subaltern classes so that their consent in favour of the dominant ideology is secured and maintained (Gramsci 1971: 328).

Gramsci's definition of hegemony is quite broad in the sense that he believes that "everything that directly or indirectly influences or could influence public opinion belongs to it" (1996: 53). The difference between ideology and hegemony lies in the idea that hegemony is not a frame of thought, it is rather a process which remains unarticulated and hidden under the surface. It is "a realized complex of experiences, relationships, and activities" (Williams 1977: 112). Gramsci asserts that hegemony is contingent historically and always remains unfinished and considers the revolutionary political parties, intellectuals, and the subaltern classes to be great agents for social transformation, in capitalist setups. So, in Gramscian theoretical perspective, there can be several ideologies existing side by side e.g. the upper class may have a different ideology than that of the middle class or lower class. Musharraf, in this

regard, once advised the Venezuelan President, Hugo Chavez, “You are far too aggressive with the Americans. Do as I do. Accept what they say and then do as you want” (*The Duel* 147). This utterance by Musharraf, if they truly depicted the reality on ground, suggest that though he was a hailed subject, he could not interpellated by the neo-colonial America. He necessarily has the germs of resistance or defying the will of imperial masters at times. At another place, Ali mentioned it more openly:

“In truth, Musharraf did not always cooperate or accept every demand” (147). Gramscian notion of hegemony applies here in a befitting manner who suggests that in a society dominated by hegemonic power instead of coercion, it is better to fight for position through a prolonged struggle with an aim to dismantle the hegemony of the ruling classes and generate a new hegemony in favour of the subaltern classes (Femia 1975: 34). However, Gramsci does not favour a revolutionary takeover of the means of production in order to bring about a social change though he understands that the struggle can be materialized, if the subaltern groups understand and subvert the common sense imposed by the hegemonic power and devise their own common sense by philosophising their own daily experiences.

What Musharraf did and what certain other elements in Pakistan army have been doing for a long time, is part of a long struggle to destabilize, defy or subvert the hegemonic neo-colonial occupation of Pakistan by the United States. Certain other actors in the Musharraf regime had this attribute of dissent and subversion, such as the then ISI chief General Mahmud Ahmed who was told, before the US attack on Kabul, to go and tell the Taliban let the US occupy their country without resistance. General Ahmed, on the other hand, told Mullah Omar that he had disagreement of the decision and he personally advise them to fight back. These phenomena complicate the Althusserian notion of interpellation through ideology and lead to the

conclusion that an interpellated subject has the chances of subverting the ideology and ensuing interpellation.

6.3.2. Subversion of the Interpellated Subjects in *The Duel*

The West creates its interpellative and fabricated images of Pakistani population and spreads them around the globe through its compliant media to simulate a threat for the Western world, in order to fulfil its imperialist, neo-colonialist agenda of subjugating nations without physically occupying them. The western media, to support the West in fulfilling its imperialist and neo-colonialist designs, portrays an interpellative, false and exaggerated image of what is happening in Pakistan; they make the Western publics believe that the major “problem confronting Pakistan is the power of the bearded fanatics skulking in the Hindu Kush, who, as the papers see it, are on the verge of taking over the country” (*The Duel* 4). Later, in the book Ali discards this negative image of Pakistan and argues that the idea that jihadists may take over Pakistan is very farfetched.

Ali subverts the ideologically driven, interpellative, stereotypical images made and propagated by the Western world and tries to recover the hailed and interpellated Muslims of the world by providing certain historical examples of how the Muslims were more tolerant and enlightened as compared to followers of other religions. Islam, thus is not to be blamed for acts of terrorism carried out by individuals or small groups of Muslim activists. While talking about his memories of passing through various regions of the NWFP, now Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, province of Pakistan, Ali recalls some historical incidents of the time of great Mughal emperor Akbar and subverts the interpellated image of Islam by providing a sharp contrast between how the Christians treated Muslims in Europe, after the fall of Granada, and how other religions were treated during the reign of emperor Akbar, “while the Catholic Inquisition was sowing

terror in Europe, Akbar, himself a Muslim, ruled that ‘anyone is to be allowed to go over to a religion that pleases him.’ The interreligious debates he organized in Agra included Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Parsis, Jains, Jews, and the atheists of the Carvaka school” (*The Duel* 18). However, later in the book, Ali’s own ambivalence makes him somewhat balance the argument by providing some instances of Akbar’s intolerance against the revolutionary rebels in the country.

It is not just the people of the Islamic world that are interpellated but the whole cities are presented by the neo-imperial West as if they are dangerous places swarmed by savages. Tariq Ali provides a quote from the *New York Times* from its January 18, 2008 edition where it clearly interpellates the city and its people by saying “for centuries, fighting and lawlessness have been part of the fabric of this frontier town” (19). Ali, while subverting the hailed, interpellated image of the city of Peshawar and the Pashtun people, argues that the Western media and analysts rely on sources like Rudyard Kipling’s novels, mistakenly considering his fiction to be history. Kipling considered Peshawar to be “the city of evil countenances” and in one of his dispatches sent from Peshawar in 1885 he further presented a very distorted and interpellative image of the people of the city that highlights the savage-civilized binary quite successfully:

“Pathans, Afridis, Logas, Kohistanis, Turcomans, and a hundred other varieties of the turbulent Afghan race, are gathered in the vast human menagerie.... As an Englishman passes, they will turn to scowl upon him, and in many cases to spit fluently to the ground after he has passed...all giving the on-looker the impression of wild beasts held back from murder and violence and chafing against the restraint. (*The Duel* 19-20)

The so-called civilized face of the colonizer is also disrupted by Ali, while at the same time disputing the interpellative image of Muslims, when he describes the way the British colonizers handled the peaceful movement called The Redshirts, initiated by famous Pashtun leader Ghaffar Khan. The greatest British imperial atrocity against The Redshirt movement was killing of hundreds of unarmed people in the Qissa Khwani bazar. The British Empire stereotyped the Pashtun people by calling the “childlike” but “noble savage” which was frequently mentioned in colonial literary works such as novels and short stories of Kipling and in “colonial historiography, violence and Pashtun could never be opposites” (*The Duel* 22). Ali asserts that the British interpellated the Pashtuns as people who were incapable of rational thinking; that was the reason why The Redshirt movement took them by surprise. He suggests at various places in *The Duel* that the Pakistan has helped the United States fight two wars in Afghanistan in exchange of trivial amounts of money. The Global Empire hails the ruling elites of the military and civilian governments and interpellates them through various ISAs (120-30). The hegemonic common sense and interpellative propaganda has made many people, particularly members of the elite class in Pakistan to evolve their personalities into enlightened-moderate types. Musharraf called himself to be one and General Kayani, the next army chief, had also “impressed the military and intelligence officials as a professional, pro-Western moderate” (155). Both Musharraf and Kayani were highly suitable subjects for the neo-colonial American elite as they established their hegemonic control over Pakistan through these two generals to attain their imperial objectives in Afghanistan.

To highlight the interpellative duplicity of the US administration, Ali refers to Senator Barry Goldwater’s statement made in 1964: “extremism in the defence of liberty is no vice!” (191). This was also considered true when the US backed the gorilla war of the Afghan Mujahedeen

against Russia. Ali believes that the same mind-set runs through the insurgents fighting the US and its allies in Iraq and Afghanistan as they are fighting for their liberty against the forces that have occupied their homelands. These freedom fighters, who were called the Mujahedeen when they were fighting with the US against the Russian invaders, are now interpellated as terrorists just because the imperial objective of the hegemon have changed and do not fit into the new ideology of the Empire. At another occasion in 1981, Senator Barry Goldwater offered an advice to his own party which, Ali believes, was equally good for the Afghan insurgents who were fighting against Russia. He states, “there is no position on which people are so immovable as their religious beliefs. There is no more powerful ally one can claim in a debate than Jesus Christ, or God, or Allah” (192). This was the strategy that was used by the US in the war against Russia when the Afghans and Pakistani Pashtuns were interpellated under the ideology that convinced that they were fighting a holy war against the enemies of God. In the contemporary war against terror too, the same narrative was converted into an ideology but in a different manner; the publics of America and Europe were interpellated through the Ideological State Apparatus of religion and politics when they were told that the savage Islamists of Al-Qaeda are after destruction of the Western civilization or the Christian World, so to say. The hegemonic common sense spread by the US bourgeoisie was so effective that the White House got populated by “religious fundamentalists” and on recommendation of the 9/11 Commission Report, the *Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act* of 2004 was promulgated by the Congress. A sustainable US aid was also approved for Pakistan to make it stay under the neo-colonial subjugation, though Pakistan was still hailed by the Western media, an ISA of the Empire, as a country with sanctuaries of terrorists. This view was internalized by the interpellated audiences of the Western countries to a great degree. Ali alludes to Stanley

Kurtz's words, while calling him ta "neocon pundit", "In a sense global Islam is now Waziristan writ large.... Waziristan now seeks to awaken the tribal jihadist side of the global Muslim soul" (*Obama Syndrome* 193). Ali argues, in an effort to subvert the interpellated images of the Pashtun insurgents, that there can be nothing more nonsensical than these words as such assumptions were also made propagated, through various ISAs, in the 1980s though that was the time when the Afghan Mujahedeen were hailed as freedom fighters, instead of terrorists. The intellectuals, journalists and other formulators of ideology shift their positions according to the needs of the Empire, yet, suggests Ali, it becomes difficult for the rulers of client states of the neo-colonial America to suddenly shift their positions and start calling the same people terrorists which were armed, trained and supported as Mujahedeen or the holy warriors.

Ali suggests that Empires denigrate their *Others* and marginalize them through various strategies. The British Imperialists too hailed the tribesmen of Waziristan to be "evil writ large" which was in fact part of their imperial strategy to expand their empire. Quoting Mr. Temple, a British civil servant of 1850s, Ali argues that the same language is now used for Islam and the Muslims as a whole: "Now these tribes are savages...absolutely barbarians.... In their eyes their one great commandment is blood for blood, and fire and sword for all infidels.... They are a sensual race" (*Obama Syndrome* 193). The Orientalist and racist overtones of the statement can be seen in the statement the savage civilized binary and a strong interpellative stereotyping of the Pashtuns from Waziristan is part of the narrative. There is a striking similarity between the British and American Empires regarding portrayal of the Pashtuns. The second example from the British Empire quoted by Ali is of Mr. Ibbetson who wrote in 1881 that the Pashtuns were "barbaric", "bloodthirsty" and "vindictive" while a few years later

another Scot official of the British Empire Mr. MacGregor wrote about Pashtuns: “Money could buy their services for the foulest deed” (194).

Pakistan’s nuclear capability has been a matter of concern for the West and India since its inception. The publics of the West have systematically been interpellated regarding a “jihadi threat” to the nuclear facilities possessed by Pakistan. As a result, even the wise scholars of the West issue statements that generate hysteria in the atmosphere. Their statements hail Pakistan as a nuclear power and represent it as a country that is so vulnerable that one day its nuclear weapons will be snatched by the terrorists which will then be used to bomb the Western cities. Matthew Bunn of Harvard University expressed his fears in one of his statements that one day Al Qaeda operatives will take over the nuclear weapons of Pakistan. The former CIA director of operations for Asia, Mr. Art Brown believed that if Musharraf is removed from the office, Pakistan’s nuclear weapons will become vulnerable and one day some of the ready-made nuclear bombs “could go out to somebody’s door and appear in our opponents’ box overnight” (*The Duel* 210). Ali further postulates that the United States supports Pakistani military regimes and prefers them over civilian governments, even at the expense of democracy, because it believes only the military can ensure the safety of nuclear weapons in Pakistan.

Tariq Ali disrupts this interpellative stance of the US imperial ideology, considering it to be either ridiculous or equally applicable to Israel and India: “What if forty heavily armed ultra-right Jewish settlers tried to seize Israeli weapons of mass destruction? Or a small group of hard-core Hindu fundamentalists attempt the same in India? As in Pakistan, they would be apprehended and dealt with” (211). Ali argues that the estimated number of Al-Qaeda operatives in the region is not more than five hundred which, of course, cannot pose a threat to more than half a million personnel of Pakistan army. Ali’s argument successfully disrupts the

interpellative propaganda spread by the Western Ideological State Apparatus of media and education and helps recover the interpellated subjects among the Western and Pakistani publics.

Ali asserts that hypocrisy of the West is obvious from its interpellative double standards which is “viewed with contempt in most parts of the world” (213). The strategy of supporting brutal violence was adopted by the US Empire after its occupation of Afghanistan as well but it was never shown in any of the Western media. Ali and Barsamian (2005) in *Speaking and Empire and Resistance* subvert the interpellated image of the US Empire by criticizing the deceptive use of media-ISA. They report that the US had told the Northern Alliance to annihilate the Taliban prisoners of war, which was “a total breach of all known conventions of war”, yet, the Western media were not covering this, though “Arab networks” had “shown massacres of prisoners” (4). What is shown on the media is nothing more than some “deliberately created” scenes that interpellate the Western masses through “ideology of so-called humanitarian intervention” i.e. “we don’t want to do this, but we’re doing it for the sake of the people who live there” (4-5). When the United States attacked Afghanistan, Cherie Blair and Laura Bush interpellated the masses by making them believe that the objective of the Afghan war was “liberating the women of Afghanistan” (85). Ali and Barsamian (2005) satirically point out that it was the “first imperial intervention for women’s liberation. But in the end, all it amounted to was a few pictures of one female announcer on Afghan television; she has long since disappeared, and the condition of women is as bad as ever, while incidents of rape have gone up” (85).

Tariq Ali subverts Pakistan’s interpellated image constructed by the Western media and politics by quoting a significant speech made by Musharraf on January 12, 2012 in which he

offered India denuclearization of both the countries, a no-war-agreement, shutting down training camps for jihadis and “total transformation of Indo-Pak relations” (215). Musharraf’s offer did not foster any opposition among the people of Pakistan who are interpellated as individuals who are obsessed with the concept of “Islamic bomb” (215). The Indian response was extremely disappointing as instead of responding in a positive manner, India test-fired another Agni missile right after two weeks of Musharraf’s land-mark speech. Ali maintains that nuclear disarmament and reduction of military budgets in both the countries will greatly help the poor populations of the two countries that are suffering from the adversities of being below the poverty line. The West and the US Empire, suggests Tariq Ali, do not have a right to demand nuclear disarmament from Pakistan and India, before they do it in their own countries since “only a twisted logic accepts that London and Paris can have bomb, but New Delhi and Islamabad cannot” (216).

6.3.4. A Neo-Imperial, Interpellated Nation

Tariq Ali (*The Duel* 2008) in the chapter “Can Pakistan be Recycled?” informs that the US Pakistan strategic relationship is of such pertinence that in 2008 the highly reputed American think tank, Brookings Institute of Washington, organized a forum to put forth the US strategic demands in the region and aptly named it “The US-Pakistan Strategic Relationship” which, instead of being a mutually beneficial relationship, had to be a relation that was supposed to serve “the immediate needs” of the neo-colonial master (249). The panel comprised of General Anthony Zinni and General Jehangir Karamat, two old friends and military philosophers where the former was the head of US CENTCOM while the latter was the former chief of staff of Pakistan army, an interpellated comprador elite, and “a decent and honourable empire loyalist” (249), and Richard Armitage, former United States Deputy Secretary of State. Although, the

choice for the panellists mirrored America's effort towards inducing heterogeneity at such an important forum, the aim of the meeting was not to discuss the causes of tension in the sixty years long US-Pak relationship. Rather, it was to bring forward the neo-imperial requirements of the United States that would shape Pakistan's policy for years to come. General Karamat, who unlike his predecessors never sought to seize power in Pakistan, began the discussion by trying to answer questions about what was happening on the western borders of Pakistan, and why, and what course of action had Pakistan adopted in the wake of such unrest on the borders. The General informed the panel of the complexity of the situation and tried his best to absolve Pakistan's name from interpellative blames of increasing militancy in the region. He also ensured the panel that problem causing tribal chiefs had been uprooted. In the end, he mildly cautioned against America's efforts to diminish Pakistan's role in the region as that would only aggravate the situation and urged for a long-lasting US-Pakistan strategic relationship. Later, General Zinni very conceitedly recounted his brief contact with the Pakistan army during early nineties in Somalia commending the Pakistani troops on their performance in Somalia. He then moved on to praising General Karamat and revealing their close ties despite the charged political atmosphere between the two countries. General Zinni quite ironically retold his visit to Pakistan in 1999 when he had gone to mediate between Pakistan and India over the Kargil war; in reality, the purpose of his visit was only to scold Pakistani high command for the Kargil misadventure. Contrary to what he said in his speech, he had come to deliver President Bill Clinton's neo-imperial interpellative orders to Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif and then chief of Army Staff General Pervez Musharraf to remove their troops from Indian territory. Dennis Kux, a former official of the Department of State of USA, elaborates on the event. According to him the US reaction to the Kargil war was even more vigorous than the Kashmir war of

1965. General Zinni pressed Pakistan to pull the plug on the Kargil operation despite Pakistan's claims of not being directly involved in it. Losing heart over being internationally interpellated and ostracized, Pakistan was forced to pull out of Kargil amidst heavy losses. The neo-imperial instructions from the foreign master left Pakistan with no choice as "not even the Chinese, let alone Americans, were willing to support the Pakistani position, Islamabad found itself internationally isolated...and decided to cut Pakistan's losses" (250-51).

However, argues Tariq Ali, General Zinni did not bring up the subject of Kargil war at the think tank meeting since it was intended to be a friendly forum with a strict agenda. Instead, he seconded General Karamat's stance that Pakistan should not be coerced when it comes to problems on its western borders, since already many military lives have been lost. In fact, there have been heavy casualties in the Pakistan army more than in the American army, although General Zinni did not admit it. The Pakistan Army purposefully understates the casualties, whereas the real sum is almost three times the one officially reported by the army, as reported by local journalists. In contrast to General Karamat's demure acknowledgements of the issues in US-Pak relationship and General Zinni's diplomatic avoidance of them, Richard Armitage uncompromisingly stated that Pakistan had been a chaos ever since its independence and it was rather a disorderly cluster of four different countries (referring to the country's four provinces). Deflecting all blame, he strongly stated that the United States was only partly accountable for the situation in the region and had full control of what it was doing in Pakistan during the Soviet-Afghan war. Ali asserts that Armitage's speech suggested clearly that "they knew perfectly well that they had handed the country to religious groups and the ISI" (151).

In the researcher's opinion, Pakistan's position as a neo-imperially managed country and an interpellated, compliant subject of the Global Empire is presented by Tariq Ali in a very

derogatory way. While talking about how Pakistan was used during the Russian and the US attacks on Afghanistan, Ali satirically states,

What they were doing was using Pakistan as a ‘Kleenex’...or, more accurately, a ‘condom’ as a retired and embittered general once described the ‘strategic relationship’ to me.... As I have repeatedly stressed in this book, U.S. priorities determined Pakistan’s domestic and foreign policies from 1951 onward. The long period of foreplay culminated in the Afghan climax. So, enthralled were the Pakistani military by the experience that they became desperate to repeat it in Kashmir and Kargil, forgetting that a condom can’t do it on its own. (*The Duel* 251-52)

Tariq Ali postulates that the neo-colonial United States asserts its hegemony over Pakistan through Ideological State Apparatuses of media and politics. The United States plans its imperial strategy first and then takes it to the media and politics in a way that suits its purpose; the weaker nations, like Pakistan and Afghanistan, in most cases are interpellated by the ideology they spread, as if it were the only version of truth. Ali gives the example of the statement given by the US president on April 12, 2008 while talking to ABC News, a client media house of the US Empire. He claimed in his statement that “the most dangerous area in the world now was neither Iraq nor Afghanistan, but Pakistan, because of the presence of Al Qaeda, who were preparing attacks on the United States” (252). US media and politicians also hail Pakistan to interpellate it as a country that can be hijacked by the extremists by representing Pakistan as a country where the “jihadi finger” is very close to “the nuclear trigger” (253). The statement of the US president not just hails Pakistan but also Afghanistan and Iraq to be dangerous places. The reason of such allegation was the fact that the United States wanted to interpellate the masses at home and abroad regarding its imperial desire to carry out military

attacks inside Pakistan. The problem, on the contrary, postulates Ali, did not lie in Pakistan but in the fact that the US had installed a comprador elite in Afghanistan against the wishes of the masses and carried out military operations and drone attacks inside Afghanistan, killing numberless innocent civilians and militants who were fighting for the freedom of their homeland.

Coming to the question raised in the title of the concluding chapter of *The Duel* (i.e. Can Pakistan be Recycled?), Tariq Ali portends that Pakistan and its modernization can be recycled, if broad-based structural reforms are carried out. The most important problem faced by Pakistan, apart from the issues related to extremism, possession of nuclear weapons, or being situated next to Afghanistan, is “doing the Washington’s bidding in previous decades” (255), i.e. being neo-colonized nations, interpellated by the hegemonic stand of the US that what Pakistan is asked to do is in the interest of Pakistan and its public. Ali sees solution of Pakistan’s problems in a self-determined local and foreign policy that focuses on regional relations and alliances rather than following the sole agenda of maintaining relationships with the US Empire: “instead of a foreign policy dependent on big powers, there should be a regional concentration on South Asia and the working out of a common approach to international relations. A rapprochement with India and the creation of a South Asian Union” (262).

Ali observes that the Western obsession with the Muslim is more because of the imperial desire of controlling oil rather than the events of 9/11. Tariq Ali subverts the interpellated image of Islam propagated by the Western media machines to justify killing of innocent Muslims around the world, and endeavours to recover the erased image of Islam. In considering the implications of Islam, Western examiners would do well to remember it for what it is: a world religion that is in no way monolithic. Both as a religion and a society it envelops various

cultures as unique in relation to one another as those in Senegal and Indonesia, South Asia and the Arabian Peninsula, the Maghreb and China. It holds all the shades of the rainbow and its society has stayed energetic right up till today. Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Indonesia gave birth to three of the finest writers of the twentieth century, Abdelrahman Munif, Naguib Mahfouz, and Pramoedya Ananta Toer. South Asia has transformed writers of supreme quality, including Ghalib, Iqbal, and Faiz. Senegal and Iran have provided for us an auteur silver screen that contrasts with the best once processed in Europe and regularly better than Hollywood. The West, however, blinded by its imperial and neo-imperial interests, cannot see the glaring cultural variety that stems out of the camps of Islam as the West is “incapable of looking beyond its own interests and unaware of the world it traduces” (263).

Tariq Ali presents a picture of Pakistan that suggests that the US neo-imperial ruling elite has interpellated the Pakistani military and political leadership, through various ideological state apparatuses, so successfully that they cannot even think about making Pakistan exist without being submissive to the US policies or the terms they dictate to them; this hailed position has converted them into mere comprador subjects who can find nothing more convenient than to be compliant to their neo-imperial masters. During the Musharraf era, the US, after consuming the benefits he could bring for them, came up with further terms and conditions that were much sterner than the ones agreed with General Zia-ul-Haq during the Russian offensive of Afghanistan. During the Musharraf era, “Pakistan has been ousted as imperial instrument in Afghanistan and checked from compensating with renewed incursions in Kashmir” (268). The United States wants Pakistan to keep a softer stance along its borders with Afghanistan to allow the imperial military to carry out its operations more conveniently. The US has spent huge amounts of money in installing a comprador regime in Afghanistan and

intends to stay in Afghanistan in years to come. Pakistan's top brass is needed by the US for fulfilment of its objectives in Afghanistan hence apart from Pakistani military, the Empire considers the political elite of Pakistan "just as serviceable agents of its designs in Kabul as Zia himself" (269).

6.4. Conclusion

Analysis of the two non-fictional works in the chapter clearly reveals how the dominant capitalist bourgeoisie influence the state power and make use of its hegemonic potential to exploit people and their resources both at home and abroad and dominate other classes of society by their conscious or unconscious consent. The neo-imperial design and hegemonic nature of the American Empire and its interpellative impact on the whole world is one of the most significant issues of our age. The social identity constructed through the neo-imperial interpellation is a misrepresentation of social relations and social meanings which is considered 'false consciousness' in Marxist terms. The human subjects in the dominated societies are made to have a false view of their true social condition; this situation allows the neo-imperial elites to have power over the proletarians. The geopolitical influence of the US Empire is massive and extensive due to its unscrupulous use of ideological and repressive state apparatuses and the mechanics of hegemony utilized by the politico-military axis. The neo-imperial America under the guise of resolving the issues related to the Middle East and its surroundings destroys, occupies and plunders the countries like Iraq. The neo-colonial US ideology continues to interpellate its subjects and those who are under suspicion of defying the imperial ideology are tortured and murdered and labelled as uncivilized savages who deserve to be eliminated without any remorse. To establish neo-colonial control over the Global Empire first initiates a military action, in case these nations deny to subdue to the will of the Empire

on political level. After establishing occupation through military, the Empire promotes a compliant, pro-Western, comprador class of politicians and intellectuals to rule the country, after military forces leave the area. The comprador class allows the establishment of a neo-colony where the neo-colonizers watch their interests in the comfort of their home, with least expenditures, minimal military presence and even least moral obligations. While believing in the power of Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses, Tariq Ali, in his writings, sounds less Althusserian and more Gramscian due to the fact that he believes in existence of more than one ideology at a time which makes the possibility of resistance more probable. He finds hope in the anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist ideology of communism which is evident from the fact that he appreciates all those uprisings that are somehow linked with or inspired by the communist thought.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

7.1. Tariq Ali's Position on Capitalism, Colonialism, and Neo-Imperialism

The critique of Tariq Ali's writings carried out by this research conveniently places him at the position of a postcolonial critic with an anti-capitalist, anti-imperial and anti-colonial standing. Born in Pakistan—a former colony and a present neo-colony—to communist, atheist parents, he spent the larger part of his life in England where he actively supported the Leftist thought and practice and contributed a lot to the struggle against capitalism. His birth, racial origin and theoretical outlook make him stand among the Pakistani diaspora intellectuals; a representative of the margin who is quite immersed in the centre. Ali clearly displays both attraction and repulsion towards the two cultures he interacted with during his life time; he speaks, in Bhabha's words, from the "third Space of enunciation" (Bhabha 1994: 37) which makes him a hybrid person who is complicit as well as a resistant towards the neo-colonial discourse. His writings are "a site on which ideological struggles are acted on" (Barry 129). Being a diasporic postcolonial intellectual, he stands apart from the rest of the First World intellectuals for being a Leftist, a Socialist, an anti-capitalist and an anti-imperialist who exposes the evil of the imperial designs of the European and American ruling elites by informing his readers about the ideological manoeuvres, political falsehoods and hunger for power and control prevailing among these elites. They hide the imperial agenda of looting, exploiting and annihilating the vulnerable nations and peoples of the world behind the metanarratives of humanism, democracy, enlightenment, freedom, and civilisation. These

metanarratives or glittering generalizations are spread through a variety of propaganda machines called the Ideological State Apparatuses, particularly, ISAs media and politics. The hybrid nature of Ali's personality, however, makes him shift positions in his narrative by disrupting the binaries of colonizer-colonized, centre-margin or self-other. While subverting the imperial gaze and the Eurocentric assumptions of the Empire, or neo-imperial powers, he, at times, buys the Eurocentric perspective himself and becomes critical of the masses that are being exploited and interpellated by the Empire. Tariq Ali has a good command on history and development of the colonial and imperial powers and their various dynamics which helps him get to the roots of the problems faced by the mankind, especially the Muslim world, that is made to suffer the most by the imperial and neo-imperial interpellation and hegemony of the West. Tariq Ali's fictional and non-fictional writings not only explore, analyse and critique the interpellative practices of the neo-imperial West but also subverts this interpellation, mostly by re-inscribing the erased history of the Muslims and Islam.

7.1.1. Impact of Imperial and Neo-Imperial Interpellation

The neo-imperial agenda of America has a deep impact on the masses of its own country and the common people living in the European countries whose ruling elites support the US foreign policy of destructive domination; though the negative impact on European publics is less destructive when compared with the publics of the third world, particularly Muslim, countries. Ali's critique of the neo-colonial outlook of the UK and the US surfaces when he points out that the anti-social and anti-peace agenda of "privatization at home, wars and occupation abroad" (*The Extreme* 91) has hampered the development of the European countries due to their seamless acceptance of the neo-imperial agenda of the United States through ideological interpellation. EU countries, especially the East European countries have been

interpellated to the degree of being mere vassal states of the Global Empire and are acting like “most loyal and compliant” subjects of the neo-imperial United States (*The Extreme* 91). In the capacity America’s client, the EU has emerged as an imperialist, non-democratic, hegemonic, dictatorial body “the mothership of the extreme centre” which is administered by a “set of unelected bureaucrats, working for banks, the IMF, the ECB, etc.” (104) who interpellate the ruling elites by dictating policies to the elected governments of the EU, supported by the neo-imperialist North America. The masses living in the EU are either less aware of the situation or under influence of an interpellative Capitalist Lie propagated by petty bourgeoisie heading the EU who make them believe that “only European Union is able to guarantee the social rights of all European citizens and to eradicate poverty. Only Europe can solve the problems of globalization, climate change and social injustice”. These interpellative, shameless capitalist lies, Ali believes, are destined to wither away as many anti-EU parties have emerged out of loss of trust in the elites.

Tariq Ali’s evaluation of the European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is a discourse that can essentially be called Postcolonial and Marxist in its essence. He has dedicated a separate chapter for discussion on NATO in *The Extreme Centre* (2015) discussing the history, function and role of NATO with reference to Europe, North America and the rest of the world. Ali clearly indicates that NATO’s, using Ashcroft’s words, “imperial impulse” to “exploit” and “civilize” its others is alive and functional and even after the demise of the colonial era and failure in Afghanistan and Iraq, they are ready to embark upon a new “civilizing mission” (Ashcroft, *Key Concepts* 20) which is interpellative in nature. NATO’s imperial impulse is more concerned with improving its image as an essential force in order to interpellate by presenting stereotyped images of the ISIS fighters. This process of interpellation

and othering is essential for the existence of the Self in the colonial discourse, the Empire as the Imperial Self cannot achieve value unless it has its Other, the enemy that is to become focus of power (Ashcroft *Key Concepts* 156). Tariq Ali argues that by interpellating the masses by invoking the fear of the enemy, NATO in fact desired to bring in significant policy changes with an aim to further negotiate its neo-colonial position. Being handmaid of the US, NATO destroys countries, mostly in the Muslim world, and helps the empire replace regimes in these countries based on interpellative lies and false accusations like presence of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs) in Iraq; these lies interpellate the masses at home and abroad in favour of the imperial military action.

7.2. Ideology, Interpellation and Empire: Marxist Inclinations in Ali's Writings

Tariq Ali's writings implicitly and explicitly reveal his Marxist and Socialist tendencies that make him a leftist and an anti-capitalist who is appalled by the neo-liberal, imperialist strategies of the US Empire and its European clients, especially Britain that interpellate the masses at home and abroad in favour of their neo-imperial discourse. Ali's Leftist, Marxist and anti-capitalist stance make him a natural postcolonial, anti-colonial author whose writings serve the purpose of decolonization and establish him as a postcolonial author, representing Pakistani diaspora in Britain who successfully disrupts the neo-imperial interpellation.

7.2.1. Fusion of Orthodox and Un-Orthodox Marxism in Ali's Non-Fiction

Ali's writings take inspiration from the Marxist notion of the class distinction and the class struggle based on the means of production. The distinction between the bourgeoisie and the proletarians, haves and have-nots resides in the core of his literary activism. The Orthodox Marxist notions of base and superstructure and the relations of production are also incorporated in his writings. He is very critical about the way pro-capitalist ruling elites in Europe, America

or elsewhere in the world exploit the proletarian masses by buying their labour-power for earning unproportioned profits, at the cost of an unjust distribution of wealth. He also criticizes the imperial, capitalist governments for the policies of privatization, military aggression and cutting down of social benefits of the masses in order to maintain their profits. Ali also criticizes the commodification and fetishism in favour of a production that is organized directly for use. His point of departure from the Orthodox Marxism is his standpoint on the communist revolution which is important for subversion of ideology and its interpellative practices.

The Orthodox Marxists believe that the communist stage of social development will establish itself as a natural course of history, after capitalism would grow to its full potential and then collapse, giving way to a communist revolution which will then end up in a proletarian dictatorship. Tariq Ali, in his non-fictional discourse, always favours all sorts of dissent and resistance that gives him some hope for the decline of capitalism and imperial hegemony around the world which can ultimately subvert the neo-imperial interpellation. Tariq Ali's writings suggest that he is a staunch advocate of the Marxist position: "the class which has the means of material production at its disposal, consequently also controls the means of mental production" (Marx and Engels in Easthope 39) which further suggests the presence of an elite ideology that hails and interpellates the masses at home and abroad, making people believe that the interests of the US empire are aligned with their own interests. Ali's attitude towards the US and UK politics is non-conformist. All his non-fictional works present a critique of the Western politics, contemporary imperialist and neo-imperialist interpellative ways of the West, while at the same time most of his writings advocate and gratify communist and socialist values. These trends are suggested by the mere titles of many of his books as well: *Bush in Babylon: The Recolonization of Iraq*, *Chile*, *Lessons of the Coup: Which Way to Workers*

Power, The Two Fundamentalisms: Crusades, Jihads and Modernity, The Stalinist Legacy: Its Impact on 20th-Century World Politics, The Duel: Pakistan on the Flight Path of American Power, Street Fighting Years: An Autobiography of the Sixties, Rough Music: Blair, Bombs, Baghdad, London, Terror, Speaking of Empire and Resistance, The Obama Syndrome: Surrender at Home, War Abroad, The Idea of Communism, The Extreme Centre: A Waning and so on. In most of these books Ali has dedicated full length chapters that deal directly with the various aspects of the communist struggle in various parts of the world. Books like *Pirates of the Caribbean: Axis of Hope* (2007) deal entirely with the subject of clash between communist and capitalist forces in South America.

The works analysed in this research including *Rough Music, The Extreme Centre* and *The Obama Syndrome*, reverberate Ali's Communist notions that can be described well in words of Lenin: "our main efforts should now be concentrated on explaining to the proletarian masses their proletarian problems, as distinguished from the petty bourgeoisie which has succumbed to chauvinist intoxication" (Lenin 1964, 111). Pivotal to all the non-fictional works, analysed by the researcher, is the critique of the neo-imperial powers which exposes the interpellative falsehoods of the Western elites, the "shameless capitalist lie" (Lenin 110) that they propagate and instil in the minds of the global masses through interpellation and ISAs to strengthen their hegemony by making the masses believe that the bourgeoisie ideology best suits the rest of the classes including the proletariats. While in reality, Ali asserts, both the bourgeoisie class and its ideology are equally harmful for the rest of the society and the world. Tariq Ali in his nonfiction, particularly in *The Extreme Centre*, has both Marxist and anticolonial standing as he vocally criticizes the bourgeoisie and their capitalist intents and raises voice in favour of economic and social equality and policies that ensure thinning of the income gap among

various strata of society. His dedication of the book to the Venezuelan President is quite symbolic as President Hugo Chavez is known for his anti-imperialist stance and his strong opposition of the US Imperial and neo-imperial strategies. Ali's nonfiction is replete with his aversion for contemporary neoliberal economics which makes him raise voice against capitalist regimes and their antisocial policies.

Ali's nonfictional texts also present a criticism of democratic capitalism and neo-liberalism in most first world countries and the capitalist lies spoken consistently by the ruling elites to ensure the masses that the economic, financial and social policies they implement are in favour of both the capitalist elite and the masses. Ali's Socialist stand point is expressed through his stance against the ways of the contemporary democracies in Europe, America, Canada and Australia that are corrupt and "in serious trouble" (*The Extreme* 1) due to their redundancy and "poverty of any real progressive ideas" (3) as instead of serving the needs of common people or the proletarians, the parties in power are serving the needs of certain special interest groups that interfere the political processes through spilling money into the democratic processes for lobbying. He has a genuinely Marxist view of the society and politics in the United Kingdom where the "US-styled politics" (*The Extreme* 7) and a hegemonic, exploitative bourgeoisie is keeping the proletarians deprived, using the ideological state apparatuses of media and education and making them believe that their interests are the interests of all. Ali's sever criticism of the English bourgeoisie is spread throughout his nonfictional books. Ali raises a postcolonial voice against a ruling class that is not only indifferent towards the plight of the underdeveloped world but also have the same attitude towards the masses in their own country. The interpellate masses both at home and abroad by generating a false ideology that diverts the attention of these masses from their evil, imperialist, manipulative deeds.

Ali's criticism of the British politicians is analogous to criticism of the bourgeois class in the Orthodox Marxist theory which postulates that the removal of the capitalist bourgeoisie is an essential requirement for the proletariat revolution. He severely criticizes the imperial bourgeoisie of the US and the UK for cutting the budgets allocated for the social services and privatization of social welfare institutions like the National Health Service (NHS). These propositions have obvious connotations that refer to Ali's desire for a Marxist revival in form of a "huge revolt from below" (*The Extreme* 99) that requires mobilization of the proletariat to replace the bourgeoisie in order to take the means of production in their own hands in order to ensure a more just distribution of wealth or in the long run head towards a socialist society. However, Ali does not seem to agree with the Orthodox Marxist standing that capitalism cannot be reformed and any attempt to restructure capitalism would only intensify its contradictions that is why revolution should be considered a natural outcome of the capitalism's last stage of development. Ali, on the other hand favours the Trotskyism which advocates a dictatorship of the proletariat and mass democracy. Tariq Ali's nonfiction does not position him as a mono-dimensional Marxist; he progresses through his nonfiction as a Marxist with a variety of shades—at times Orthodox, at times Trotskyian and a Leninist. He even rectifies the World Systems Theory that applies the Marxist concept of class system on global level by proposing that the world is divided into two classes i.e. the Core Nations and the Periphery Nations. The core nations own and control the global means of production and act as world's Hegemon; the periphery nations, on the other hand, possess least amount of the major means of production of the globe.

Tariq Ali's postulation that the growth of empire is profoundly engrained in the logic of capitalism seamlessly provides him a ground for criticizing the neo-imperialist designs of the

West. He suggests that capitalism has divided the world into centre and periphery since its birth during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The leading capitalist countries establish new economies around the globe with an aim to import low priced raw materials from the peripheral economies. The third world countries, having weak economies, serve as pools of inexpensive work force. Ali's subversion of the capitalist mindset is spread throughout his nonfiction. He is convinced that the United Kingdom cannot be separated from the neo-imperial hegemonic intents of the United States as its political elite is strongly bound and compliant to the imperial desire of the US capitalist and political elites. He satirically terms the special relationship between the US and the UK as "dog-like coital lock" (*The Extreme* 124) that has its own pains and pleasures but being a lock, it cannot be broken; the UK, instead, forms part of the imperial discourse of the global empire and likes to be part of its violent imperial adventures in the foreign lands. Marxist contempt for capitalism is also strongly brought forward by Tariq Ali in his criticism of the petty bourgeoisie led by Bush and Blair and toadyism of the print media in the West (*Rough Music* 40). Ali criticism of the US and Britain's so-called war for freedom or war on terror places the two powers at the positions of neo-colonial powers that interpellate the weaker nations in order to occupy them both geographically and politically.

Although Tariq Ali is a stern believer of dissent against the interpellating neo-imperial American elites, yet he is not much hopeful about the demise of the US Empire in the near future through the communist regimes or any other outside forces of dissent. He believes that the power house of the US neo-imperial regimes can only be overpowered from political forces inside the Empire itself. The neo-imperial ideology has interpellated the subjectivities of its proletariats so much that those who oppose the foreign imperial adventures in the US and Europe are considered either "bad patriots" or "a little more than back-stabbing traitors" (*The*

Extreme 141-2). His critique of the moderate Islamist forces of the Arab East is necessarily postcolonial as he considers them to be the comprador class of rulers having no will to carry out struggle for cultural or economic autonomy by opposing the neo-imperial policies of subduing and plundering the world in the guise of its civilizing impulse. However, Ali is not very optimistic about the success of the anti-colonial forces in the contemporary world. He believes that the decline of the global empire seems improbable in the near future and those who think that its economic problems or the setbacks in South America will lead to a decline soon have little more than wishful thinking. However, he sternly believes in the goodness and strength of the Socialist values and hopes that the solution to all the problems posed by the neo-imperial, neo-liberal and capitalist policies of the west resides in implementation of Socialist values though he does not see a proletarian dictatorship, as conceived by Carl Marx, after overthought of the bourgeoisie; instead, he advocates a revived and overhauled democratic system that is not run by a selfish gang of elites, established as a result of proletarian “movements from below” (*The Extreme* 175). A critique of Ali’s nonfictional works demonstrates that his solution of the global problems created by the Empire does not stem from Orthodox Marxist agenda; it is rather a mix of various streams of Marxist discourse mingled with the existing democratic system prevalent in the developed world. The revolution, in Ali’s discourse, cannot simply be brought in by the proletarian classes as oppression alone cannot encourage revolution, both the proletarian and the bourgeoisie should find it uncomfortable to rule or to be ruled in the old way.

7.3. Tariq Ali’s Critique of Neo-Imperial Interpellation

Tariq Ali suggests in his fictional and non-fictional writings that the Western neo-imperial ideology, interpellation and (mis)representation of the Muslims and Islam has not only created a false and demonized image of the Muslims in the minds of the Western masses but the

populations of the Islamic countries, particularly, the ruling elites have also been influenced by this manipulated image, spread and perpetuated through the ideological state apparatuses. These false, interpellated images of the Muslims and Islam, thus, need to be subverted and their erased identity needs to be reinstalled. He has endeavoured to do so in his fictional series *The Islam Quintet*.

7.3.1. Fiction

Tariq Ali subverts the imperial interpellative discourse and its colonial allegory by disrupting the self-other and centre-margin binary in the novels of *The Islam Quintet* series. He defies the interpellative neo-imperial binaries of the centre and margin by intermixing and hybridizing the attributes of the self and other, with the help of the tools like genealogical mixing of multiple ethnic or religious hereditary lines; by doing this, he dims and disrupts the very notion of self and other and introduces cultural pluralism.

In the fictional works of *The Islam Quintet*, Ali has successfully disrupted the neo-colonial allegorical and interpellative representations and Eurocentric versions of history by appropriating the neo-imperial allegory and using it to respond to the allegories of hegemony. *The Islam Quintet* is an attempt to replace the Eurocentric, monolithic, and interpellative cultural traditions with cross cultural pluralism. The erased or (mis)represented history of the Muslims and Islam through colonial and neo-colonial allegory and palimpsest has been subverted through presentation of certain vital historical moments of the Islamic history where followers of different religions lived with peace and cultural harmony. Ali's fiction is necessarily an attempt to present a view of history which is devoid of the colonizing and interpellating European gaze. This is done through linguistic appropriation by frequent use of Arabic words and expressions in most of the novels of the *Quintet*. The postcolonial allegorical

nature of the work can be vividly seen through the pages where the author consistently disrupts the Eurocentric versions of the interpellative and allegorical images and presents Europeans as invaders who are barbaric, liars, murderers of women, children and Jews and defilers of the holy places. Ali assertively disrupts the re-inscribed Palimpsest and neo-colonial interpellative allegory in *A Sultan* as well by emphasising on the greatness of the Muslim civilization of Sicily where Arabic culture advanced so much that even the Christian kings idealized it and adopted many aspects of it including the very titles they bore. He subverts the colonizing, interpellating gaze of the West by presenting grandeur of the Islamic culture during various historical epochs when Islam was the epitome of learning and cultural advancement. *Shadows* and *A Sultan*, contrary to the interpellation, suggest that religious harmony, at least among the people of the book, is possible in presence of wise and just rulers. Through the presentation of Christian violence against the Muslims, Tariq Ali clearly disrupts the colonizer-colonized binary of the neo-imperial ideological interpellation spread through its media apparatus by suggesting that Christians had always been a more violent people as compared to the Muslims who are being targeted and interpellated for being violent and barbaric in the contemporary world.

Ali's post-coloniality resides in his presentation of the Islamic version of history. He repetitively disrupts the interpellative myths and allegories of colonial hegemony by recovering the re-inscribed identities and representations in the cultures of Jerusalem and Moorish Spain at carefully and meaningfully chosen points of time in history. The native narrators are given voice and the marginalized, interpellated characters are empowered to reverse their position from margin to centre. In *The Book*, Saladin's enlightened and civilized identity, that subverts the interpellative image of Muslims, puts him into centre when it is

contrasted with the barbaric killings of women, children, Muslims and Jews by the Christians. Ali's most significant postcolonial, decolonizing expression against neo-imperial interpellation and Palimpsest appears in *A Sultan* in form of the last words spoken by Amir Philip before he is sentenced to be burnt in fire, to satisfy the Christian Barons: "We were your strength, we gave you the courage to be independent, our learning, our language, our culture enabled you to boast that you were superior in every way to your poor cousins in England, which was only the truth" (103).

Tariq Ali has a strong decolonizing strain prevalent in the *Islam Quintet* series. In his fictional works he subverts the interpellated re-inscribed history and Eurocentric allegory by claiming the right version of truth. He persistently reverses the binary of civilized/barbaric to reveal the historic truth that there was a time when the Muslims were learned, scholarly and civilized while the Christians were barbaric, illiterate, barbaric and extremists. Through a variety of hybrid characters such as Sultan Rujari and Muhammad al-Idrisi, he disrupts the colonial binary of centre/margin offered by the colonial discourse and re-inscribes the erased image of the great Muslim civilization.

Islam's interpellated, mythical, allegorical and stereotypical image, which presents it as a religion that is a threat to the West having followers who are barbaric, extremists and uncivilized, is recovered through postcolonial allegory of Islam that puts it back to the position of a religion of peace, tolerance and harmony that once gave birth to one of the greatest civilizations in the history of mankind. The acts of barbarism and savagery, on the other hand, are linked with the Christian conquerors who remorselessly exterminate their enemies, force them to convert, and burn their books and libraries publicly. Historical figures exalted by the Western historians are reversed to be everyday people, unworthy of being exalted. The best

example of Postcolonial allegory is presented in *Shadows* where Juan, the carpenter entertains Yazid Ibn Umar by carving caricatures of historical Spanish figures on a chest showing them as black and monstrous. King Ferdinand appears like a satanic figure with a pair of horns on his head and Queen Isabella is painted as a blood sucking creature with red lips. Inquisition monks, famous for their barbaric punishments, together with Spanish knights are demonized and caricatured through allegorical signs and figures. All this suggests that once the Muslims had the power to represent Christians though, unlike contemporary European Christian neo-imperial elites, not so unrealistically. *Shadows* manifests instances of postcolonial orality by quoting several pieces of oral poetry, songs and stories that were preserved by the Moorish people, even after the mass burning of their books in Granada. The use of orality also provides a good opportunity to present richness of the Muslim culture, providing a contrast to the interpellated representation of the Muslim culture.

The stereotypical image of women and gender relations in Islamic civilization is based on colonial allegory and palimpsest of erased, eradicated, interpellated and re-inscribed history. This Eurocentric version based in colonial ideological discourse, presents the allegory of the Muslim female in form of an image that is suppressed, degraded, weak and inferior to men, having no role to play in social, economic, cultural or political levels, limited to the enclosed environment of the *harem*. The image of the marginalized other is strongly subverted by Tariq Ali in *Shadows*, where the environment of *harem* is less private and Muslim women have the opportunity to resist the system for their freedom and independence. The social environment provided by Umar in his house, for example, is liberal enough to allow Hind and her mother Zubayda to cultivate freedom of thought.

Ali's fiction also reveals his own hybrid subjectivity where he locates himself both at the colonized and the colonizer's space. His narrative contains heterogeneous multi-ethnic characters blended in a common social fibre. He blends-in ethnic groups of Arabs, Asians, Europeans and Africans, offering allegorical images that stem out of historical accounts of Islam, Christianity and Judaism during the Moorish rule in Spain and the conquest of Jerusalem by Saladin during the twelfth century. His attempt to restore the erased or misrepresented images and identities positions him as a narrator who is retelling the historical accounts of the colonized in order to decolonize history and historical identities. *The Islam Quintet* is also an attempt to contextualize the encounter between the neo-colonial empire and its Others in the Middle East in the backdrop of the contemporary clashes between the two. The hybrid nature of Ali's own subjectivity and that of his characters is revealed by the fact that the agenda of his historical project in the novels is to oppose both the fundamentalisms of the East and the West, though his intention is to create a space for tolerance between the two.

7.3.2. Non-Fiction

In his non-fictional works, Tariq Ali resists the ideology propagated by the British politicians in power and critiques how they have maintained their hegemonic control over the interpellated subjects through Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs), particularly the ISA of media. He considers "New Labour" to be Blair's "most significance ideological success" (*The Extreme* 6). The neoliberal and capitalist ideology was though a "hallucinatory euphoria" yet it was "aided and abetted by a sycophantic news establishment, helped to cement the new consensus" (7). Ali calls it a "full-scale ideological assault" which can be translated as 'domination by consent', in Gramsci's words or interpellation in Althusserian terms. Ali rightly posits that the most effective ideological apparatus engaged by the neo-imperialist West in

Europe and the US is the media which, instead of being “combative, creative” or “critical” in the “scoundrel times”, has become “loyal” to the imperial regimes (Ali *RM*, 64) and assisted them in propagating the capitalist lie or the “grammar of deceit” (15) around the globe to interpellate masses in favour of their exploitative acts of imperial control. Media spreads ideological and interpellative falsehood through its effective and speedy communication. Tariq Ali suggests that the unashamed falsehoods, enforced by the bourgeoisie ideology, are sometimes so intensely internalized by the interpellated subjects that it becomes very difficult for them to differentiate truth from falsehood. Marx calls this false-consciousness, a consciousness that positions the masses as subjects who do not have the ability to recognize the falsehood of the elitist oppressors. Tariq Ali in *Rough Music* suggests that the falsehood, the capitalist lie, related to the WMD propaganda was part of the neo-imperial ideology of the US and the UK. The truth was manipulated and spread among the masses through the Ideological State Apparatus (ISA) or Media and the Repressive State Apparatus of Law in some cases. Ali’s response to the London bombings was of a postcolonial critic, since he defied the imperial assault on Afghanistan and Iraq and the war mongering missions of the Blair government. He declares that the Empire’s war-against-terror was “immoral and counterproductive” as it sanctioned the use of “state terror—bombing raids, tortures, countless civilian deaths in Afghanistan and Iraq—against Islamo-anarchists whose numbers are small, but whose reach is deadly” (*Rough Music* 47). He posits that a political solution of the problem would have been better as compared to a military assault. Ali’s anti-imperialist, anti-colonial stance vividly comes to surface when he asserts that ending the occupation of Palestine, Afghanistan and Iraq can put an end to the violent reaction of the Islamo-anarchists around the world. The neo-imperial powers follow the footsteps of the colonial powers of the past whose

so-called mission was to civilize and exploit the uncivilized barbarians. Both Bush and Blair responded to the London bombing in the same way, calling it an attack on “our civilization” by barbarians (*Rough Music* 49). Tariq Ali’s writings repetitively suggest the existence of colonial and neo-colonial binaries of self and other, centre and margin, civilized and barbarian that appear in the neo-imperial discourse containing the same old desire for control and power.

Tariq Ali critically examines and subverts the neo-imperial discourse and asserts that the interpellation it caused among the Muslim communities residing in the west has generated the ideology that the Islamic fundamentalism was directly responsible for the extremist and terrorist attacks that took place in the West. Ali subverts this ideologically driven, interpellative opinion propagated by the empire and its state apparatus of media. Ali unveils the interpellative double standards of the Western media by pointing out the “price tag” (*Rough Music* 52) it places on citizens of the Western countries and on tens of thousands of people murdered on the orders of the brutal imperialists like Bush, Blair and their successors.

Tariq Ali suggests that the ruling neo-imperial British elites phrase out their anger in terms of self/other and centre/margin binaries, which portrays their imperialist and neo-colonial agenda. By doing this they place the Muslim communities, the Asian races and everyone else that is not white British at a marginalizing distance created by a process of Othering. Tariq Ali, from a postcolonial standpoint, subverts such statements while calling them mantras of “Anglo-Saxon politicians” that are “shrouded in untruth” and are constantly repeated (*Rough Music* 67). The capitalist regime creates interpellated savage images of mad fundamentalists who represent uncivilized ideology and are determined to destroy everything touching modernity, democracy and “our” British values.

7.4. Contradictions in Tariq Ali's Critique of Neo-Imperial Interpellation

Tariq Ali's fictional and non-fictional writings, despite being postcolonial, anti-imperialist in nature, at times, place him at the crossroads of two opposing cultures. His birth, racial origin and theoretical outlook make him stand among the Pakistani diasporic intellectuals; in postcolonial terms: a representative of the margin who is quite immersed in the centre, being a citizen of England. Ali clearly displays both attraction and repulsion towards the two cultures he interacted with during his life time; he seems to speak from the "third Space of enunciation" (Bhabha 1994: 37) which makes him at the same time a complicit as well as a resistant towards the neo-imperial/neo-colonial interpellative discourse regarding Islam and the Muslims. His writings can be termed as "a site on which ideological struggles are acted on" (Barry 129). Tariq Ali's hybrid position puts him at the 'third space', as proposed by Bhabha, where he is at the same time representing the colonizers and the colonized. He, at times, conforms to the neo-imperial Ideology, yet, being a mimic subject, he has the potential of subverting the ideological discourse of the centre.

In the *Islam Quintet* fictional series, characters like Al-Idrisi appear to be the product of a colonial gaze that is Orientalist in nature, seeing the Orient to be sensual, savage and uncivilized. These are the, characters that are overcome by a passion for sensuality and making love with women, making Ali look more like an Orientalist author who interpellates the Eastern people for being sensual rather than intellectual. The elements of atheism also make Ali's fictional discourse hybrid and make him appear representative of the Centre rather than the Margin. For instance, when al-Idrisi is thinking about various aspects of Christianity and Greek mythology and his vessel arrives near the shores of Palermo, he hopes that "Poseidon willing", instead of Allah/God willing, "they would reach Palermo without another storm" (*A Sultan* 4).

In an atheistic spirit, while studying Hercules' visit to Siqilliya, he questions himself "why should he start In the name of Allah, the Beneficent... just like every other scholar in his world" (5) and why not "in the name of Satan" (*A Sultan* 13). Ali presents hybrid characters of Sultan Rujari and Muhammad al-Idrisi to subvert the binaries of colonizer-colonize, offered by the colonial discourse. The Sicilian leader is a Norman Christian but necessarily has characteristics of the Arab or Muslim culture; he can speak Arabic, enjoys hybrid titles of King Roger of Sicily and Sultan Rujari of Siqilliya, and keeps a *harem*. His son Guillaume is so hybrid a character that the Sultan considers him to be someone who "feels and thinks like an Arab" and would "anger the nobles" for being "imbibed" in the Arab culture (40). He respects Muslim scholars like alIdrisi and prefers "to ignore the Pope and rely, instead, on the loyalty of his Muslim subject" and advisors (*A Sultan* 11). Among the most venerated Muslim advisors was Younis al-Shami, his tutor and a sage scholar who taught him algebra, astronomy and Arabic.

In non-fictional works, Tariq Ali again offers contradictions regarding his view point and suggests his hybrid subjectivity. While criticizing the role of the US in exploiting the religious friction among the Muslim states, Ali seems to shift positions between the Colonizer and the Colonized by his Eurocentric, interpellative stern criticism of the Iranian and Saudi leadership and policies.

There are several instances of writing in Tariq Ali's works that complicate the understanding of Ali's own subjectivity. The image of Islamic political parties of Pakistan provided by Ali sounds casual and at times demeaning, which once again makes Ali look like a representative of the West instead of a postcolonial critic of the West. When discussing various aspects of Jamiat-Ulema-e-Islam (JUI) and Jamaate-Islami (JI), Ali calls the JUI leader Mufti Mahmud "a wily political operator, capable of alliances with secular nationalists to

further his aims” and during an interview with a JI representative he asks him “why they were so obsessed with women, why not leave them alone?” Later in the passage claims that homosexuality has strong roots in the Pashtun regions; he further hails the image of the Pashtuns by saying, “The general disgust with traditional politics has created a moral vacuum, which is filled by pornography and religiosity of various sorts. In some areas religion and pornography go together” (*The Duel* 24). The moral degeneration of the Pashtuns together with their obsession for religion is equated without much logic, which further enhances the distorted image of the Pashtuns presented by the British colonialists in the past and the US imperialists in the present world. Here Ali enhances the hegemonic, ideological interpellation of the West, instead of subverting it.

Ali’s voice changes at many places in his non-fiction, particularly when he is talking about “Islamists”, and he becomes more of a colonizer rather than the colonized or a representative of the West rather than the East; in all such instances, he himself becomes an interpellated subject whose common sense is derived out of the Western hegemon and its neo-imperial ideology. He seems to have two masques that he keeps on changing like an ambivalent diasporic Pakistani who turned into a British subject. Ali’s analysis of the Kargil war is one such example in *The Duel*. While discussing General Musharraf’s era and the Kargil war, he refers to an incident in which an Islamist army captain refused to withdraw from a Kargil peak, Ali writes “There were...a few unpleasant reminders of the ideological fanaticism introduced into the Pakistan army during the Zia period” (141). Ali on many occasions, in a Eurocentric tone, stereotypes the jihadis as brutal savages who fight without a cause; he does not bother to put things in proper context; even when the discussion is about the struggle of the Kashmiri people against the Indian occupation, he seems to link their struggle for freedom with

extremism. He equates the brutality of the jihadis with the atrocities of the India army in Kashmir in: “The Indian troops were undoubtedly brutal, but the jihadis, with their Wahhabi rhetoric, also antagonized important layers of the population” (*The Duel* 142). Anything that relates to religion or that has a tinge of being religious, howsoever insignificant it might be, is targeted by Ali by slight mockery to satire or strong disapproval to utter rejection. This is done many times in *The Duel*. Ali portrays ISI’s director general, who was visiting America when the twin towers were attacked, as “long-bearded General Mahmud Ahmed” whose “strong antipathy to the United States was hardly a secret” (145-46).

Tariq Ali seems to interpellate Pakistan and its greatest leader Muhammad Ali Jinnah by demeaning his struggle for survival of Pakistan. Instead of using the popular name given to Jinnah i.e. Quaid e Azam, Ali calls him The Great Leader in a manner that sounds quite sarcastic and hails him as a person who tried to sell out or rent out the whole country: “The Great Leader had tried to rent his house to the new world power and failed” (*The Duel* 195). Whatever Jinnah and his cabinet did was a struggle for a new born resource less country to survive in the face of an obvious bankruptcy. Though Ali rightly and more realistically asserts that the demand for foreign financial assistance “has been a constant of Pakistani politics” (195). Ali sounds sarcastic while talking about the whole issue of demanding financial assistance from the US and Turkey and even demeans the Pakistani government officials involved in the struggle of making ends meet for Pakistan. While discussing the history of Kashmir, Tariq Ali, instead of putting things in a right context, uses the language of the British colonialist for the Pashtun tribesmen and calls them “terror tribes” who had “untamed tribal egoism”; Ali accuses them of “looting and raping nuns en route” and links them to the Al Qaeda terrorists “that occupy the news headlines today” (*The Duel* 197). Ali clearly disrupts the colonizer/colonized

binary here and by inverting the binary he becomes a colonizer who has the capacity to stereotype and denigrate the colonized. In his non-fictional writings, it appears that, Tariq Ali, while on one hand he has a desire to subvert the forged and interpellated image of the Muslims and Islam spread by the West, on the other hand, he has a strong desire to prove himself to be a Westerner. All the disputed and highly contentious occurrences and opinions concerning Islam and the Muslims are debated in these two chapters which clearly suggest that he agrees with the major allegations compiled by the Western propaganda machines.

Works Cited

- Abeles, Marc (2006). "Globalization, Power, and Survival: An Anthropological Perspective". *Anthropological Quarterly*, Institute for Ethnographic Research: George Washington University. 79 (3), pp. 484–486. 2 July 2015. Web.
- Ahmed, Talat. "Interview: Tariq Ali". *Socialist Review*, 311, November 2006, 2006. Web.
- Akram, Tanweer and Virginia Arlington. "Review of Bush in Babylon: The Recolonisation of Iraq". *Journal of Third World Studies*, Fall 2004. 5 July 2015. Web.
- Allen, Robert L. "Reassessing the Internal (Neo) colonialism Theory". *The Black Scholar*, Vol. 35. No. 1: *The Popular Struggle* (Spring 2005), pp. 2-11, Taylor & Francis, Ltd. 3 July 2015. Web.
- Aponte-Moreno, Marco; Lance Lattig. "Chavez: Rhetoric Made in Havana". *World Policy Journal* (Spring 2012). Web. 8 July 2015. Web.
- Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1996. Print.
- Arellano, Veronica. "The Duel: Pakistan on the Flight Path of American Power." *Library Journal* 133.16 (2008): 85. *Academic Search Complete*. 10 May 2015. Web.
- Ali, Tariq. *On History*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2011. Print.
- . *Rough Music: Blair / Bombs / Baghdad / London / Terror / London*: Verso, 2005. Print.
- . *The Extreme Centre: A Warning*. London: Verso, 2015. Print.
- . *A Sultan in Palermo*. London: Verso, 2005. Print.
- . *Shadows of the Pomegranate Tree*. London: Verso, 1993. Print.

---. *The Book of Saladin*. London: Verso, 1999. Print.

---. *The Clash of Fundamentalisms: Crusades, Jihads and Modernity*. London: Verso, 2002.
Print.

---. *Pirates of the Caribbean: Axis of Hope*. London: Verso, 2006. Print.

---. *The Obama Syndrome: Surrender at Home, War Abroad*. London: Verso, 2010. Print.

---. *Speaking of Empire and Resistance*. London: The New Press, 2005. Print.

---. *Bush in Babylon*. London: Verso, 2003. Print.

---. *The Clash of Fundamentalisms: Crusades, Jihads and Modernity*. London: Verso, 2002.
Print.

---. *Pakistan: Military Rule or People's Power*. New York: William Morrow & Co., 1970.

Print.

Althusser, Louis, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses", In *Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays*, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971/72. Print.

---. "Elements of Self-Criticism" (1974) in *Essays in Self-Criticism* (1976), translated by Grahame Lock, pp. 101–62, 107. New Left Books, 1976. Print.

---. *For Marx*. New York: Verso, 1982. Print.

---. "Overdetermination and Contradiction." In *for Marx* (Trans. By Ben Brewster). New York: Vintage Books, 87-128, 1970. Print.

---. *Essays in Self-Criticism*. (Trans. By Grahame Lock). London: New Left Books, 1976.

Print.

---. *Lenin and Philosophy*. (Trans. By Ben Brewster). New York: Monthly Review Press, 1978. Print.

---. *The Future Lasts Forever*. (Edited by Olivier Corpet and Yann Moulier Boutang and translated by Richard Veasey). New York: The New Press, 1993. Print.

---. *Sur la Reproduction*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1995. Print.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. London: Routledge, 1989. Print.

---. *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies*. London: Routledge, 2004. Print.

---. *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995. Print.

Auken, Bill Van. "The Catastrophe Unleashed by US Imperialism in the Middle East". *Global Research*, January 14, 2014. 10 July 2015. Web.

Ball, Jared A. "Barack Obama, Connected Distance: Race and Twenty-first Century Neocolonialism". *The Black Scholar*, Vol. 38, No. 4, (Winter 2008), pp. 35-37, 2009. 12 July 2015. Web.

Barua, Pranjal Protim. "A Critical Study of the Concept of Ideology: Based on Althusser's *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses* and Slavoj Zizek's *The Sublime Object of Ideology*". *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Humanities*, Vol. II, Issue I, April 2014. 3 July 2015. Web.

Bates, Thomas R. "Gramsci and the Theory of Hegemony". *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 36, No. 2 (Apr. - Jun., 1975), University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 351-366, Retrieved on 10 Mar 2017. 3 July 2015. Web.

Belsey, Catherine. *Critical Practice*. London: Methuen, 1980. Print.

- Bernays, Edward L. *Propaganda: The Public Mind in the Making*. New York: Horace Liveright, 1928. Print.
- Bernays, Edward L. "The Engineering of Consent". *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. No 250, March 1947 p. 113-120. Print.
- Bottomore, Tom, ed. *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*. 2nd Ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1983.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble*. New York and London: Routledge, 1990. Print.
- Butler, Judith. *Bodies That Matter*. New York and London: Routledge, 1993. Print.
- Cameroon and Ghana". *ICIP Working Papers: 2011/6*. Institute of Catala International, Per La Pau, 2011. 12 July 2015. Web.
- Campbell, James (8 May 2010). "A life in writing: Tariq Ali". *The Guardian*. Guardian Media Group. 9 Mar 2017. Web.
- Carter, Graydon. *What We've Lost*. London: Little, Brown, 2004. Print.
- Cavanagh S. "Content analysis: Concepts, Methods and Applications." *Nurse Researcher* 4, 5–16, 1997. 21 July 2015. Web.
- Chengu, Garikai. "America Created Al-Qaeda and the ISIS Terror Group". Global Research, globalresearch.ca. 13 June 2016. Web.
- Chesley, Ian. (2008). *The Duel: Pakistan on the Flight Path of American Power*. Far Eastern Economic Review, 171(9), 61-63. July 14 2016. Web.
- Childs, Peter and R. J. Patrick Williams. *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory*. London: Prentice Hall/Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1997. Print.
- Chomsky, Noam. *Power Systems*. London: Penguin Books, 2013. Print.

- Clark, Robert. "Officially-Sanctioned Falsehoods." *Telecom Asia* 17.3 (2006): 46. *Business Source Premier*. 25 July 2015. Web.
- Clawson, Patrick. "Book Review: Bush in Babylon". *The Middle East Quarterly*. Summer 2004, Vol. 11, No.3, 2004. 12 July 2015. Web.
- Cohen, Stephen P. *Pakistan's Future: The Bellagio Papers*, May, 2010. 12 July 2015. Web.
- Cooper, Robert. *The Breaking of Nations: Order and Chaos in the 21st Century*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 2003. Print.
- Cox, Michael. "Empire, Imperialism and the Bush Doctrine". *Review of International Studies*, 30 (4), pp. 585-608. Cambridge University Press, 2004. 21 July 2015. Web.
- Creswell, Robyn. "The Heretic and the Holy: Tariq Ali's Histories of Islam". *The Review*. 7 May 2010. Web.
- Culler, Jonathan. *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997. Print.
- Dobbins, James, et al. *America's Role in Nation-Building: From Germany to Iraq*. Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND, 2003. 12 July 2015. Web.
- Duerden, Paul. "Ali, Tariq". *Literature Online Biography*. Literature Online. Web.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (Anniversary Ed.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008. Print.
- Eakin, Emily. "Ideas and Trends: All Roads Lead To DC" *New York Times*, March 31, 2002. 1 Aug. 2015. Web.
- Easthope, Antony and Kate McGowan (Eds.). *A Critical and Cultural Theory Reader*, 2nd Ed. Berkshire, England: Open University Press, 2004. Print.

- Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso, 2007. Print.
- Elo, Satu; Helvi Kyngas. "The qualitative content analysis process". *JAN Research Methodology*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2007. 12 Aug. 2015. Web.
- Fallaci, Oriana. *The Rage and the Pride*. New York: Rizzoli, 2002. Print.
- Fatah, Tarek. *Chasing a Mirage: The Tragic Illusion of an Islamic State*. Ontario: John Wiley & Sons Canada Ltd., 2008. Print.
- Feffer, John. *Crusade 2.0: The West's Resurgent War on Islam*. San Francisco: City Lights Books, 2012. Print.
- Femia, Joseph. "Hegemony and Consciousness in the Thought of Antonio Gramsci." *Political Studies* 23:29-48, 1975. Print.
- Ferguson, Niall. *Colossus: The Price of America's Empire*. New York: Penguin Press, 2004. Print.
- Flynn, John T. *As We Go Marching*. New York: Free Life Editions, 1973. Print
- Foster, John Bellamy. "After the attack...The War on Terror". *Monthly Review*, Vol 53, Issue 6, November 2001.3 July 2015. Web.
- Foster, John Bellamy. "Naked Imperialism." *Monthly Review: An Independent Socialist Magazine* 57.4 (2005): 1-11. *Academic Search Complete*. 8 July 2015. Web.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Random House, 1975. Print.
- . *The History of Sexuality Volume I: An Introduction*. Translated by R. Hurley. New York: Vintage Books, 1978. Print.

---. *The History of Sexuality Volume 2: The Use of Pleasure*. trans. Robert Hurley. Vintage Books: New York, 1985. Print.

---. *Power/Knowledge*. ed. by Colin Gordon. New-York: Pantheon Books, 1980. Print.

---. "Truth and Power." Pp. 109-133 in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, edited by C. Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980a. Print.

---. "Two Lectures." Pp. 78-108 in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, edited by C. Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980b. Print.

---. "Truth and Juridical Forms." Pp. 1-89 in *Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984*, Volume 3, edited by J. Faubion. New York: The New Press, 2000 [1994] b. Print.

Frow, John. *Marxism and Literary History*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986.

Print.

Fukuyama, Francis. *State-Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2004. Print.

Daldal, Asli. "Power and Ideology in Michel Foucault and Antonio Gramsci: A comparative Analysis". *Review of History and Political Science*, June 2014, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 149-167. American Research Institute for Policy Development, 2014. 1 July 2015. Web.

Gamble, Andrew, David Marsh, and Tony Tant, eds. *Marxism and Social Science*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1999. Print.

Ghani, Mamuna and Sohail Ahmad Saeed. "Tariq Ali's Shadows of the Pomegranate Tree and Alternative Historiography". *ELF Annual Research Journal*, No.18, pp. 279-295, 2016. 3 Jan. 2017. Web.

Gladwin, Thomas. *Slaves of the White Myth: The Psychology of Neocolonialism*. New York:

- Humanities Press Inc., 1980. Print.
- Goss, J. "Postcolonialism: Whose Empire?". *Third World Quarterly*. Vol. 17 NO.2, 239– 250, 2012. 3 Jan. 2017. Web.
- Grosfoguel, Ramon. *Colonial Subjects: Puerto Ricans in a Global Perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003. Print.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Prison Notebooks: Volume I*. Translated by J. A. Buttigieg. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992. Print.
- . *Prison Notebooks: Volume II*. Translated by J. A. Buttigieg. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996. Print.
- . *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Translated by Q. Hoare and G. N. Smith. New York: International Publishers, 1971. Print.
- Guthrie J., Yongvanich K. & Ricceri F. "Using content analysis as a research method to inquire into intellectual capital reporting". *Journal of Intellectual Capital* 5, 282-93, 2004. 3 Aug. 2016. Web.
- Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Studies and its Theoretical Legacies." Pp.277-294 in *Cultural Studies*, edited by L. Grossberg, c. Nelson, and P. A. Treichler. New York: Routledge, 1992. Print.
- Haag, Diana. "Mechanisms of Neo-colonialism: Current French and British Influence in
Hanson, Margaret, and James Hentz. "Neocolonialism and Neoliberalism in South Africa and Zambia". *Political Science Quarterly* 114 (3): 479, 1999. 3 July 2015. Web.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2000. Print.

- Harman, Chris. "Anti-capitalism: Theory and Practice". *International Socialism Journal*, No. 88 (2000): 1-75. Web. 27 July 2015. Web.
- Hetherington, M. and Suhay, E. "Authoritarianism, Threat, and Americans' Support for the War on Terror", *American Journal of Political Science*, 55(3): 546–60, 2011. 12 July 2015. Web.
- Herring, Eric and Glen Rangwala. "Iraq, Imperialism and Global Governance". *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 6, No. 4/5, pp. 667-683. Routledge Taylor & Francis, Ltd, 2005. 2 Aug. 2015. Web.
- Hodges, Norman E. "Neo-Colonialism: The New Rape of Africa". *The Black Scholar*, Vol. 3, No. 5, pp. 12-23. Taylor & Francis, 1972. 4 Feb. 2016. Web.
- Hoge, James F. & Gideon Rose (Eds.). *How Did This Happen? Terrorism and the New War*. New York: Public Affairs, 2001. Print.
- Horvat, Branko. *The Political Economy of Socialism: A Marxist Social Theory*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc., 1982. Print.
- Hulme, Peter. "Including America." *ARIEL* 26.1 (1995):117-23, 1995. Print.
- Ignatieff, Michale. *Empire Lite: Nation Building in Bosnia, Kosovo, and Afghanistan*. London: Vintage, 2003. Print.
- Johnson, Chalmers. *Blowback: The Costs and Consequences of American Empire*. New York: Henry Holt, 2000. Print.
- Johnson, Chalmers. *America's Empire of Bases*. TomDispatch.com. January 15, 2004. Web.
- Jameson, Fredric. *The Political Unconscious*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981. Print.

- Jameson, Fredric. "Third World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism." *Social Text* 15 (1986): 65-88. Web. 8 July 2015. Web.
- Joya, Angela. *Theorizing Post-Cold War US Imperial Strategies in the Middle East: Integrating the Region into the Capitalist World Market*. YCISS Working Papers Series, Yale University, 2005. 12 July 2015. Web.
- Kamran, Mujahid. *9/11 and the New World Order*. Lahore: U of the Punjab P, 2013. Print.
- Karbiener, Karen. *Encyclopaedia of British Writers, 1800 to the Present*. Vol. 2. New York, NY: Facts on File, 2009. Print.
- Keith, Jim. *Mass Control: Engineering Human Consciousness*. Adventures Unlimited Press, 2003. Print.
- Kellner, Douglas (April 25, 2003). "American Exceptionalism". Archived from the original on February 17, 2006. 3 July 2015. Web.
- Kinna, Ruth. *Anarchism: A Beginner's Guide*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2005. Print.
- Krips, Henry. "Interpellation, Populism, and Perversion: Althusser, Laclau and Lacan". *Filozofski Vestnik*, Vol XXVII, No. 2, pp. 81-101, 2006. 14 Aug. 2015. Web.
- Kyngas H. & Vanhanen L. "Content analysis (Finnish)". *Hoitotiede* 11, 3-12, 1999. 3 July 2015. Web.
- Lacan, Jacques. *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1981. Print.
- LaCapra, Dominic. *Rethinking Intellectual History: Texts, Contexts, Language*. Cornell University Press, 1983. Print.

- Lake, David A. "Escape from the State-of-Nature: Authority and Hierarchy in World Politics," *International Security*, 32/1: (2007), p 48. Web.
- Lenin. V. I. *Lenin: Collected Works, Vol 24, April-June 1917*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1964. Digital Reprints, 2011. 3 July 2015. Web.
- Lens, Sidney; Zinn, Howard. *The Forging of the American Empire*. London: Pluto Press, 2003 [1971]. Print.
- Levine, M. "Chaos, Globalization, and the Public Sphere: Political Struggle in Iraq and Palestine". *The Middle East Journal*. Vol. 60 No.3, 467–492, 2012. Print.
- Lieven, Dominic. "Dilemmas of Empire 1850-1918: Power, Territory, Identity". *Journal of Contemporary History*. 34(2), 163–200, 2012. 3 Aug. 2015. Web.
- Lincoln, Abbey. Song: "What Will Tomorrow Bring?" on *Over the Years* (Verve Records, 2000). 12 July 2015. Web.
- Ludden, David. "America's Invisible Empire". *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 39, No. 44 (Oct. 30 - Nov. 5, 2004), pp. 4776-4777. 11 May 2015. Web.
- Macdonell, Diane. *Theories of Discourse: An Introduction*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986. Print.
- Macherey, Pierre, and Etienne Baibar, "On Literature as an Ideological Form", In Robert Young, ed. *Untying the Text: A Poststructuralist Reader*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981. Print.
- Macherey, Pierre. *A Theory of Literary Production*. Trans. Geoffrey Wall. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul plc, 1985. Print.

- Mann, M. *The Social Sources of Power*, vol. II, *The rise of classes and nation states, 1760–1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. Print.
- Mansfield, Nick. *Subjectivity: Theories of the Self from Freud to Haraway*. St Leonards (Australia): Allen & Unwin, 2000. Print.
- MacDonald, Paul K. “Those Who Forget Historiography Are Doomed to Republish It: Empire, Imperialism and Contemporary Debates about American Power”. *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (Jan., 2009), pp. 45-67. Cambridge University Press, 2009. 12 May 2015. Web.
- Marranci, Gabriele. *Wars of Terror*. London: Bloomsbury, 2016. Print
- Marshall C. & Rossman G.B. *Designing Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publications, 1995. Print.
- Martin, Guy. “The historical, economic and political bases of France’s African policy.” *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 23/2 (1985): 189-208, 1985. 12 May 2015. Web.
- Mead, Walter Russell. *Power, Terror, Peace, and War: America’s Grand Strategy in a World at Risk*. New York: Knopf, 2004. Print.
- Mearsheimer, John. *Why Leaders Lie: The Truth About Lying in International Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Oxford University Press, 2011. Print.
- Mills, C. Wright. *The Causes of World War Three*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1958. Print.
- Mohan, Dinesh “Promotion of 'Modern' Technology: A New Tool for Neo-Colonialism” *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 24, No. 32 (Aug. 12, 1989), pp. 1815-1818. 12 May 2015. Web.

- Moore, D. S. "Postcolonialism, in Adam". M. K. (ed), *Handbook of Postmodern Biblical Interpretation*, 182-188. St Louis, MO: Chalice, 2001. 21 May 2015. Web.
- Mulhern, Francis. *Contemporary Marxist Literary Criticism*. London: Longman Group UK Ltd, 1992. Print.
- Panitch, Leo and Sam Gindin. "Global Capitalism and American Empire". *The Socialist*. October 2003. 21 May 2015. Web.
- Parenti, Stephanie. *Neocolonialism: Construction and Solutions*. University of Central Florida, 2011. 21 May 2015. Web.
- Pecheux, Michel. *Language, Semantics and Ideology*, New York MacMillan, 1983. Print.
- Pike, Francis. *Empires at War: A Short History of Modern Asia Since World War II*. London: I. B. Tauris & Co., 2011. Print.
- Pointing, Scott. Review: *Rough Music*. *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, Vol. 17, No.3, March 2006. 12 Mar. 2015. Web.
- Polit D.F. & Beck C.T. *Nursing Research: Principles and Methods*. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, Philadelphia, PA, 2004. 3 Mar. 2015. Web.
- Pomeroy, William J. *American Neo-Colonialism: Its Emergence in the Philippines and Asia*. New York: International Publishers, 1970. Print.
- Price, Wayne. "Obama's Imperial War: An Anarchist Response". Dec. 11, 2009. *Anarchismo.net*. 21 May 2016. Web.
- Procter, James. "Tariq Ali: Fiction, Non-Fiction, Poetry". *Literature*. British Council, 2009. 12 May 2015. Web.
- Rahman, Mujtaba. "Review of The Duel: Pakistan on the Flight Path of American Power." *Journal of International Affairs* 63.1 (2009): 227-8. ProQuest. Web. 10 May 2015.

Web.

Resnick, Stephen and Wolff, Richard. *Knowledge and Class: A Marxian Critique of Political Economy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987. Print.

Ross, Chris. "Review of *Night of the Golden Butterfly*". *The Guardian*, theguardian.com, 5 Mar. 2011. Web.

Ruppert, Michael C. *Crossing the Rubicon: The Decline of the American Empire at the End of the Age of Oil*. New Society Publisher, 2004. Print.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon, 1978. Print.

Sales, Jr., William W. *From Civil Rights to Black Liberation: Malcolm X and the organization of Afro-American Unity*. Boston: South End Press, 1994. Print.

Sandelowski M. "Qualitative analysis: what it is and how to begin?" *Research in Nursing & Health* 18, 371–375, 1995. 3 May 2015. Web.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Colonialism and Neocolonialism*. Trans. Azzedine Haddour, Steve Brewer, and Terry McWilliams. London: Routledge, 2001. Print.

Schlesinger, Arthur Jr. The American Empire? Not so Fast. *World Policy Journal*, Vol. 22, No. 1 (Spring, 2005), pp. 43-46. The MIT Press and the World Policy Institute, 2005. 12 May 2015. Web.

Schueller, Malini Johar. "Postcolonial American Studies." *American Literary History*, Vol. 16, No. 1 (Spring, 2004), pp. 162-175. Oxford University Press. 3 Mar. 2015. Web.

Shamsie, Kamila. "Defending the Faith": Review of *A Sultan in Palermo*. *The Guardian*, 30 July 2005. 7 Aug. 2015. Web.

Schueller, Malini Johar. "Postcolonial American Studies." *American Literary History*, Vol. 16, No. 1 (Spring, 2004), pp. 162-175. Oxford University Press. 11 May 2015. Web.

Schwarz, Henry, and Sangeeta Ray (eds.). "Mission Impossible: Introducing Postcolonial Studies in the US Academy". *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. Print.

Scott, McLemee. "Book Review: The Obama Syndrome". *International Socialist Review*, Issue 74. Web. 11 May 2015. Web.

Selden, Raman, Peter Widdowson, and Peter Brooker. *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*, 2005. Print.

Slemon, S. 'The scramble for post-colonialism' in C. Tiffin and A. Lawson (eds) *Describing Empire: Postcolonialism and Textuality*, London: Routledge, 1994. Print.

Slemon, S. *Post-colonial Critical Theory*, in Ashcroft, et al 1995:99-116, 1995. 3 May 2015. Web.

Smith, Paul. *Discerning the Subject*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988. Print.

Soldz, Stephen. "The 'Black Jail.'" Counterpunch (May 21–23). At www.counterpunch.org/soldz05212010.html. 12 Aug. 2015. Web.

Solomon, Robert C. "Subjectivity," in Honderich, Ted. *Oxford Companion to Philosophy*. Oxford University Press, 2005. p.900. 3 Aug. 2015. Web.

Stoddart, Mark C. J. "Ideology, Hegemony, Discourse: A critical Review of Theories of Knowledge and Power". *Social Thought and Research* Vol. 28, pp. 191-221, University of British Columbia, 2007. 3 Mar. 2015. Web.

Strickland, Ronald. "The Western Marxist Concept of Ideology Critique". *VNU Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*. 28, No. 5E, pp.47-56, 2012. 21 May 2015. Web.

- Stott, Paul. "Anarchism, Terrorism Studies and Islamism", *Global Discourse*. 1–23, 2010.
- Suckling, John, and Colin Stoneman. "Apartheid to Neocolonialism". *Third World Quarterly* 9 (2): 515, 1987. 12 May 2015. Web.
- Taylor Jr., Stuart. "Falsehoods About Guantanamo." *National Journal* 38.5 (2006): 13-14. *Academic Search Complete*. 26 July 2015. Web.
- Taylor, Ian. Review of *The Extreme Centre: A Warning*. *Socialist Review*, Issue 400, socialistreview.org.uk, March 2015. 3 Aug. 2015. Web.
- Tucker, Robert C. Ed. *The Marx-Engels Reader*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1978. Print.
- Tufail, W. and Poynting, S. "A common "outlawness": Criminalisation of Muslim minorities in the UK and Australia". *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy*, 2(3): 43–54, 2013. 21 Mar. 2015. Web.
- Turner, Frederick Jackson. Significance of the Frontier in American History 1893, at the Wayback Machine (archived May 21, 2008), sagehistory.net (archived from the original on May 21, 2008). 3 June 2015. Web.
- Vajrushev, Vasili. *El neocolonialismo y sus metodos*. Moscow: Editorial Progreso, 1974. 2 May 2015. Web.
- Walt, Lucien van der. "How Imperialism and Postcolonial Elites have Plundered Africa". *Tokologo*, No. 5/6, pp. 17-19, March 31, 2016. 27 May 2016. Web.
- Waterman, David. "Power Politics, Hobbesian Fear and the Duty of Self-Preservation: Tariq Ali's *Shadow of the Pomegranate Tree*". *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, Vol. 52, Issue 2, pp. 153-164, 2016. 3 Aug. 2015. Web.
- Weedon, Chris. *Identity and Culture: Narratives of difference and Belonging*. New York:

- McGraw-Hill Education, 2004. Print.
- Weiss, Robert P. "Introduction: Imperial Obama – A Kinder, Gentler Empire?" *Social Justice* Vol. 37, Nos. 3, 2011. 12 Aug. 2015. Web.
- Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977. Print.
- Wolfe, Patrick. "History and Imperialism: A Century of Theory, from Marx to Postcolonialism". *Oxford Journals*, 102(2), 388–420. Oxford University Press, 2012. 1 June 2016. Web.
- Wolf, Richard D. "Ideological State Apparatuses, Consumerism, and U.S. Capitalism: Lessons for the Left". Working Paper 2004-7. University of Massachusetts. 9 April 2017. Web.
- Woodward, Bob. *Obama's Wars: The Inside Story*. London: Simon & Schuster, 2010. Print.
- Young, R. J. C. *Colonial desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*. London: Routledge, 1995. Print.

Appendix 1

<u>Thematic Categorization Matrix</u>			
Main Category	Generic Category	Sub-category	Codes
Colonialism & Postcolonialism, Postcolonial Reading	Otherness, Marginality	Binaries: Centre/margin, noble/evil, advanced/retarded, human/bestial, beautiful/ugly, Orient/Occident, civilized/primitive. English Lang belongs to the English (they have a right to it) The imperial impulse to “civilize” and “exploit”	Oth Mar Bin Imp
	Orientalism	Exotic, Mysterious, Sensual land of uncivilized, immoral savage people. Desire/need to RECLAIM the past	Ori
	Hybridity, Liminality [in-between, transcultural space] and Ambivalence [double, divided or fluid identity], Exile [A complex mix of attraction and repulsion] Bhabha [colonial discourse wants to create Compliant Subjects not ambivalent or mimic ones]	Hybrid: Simultaneously belonging to more than one culture Forms of hybridization: racial, political, linguistic, and cultural. ‘Third Space of enunciation’ (Bhabha 1994: 37) [An important question to explore in this regard would be: Is Tariq Ali complicit as well as resistant in his writings? Or “white but not quite”?] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literature as a Site of Ideological Struggle • Postcolonial critic rejects the claim of universality and emphasizes on cultural/ethnic diversity. 	Hy, Lim, Amb
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colonial discourse can be exploitative and nurturing at the same time as well. 	

	Hegemony	Gramsci “domination by consent” The power of the ruling class to convince other classes [through ISAs] that their interests are the interests of all [supressing their desire for self-determination].	Heg
	Abrogation &	Rejection of the concept of correct/Standard English and Inferior dialects. App: Process of adaptation in English.	Abro
	Agency [resistance to achieve agency]	Free, autonomous initiation of action (Subjectivity is constructed by Ideology/Language/Discourse Possible only when colonial power/ideology is resisted	Age
	Allegory [symbolic narratives of imperialism]	A Postcolonial strategy of resistance against allegory. Disruption of the symbols of Imperial power Use of appropriate allegory to respond to allegorical representation of imperial dominance.	Alg
	Apartheid	Racial discrimination institutionalized by law	Apar
	Appropriation [using tools of the dominant culture to resist it]	Taking over aspects of the imperial culture (language, forms of writing, film, theatre, even, rationalism, logic and analysis) by post-	Appr
		colonial societies to articulate their own social and cultural identities.	
	Authenticity Decolonization [Revealing and dismantling colonial power]	Demand for restoration of authentic precolonial traditions and customs. Macaulay’s notorious 1835 Minute on Indian Education (deliberately creating a class of ‘brown white men’ in India)	Auth Decol

	Colonial Discourse	From Foucault's Discourse: Imposition of specific values, disciplines, and knowledges on dominated groups by the dominant classes.	Col Dis
	Colonial Patronage	Supporting cultural/social activities favourable to the Centre and not supporting the ones crucial for the colonized.	Col Pat
	Comprador/Bourgeoisie [Exchanged role with the colonizers] (Purchaser)	Elite/wealthy/intelligentsia class – less inclined to struggle for cultural, economic independence.	Comp/ Borg
	Dependency theory [global structure of domination]	Third World former colonies are deliberately kept underdeveloped by capitalistic forces in the 1 st world so that they generate raw materials for their industries.	DepT
	Diasporic Identity	[Tariq Ali has an established Diasporic identity]	DiaspId
	Euro-centrism	The world-view enforced by the western civilization on the rest of the world. European exceptionalism.	EuCen
	Fanonism & Comprador Class	“Black Skin White Masks”. Comprador Class. [The native intellectuals should endeavour to fundamentally reform the society based on the values of their people.]	Fan Comp
	Marginality [resistance for replacing the centre]	Peripheral experience. Marginal in terms of access to power [Power is a function of centrality].	Marg

	Mimicry “blurred copy”: can be threatening	Colonial discourse encourages the colonized subject to ‘mimic’ the colonizer. Mimicry is not far from mockery – a crack in the certainty of colonial control of its subjects’ behaviour ‘almost the same, but not quite’, “at once resemblance and menace” Bhabha (1994, 86). Double vision: at the same time discloses and disrupts the colonial authority. The mimicry of the colonized subjects has the potential to destabilize colonial discourse. (Ashcroft 142)	Mim
	Neo-colonialism or Neo-imperialism	Ex-Colonial powers and the United States continue to control ex-colonized nations economically through International Monetary bodies, media, education and cultural institutions More sinister and hard to perceive and repel than covert colonialism	NeoCol
	Othering	Imperial discourse constructs its others in order to confirm its own reality and later to exclude and marginalize them.	Oth
	Palimpsest	Erasure, eradication, denigration, of local history, literature, oral tradition and its re-inscription in colonial terms They place is emptied and then re-inscribed through Mapping, naming, fictional and nonfictional narratives.	Pal
Marxism & Capitalism (Preparation for the Global Communist Revolution)	Karl Marx [1818-1883]	It’s all about Money: Those who have [bourgeoisie] Capitalists want: Lowest cost and maximum profit. Workers want: Highest wages for least work Capitalists get richer and Workers poorer Workers will one day rise up in Revolution Social Control: Achieved through ideology of Elites. Working Class suffers from False	

		Consciousness – not understanding their true position as Capitalism creates false needs.	
	Base and Superstructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Base: Economy/means of production • Superstructure: Edu, state, political and legal systems, culture as well as social relations, morality and ideology. • Economic base determines superstructure 	B&S
	Means of Production [technology]	Machines, Steam Engines, Media, Industry: Controlled by the Powerful	MoP
	Modes of Production	Mechanical Reproduction, Electronic reproduction	MDoP
	Economic Determinism	Our Socio-Economic condition determines our consciousness. The material features govern the manifestation and communication of concepts.	EcoD
	Critique of Capitalism by Marx. Exploitation Capitalist Lie	Exploitation and Alienation of labourers. The worker must work or starve. Exchange value over Use value Commodification/objectification of human relations. Capitalists lie: "The interests of the capitalist and those of the worker are ... one and the same"	CrCap Exp Comf CapL
	Class System/struggle [between proletariat and bourgeoisie]	Intensifying contradictions between the Proletariat and the Bourgeoisie This social unrest culminates into Social Revaluation. The long-term outcome of this revolution is establishment of Socialism	CS

	Socialism and Communism	<p>A socioeconomic system based on complaisant proprietorship of the means of production</p> <p>Dispersal of money based on one's contribution.</p> <p>Socialism would eventually give way to a communist stage of social development.</p> <p>Communism would be a classless, stateless, humane society erected on common ownership.</p>	Soc/Com
	Alienation	<p>The estrangement of people from aspects of their human nature as a consequence of social class system.</p> <p>Alienation from working/act of producing Alienation from himself as a producer and the humanity</p> <p>Workers alienate from other workers (competition for higher wages)</p> <p>Lack of self-worth, lack of meanings in life</p>	Ali
	Orthodox Marxism	<p>Opposed Reformism: capitalism cannot be reformed through policy and that any attempt to do so would only exacerbate its contradictions or distort the efficiency of the market economy.</p> <p>Lasting solution to the contradictions of capitalism is for the establishment of a post capitalist socialist economy.</p> <p>The socialist revolution is necessarily the act of the majority (contrasted with Marxism-Leninism's view of the vanguard party and democratic centralism)</p>	OrM

Leftism, Left Wing Politics, Leftists		Leftists... claim that human development flourishes when individuals engage in cooperative, mutually respectful relations that can thrive only when excessive differences in status, power, and wealth are eliminated	Lft
Ideology & Interpellation	Althusser's notion of Ideology	Ideology Interpellation: hailed subjects. Ideological State Apparatuses (politics, media, religion, family, education) Repressive State Apparatuses (police, armed forces etc.)	Id Int. ISAs RSAs
	Gramsci's notion of ideology and Hegemony	Hegemony	Heg.
Marxism- Leninism	Socialist State Revolutionary Vanguard	Goal of ML was development of a Socialist State: Developed by Revolutionary Vanguard [revolutionary working-class people having	MxLn RevV DPro
[adopted by Communist Party of Soviet Union] Vladimir Lenin died 1924, Joseph Stalin came into power and suggested this term	Dictatorship of the Proletariat	socialist consciousness as a result of class struggle] Represents dictatorship of the proletariat Today ML in four countries – China, Cuba, Laos, and Vietnam—the ruling parties hold Marxism–Leninism as their official ideology Communist Party: supreme political institute of the state	
		Sino-Soviet Split: 1960s Soviet Union and Peoples Republic of China split. Mao adapted Marxism-Leninism to Chinese conditions	

	<p>Socialism</p> <p>[first stage after the revolution – second stage being communism]</p>	<p>Based on Marxism: lower stage i.e. immediately after the revolution, distribution must be based on the contribution of the individual, whereas in the upper stage of communism the from each according to his ability, to each according to his need concept would be applied</p> <p>Stalin invented the concept of Socialism in one country in negation of Marxism or Leninism.</p> <p>Stalin declared 1936 USSR to be a worker's/socialist state and all property to be socialist property</p> <p>Trotskyists consider it a deformed or degenerated workers' state.</p>	Soc
	<p>Universal Social Welfare</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progresses in community wellbeing and education Facilitation of shared childcare • Collective education for the masses • Social services for all • Delivery of social welfare • Liberation of womenfolk Elimination of privately owned property • 	USW

	Socialist Political System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One-party government under the leadership of a Marxist–Leninist Communist [vanguard] Party with an aim to establish socialist and then then communist systems. Proletariat will and rule. • Complete or partial ban on other parties to ensure national unity. • Struggle against imperialism and colonialism through advocacy of decolonisation and anti-colonial powers. <p>Marxist-Leninists adhere to Atheism and target religious ideologies and parties.</p> <p>Capitalism directly leads to imperialism. <i>“Imperialism, the highest stage of Capitalism”</i></p>	SocPS
	Socialist Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emancipation of the individual from alienating work. Price of goods and services should be based on its cost rather than its use value. • The driving force of production should be social obligation rather than profit. • Major means of production are to be under public control and personal properties not involving mass production remain unaffected. 	SocE

<p>World Systems Theory [Immanuel Wallerstein]</p>	<p>Transnational and Inter-regional division of labour. Division of the globe into periphery, semi periphery and core countries.</p>	<p>World Systems Theory</p> <p>Core-Countries turn into the global hegemon: this position passed from the Netherlands, to England and (most recently) to America</p> <p>Semi-periphery countries</p> <p>Major means of production are controlled by the core-countries that do the tasks of higher level-production.</p> <p>Very little means-of-production are owned by the periphery-countries even if they are located in their countries. They also provide less skilled labour.</p> <p>Periphery-countries provide raw-materials on very low rates, while the semi-periphery and periphery countries purchase the finished products from the core nations on very high prices.</p>	<p>WST</p> <p>CC</p> <p>SPC</p> <p>PC</p>
--	--	---	---