

**STRATEGIZING VIOLENCE: AN
ANARCHIST PERSPECTIVE ON OMAR
SHAHID HAMID'S *THE PRISONER* AND *THE
SPINNER'S TALE***

By

Momina Hafeez



**NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF MODERN LANGUAGES
ISLAMABAD**

February, 2019



THESIS 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: Strategizing Violence: An Anarchist Perspective on Omar Shahid Hamid's *The Prisoner* and *The Spinner's Tale*

Submitted By: Momina Hafeez

Registration #: MP-F15-098

Master of Philosophy

Degree name in full

English Literature

Name of Discipline

Prof. Dr. Sibghatullah Khan

Name of Research Supervisor

Signature of Research Supervisor

Prof. Dr. Muhammad Safeer Awan

Name of Dean (FoLs)

Signature of Dean (FoLs)

Brig. Muhammad Ibrahim

Name of DG

Signature of DG

Date

CANDIDATE DECLARATION FORM

I Momina Hafeez

Daughter of Muhammad Hafeez

Registration # MP-F15-098

Discipline English Literature

Candidate of **Master of Philosophy** at the National University of Modern Languages

do hereby declare that the thesis **Strategizing Violence: An Anarchist Perspective on Omar Shahid Hamid's *The Prisoner* and *The Spinner's Tale***, submitted by me in partial fulfillment of MPhil 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.

Signature of Candidate

Date

Momina Hafeez

Name of Candidate

ABSTRACT

Thesis Title: Strategizing Violence: An Anarchist Perspective on Omar Shahid Hamid's *The Prisoner* and *The Spinner's Tale*

Omar Shahid Hamid's novels, *The Prisoner* and *The Spinner's Tale*, represent a meteoric surge in terrorist violence in Pakistani society after the catastrophic event of 9/11. In the backdrop of scenes of violence and terrorism, Hamid highlights the possible nexus between centralized state authority and violence by non-state players. The selected novels portray the recurring antagonism between multiple forms of authority (such as state, ideology, and capitalism) and the individual and political agency of the citizens of Pakistan. Along with this, Hamid depicts the use of subjective violence by terrorist entities in society as potential means to secure political, ideological and capitalist interests. This study applies the anarchist theory of Mikhail Bakunin who advocates the use of violence as a necessary tool to defy oppressive state authority. It invokes his perspective in order to analyze the role of state and its subordinate institutions as far as the situation of violence and anarchy is concerned. It further explores how, on the one hand, violence by anti-state elements destabilizes society and endangers the ordinary state subjects, and how, on the other hand, it is used as a potent tool by peripheral voices of dissent to dismantle the centralized state authority. In order to analyze the role of state institutions in a more elaborate manner, this study makes use of Louis Althusser's theory of state as a repressive state apparatus. To avoid a one-sided take on violence by the dissident groups as purely an act of subversion, this thesis investigates how the state uses repression as a strategy to ensure social, economic and political stability. It also examines how violence is employed by the state institutions as a way to eliminate existential threat by terrorist elements to the state of Pakistan. This research is exploratory and interpretive in nature therefore, the research approach followed in this thesis is qualitative. The research method used in the thesis to interpret the selected works is textual analysis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
THESIS AND DEFENSE APPROVAL FORM	ii
CANDIDATE DECLARATION FORM.....	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	viii
DEDICATION	ix
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Situatedness of the Researcher.....	7
1.2 Delimitation	7
1.3 Thesis Statement	8
1.4 Research Questions	8
1.5 Research Plan.....	8
1.6 Significance of Study	9
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	11
2.1 Introduction.....	11
2.2 Review of the Selected Sources	11
2.3 Conclusion	32
3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	34
3.1 Introduction.....	34
3.2 Theoretical Framework.....	34
3.3 Research Methodology	46
3.4 Research Method	48
3.5 Conclusion	48

4. “A CREATURE OF INSTINCT”: REBELLION AGAINST THE STATE AUTHORITY IN <i>THE PRISONER</i>.....	51
4.1 Introduction.....	51
4.2 State as a Machinery of Violence	52
4.3 Akbar Khan, the Violent Gendarme	64
4.4 “The Strangest Bedfellows”: An Abrupt Change in State Alliances.....	71
4.5 State vs. the “Unbridled” Rebel.....	74
4.6 Conclusion	86
5. “A REAL PASSION FOR DESTRUCTION”: VIOLENCE AS A TOOL OF RESISTANCE IN <i>THE SPINNER’S TALE</i>	88
5.1 Introduction.....	88
5.2 Ausi as “Homo Sacer”: The Journey from Oppression to Rebellion.....	89
5.3 State Oppression as a Cause of Anarchy	93
5.4 The Road to Destruction	98
5.5 Finding the “True Path”	103
5.6 The Proletariat Brotherhood	106
5.7 Individual Violence Vs State Violence.....	107
5.8 State: The Real Target of Violence.....	110
5.9 Conclusion	116
6. CONCLUSION.....	116
6.1 Findings.....	118
6.2 Recommendations for further research.....	121
Endnotes.....	123
Works Cited	124

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>TP</i>	<i>The Prisoner</i>
<i>TST</i>	<i>The Spinner's Tale</i>
<i>GATS</i>	<i>God and the State</i>
<i>SAA</i>	<i>Statism and Anarchy</i>
UF	United Front
'ISA'	'Ideological State Apparatus'
'RSA'	'Repressive State Apparatus'

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank Allah almighty who gave me the strength to embark upon this project. I am truly grateful to Him for guiding me in the right path. It is only because of Him that I didn't lose hope during the gloomy moments of thesis writing. I would also like to give the credit of this dissertation to my parents who encouraged me to work on it on every step of the way. They provided me with the preliminary educational opportunities that made it possible for me to gain higher education at the MPhil level by working hard day and night. Also, during my course work and thesis writing, they made sure that all my educational and financial needs were well-provided for. It is due to their support that I have been able to finish this tiresome task. I am hugely thankful to my respected supervisor, Dr. Sibghatullah Khan, for being an absolute beacon of guidance from the beginning of this thesis. I am at a loss for words to express my gratitude for his kindness and generosity and the limitless time he spent with me to help me write this thesis. I am sure that I would not have been able to write it without his guidance.

I would also like to thank my older sister, Beenish Hafeez, who took great care of me while I stayed at her place here in Islamabad while working on my dissertation. I can never pay her back for her endless hospitality and love. I would also like to thank Hamza, my dear friend, who never let me feel lonely during this hard time and listened to all I ever had to say about anything and everything. I owe him many a meal for the rest of my life.

Lastly, I would like to thank all my teachers during my BS and MPhil course works who diligently taught us semester after semester. It is surely due to their hard work and dedication that I am able to write my thesis.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my family and friends who supported me through every thick and thin. Moreover, I dedicate my research to all those brave souls who dare to raise their voices, no matter how weak they may be, against oppression.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The contemporary Pakistani society witnessed a meteoric rise in the events of violence and terrorism in the wake of 9/11. The attack on the Twin Towers, staged by Al-Qaeda, landed as a severe blow to the international hegemony of the United States of America. Considering it as a physical attack on the sovereignty of its country, the government of America launched a series of systematic retaliatory military operations in Afghanistan where such organizations operated from. These state operations are generally termed as the “war on terror” by the USA. Pakistan, due to its significant geopolitical location as well as being an immediate neighbor of Afghanistan, served as a close ally to America in launching state-sponsored operations against terrorist elements in the region. As an outcome of these operations, Pakistani society, in general, and the state, in particular, had to face the brunt of militant violence on its territory carried out by non-state actors. The two novels, *The Prisoner* (2013) and *The Spinner’s Tale* (2015)¹ by Omar Shahid Hamid, that I have chosen to analyze in this thesis aptly represent the situation of violence and anarchy that has ensued due to the encounters between the Pakistani state and the anti-state elements in society. The purpose of this study is to investigate the strategies of violence employed by the state as well as non-state actors during the era of the ‘war on terror’ depicted in contemporary Anglophone Pakistani fiction.

As mentioned previously, the rise of terrorist violence on Pakistani soil seems to share a direct link with the state persecution of anti-state organizations. While the terrorist elements may be held responsible for creating a situation of chaos within society, they may be, at the same time, considered responsible for posing threat to both national and international structures of domination. Therefore, it is necessary to view events of violence as strategic means employed by terrorist entities to question uniform state authority. On the contrary, it is also important to avoid seeing violence by terrorist organizations solely

in the context of subversion against authoritarian structures in society since one may never ignore the destructive effects of said violence on society as a whole. Terrorist violence indiscriminately targets government officials as well as ordinary people as witnessed in Pakistani society. Therefore, in order to view violence only as means of resistance against state domination would be tantamount to simplifying its nature to a great extent. In order to analyze the nature of violence and terrorism by non-state actors, one therefore needs to take into account its variegated impact on society. Hamid's fiction represents the myriad effects of state repression as well as non-state violence on Pakistani society.

Before divulging further details of this study, I need to first define violence itself since it forms the core subject of my analysis and discussion. According to Slavoj Žižek, there are two main type of violence: subjective and objective. He points out that “the obvious signals of [subjective] violence are acts of crime and terror, civil unrest, international conflict” (1). He argues that “subjective violence is experienced as such against the background of a non-violent zero level. It is seen as the perturbation of the ‘normal’, peaceful state of thing” (2). Whereas, the objective type of violence, on the other hand, “is precisely the violence inherent to this normal state of things” (2). In order to explain objective violence more clearly, Žižek further subcategorizes it into “symbolic” and “systemic” violence. He is of the opinion that symbolic violence is “embodied in language and its forms” (1). He defines the nature of this type of violence in the following lines:

[T]his violence is not only at work in the obvious – and extensively studied – cases of incitement and of the relations of social domination reproduced in our habitual speech forms: there is a more fundamental form of violence still that pertains to language as such, to its imposition of a certain universal meaning. (1-2)

This type of violence, therefore, corresponds to the ideological indoctrination of individuals as state subjects through apparently non-violent means. The second type of objective violence, systemic violence, is “the often catastrophic consequences of the smooth functioning of our economic and political system” (2). This form of violence basically means an unchallenged, undisrupted domination of the political and economic power structures in society which may result into the subjugation of the governed state

subjects. Zizek notes that this form of violence may be “invisible” to us, yet it is important to take it into consideration in order to evaluate the seemingly “‘irrational’ explosions of subjective violence” (2). In this thesis, I conduct an investigation of the conflict between the subjective violence perpetrated by radicalized individuals in society and the objective violence carried out by the state to maintain centralized authority as depicted in Hamid’s work.

In order to systemically conduct my analysis on Hamid’s novels, I need to ground him in the tradition of other Pakistani post-9/11 fiction writers in English. 9/11 is a highly important event for Pakistani writers as it actively contributed in bringing Pakistani Anglophone fiction to global literary attention. Novel as an art form gave Pakistani writers an opportunity to present their point of view regarding the ‘war on terror’ in response to the over-arching Western narrative about Muslims as terrorists. In *Rethinking Identities in Contemporary Pakistani Fiction: Beyond 9/11*, Aroosa Kanwal points out that “the ‘war on terror’, that has had the effects of equating Islam and Muslims with terrorism, has become a dominant political narrative in Europe and the US over the last decade” (2). Pakistani writers writing in English, as citizens of Pakistan with firsthand experience of terror and violence which followed the wake of 9/11, use novel as a medium to project their subjective voices on to the world stage. Writers such as Nadeem Aslam, Uzma Aslam Khan, Kamila Shamsie have undertaken this task in their fiction to represent their unique of accounts of chaos and anarchy as a result of multiple possible elements in Pakistan instead of a simplifying western narrative that attributes it entirely to religious extremism. The aim of this study, then, is to see how Pakistani fiction in English explores the radicalization of Pakistani society, particularly as an aftermath of 9/11. Moreover, its objective is to investigate the role of the USA as the international hegemonic power since it wields a direct influence on the policy-making of the government of Pakistan towards the so called radicalized subjects.

Another literary medium that complements these narratives of violence in the Pakistani context is that of ‘city noir’ since it tends to represent urban life in dark, unsettling imagery. Gyan Prakash, in his book, *Noir Urbanisms: Dystopic Images of the Modern City*, defines city noir in the following lines:

Since the turn of the twentieth century, dystopic images have figured predominantly in literary, cinematic, and sociological representations of the modern city. In these portrayals, the city often appears as dark, insurgent (or forced into total obedience), dysfunctional (or forced into machine-like functioning), engulfed in ecological and social crises, seduced by capitalist consumption, paralyzed by crime, wars, class, gender, and racial conflicts, and subjected to excessive technological and technocratic control. (Prakash 1)

The post-9/11 rise of terrorism and violence has also found its representation as the dystopic image in city noir. Pakistani fiction writers in English, such as Bilal Tanweer in *The Scatter Here Is Too Great*, Saba Imtiaz in *Karachi You're Killing Me*, Omar Shahid Hamid in *The Prisoner* and *The Spinner's Tale*, among others, seem to portray Pakistani cities in dark imagery that may be the result of terrorist violence that has profoundly changed the nature of these cities for the worse. In the backdrop of the exercise of violence and scenes of destruction depicted in these works, the cataclysmic event of 9/11 looms large. In this study, I attempt to investigate the link between the representation of city life in Pakistani fiction in English and the increase in the events of terror and violence. Though this dissertation does not focus on city noir, there is no avoiding it while I develop my argument and do my analysis. In order for me to situate my argument convincingly, it would be in order to partially contextualize my study in literature on city.

In his 2016 book, *The Palgrave Handbook of Literature and the City*, Jeremy Tambling points out that city literature largely includes those works that have “come out of the city, or [have] shaped the city, attempting either to construct, or to represent it, or to make it a text” (ix). My thesis views Hamid’s works as literature on city to explore how they construct and represent Pakistani cities, especially Karachi. Tambling argues that events of violence and terrorism have greatly influenced the “ways of seeing and being in cities” (xi). He further points out that the event of 9/11, in particular, has called for a need of a “new way of thinking of – or recognition of – ‘the other’ within the city” (xi). In this thesis, I investigate how Hamid’s texts depict the gradually changing realities of Pakistani cities, such as Karachi, due to the rise in violence and destruction in the wake of 9/11. In order to analyze the events of violence shown in the texts, I explore how the non-state players occupy the status of “the other” in the peripheries of the city while challenging the

central authority of state. Keeping the antagonistic nature of conflict between the state and the violent agents of chaos in mind, I have decided to explore their relationship in the light of anarchist theory. Though I do not follow the anti-state argument only, I need to foreground the relationship of state and institutional violence and look at them vis-a-vis the violence of non-state actors.

Anarchism, as a political theory, engenders critique of authority in all its forms. It negates the subjugation of mankind in all shapes and forms and therefore rejects authoritarian structures of capitalism, patriarchy, religion etc. However, the primary object of anarchist criticism is state authority that it considers to be “the fundamental evil in society” and advocates for its abolition through all means necessary (Newman 25). The anarchists consider state authority to be completely unjustified in its nature and believe that in order to continue its unquestioned domination, the state favours unequal economic relations in the society. In this manner, it ensures and promotes hierarchical power relations in society to facilitate economic exploitation of the masses by the powerful elite. Unequal power relations seem to be beneficial for the state since they allow “the development of the means of coercion needed by the state” (Newman 25). Hence an intensely stratified society emerges due to the establishment of state apparatus that subsequently leads to the exploitation of the masses.

Moreover, according to the anarchist viewpoint, the state uses force and coercion in order to secure the unquestioned exploitation of the masses. For this purpose, it employs its repressive institutions that exercise physical violence on its subjects, to ensure their complete submission in the face of state authority. Anarchism, firstly, completely negates state authority and, secondly, it challenges the use of legitimized violence by state institutions. In order to put an end to the exploitation of people, anarchists argue for the abolition of the centralized structure of the state along with its subordinate institutions. It proposes a reshaping of society along a non-hierarchical structure where power is not concentrated in the hands of a privileged few.

In order to carry out the operation of state desecration, anarchists advocate the tactic of “propaganda by the deed.” ‘Propaganda by the deed’ refers to the “concept that advocates the necessity for members of the revolutionary vanguard to undertake acts of

violence as individual revolutionary statements” (Wardlaw 21). Hence, McLaughlin points out that the “sporadic acts of individual violence” against the representatives of state authority or the state itself are considered to be useful in order to challenge hierarchical social structure in society (2007: 7). These may be seen as tools of resistance to confront repressive state apparatus in order to assert individual agency. Therefore the chaos and violence present in the Pakistani society needs to be re-examined in terms of resistance to the centralized state authority by the peripheral forces of insurgence. The purpose of this study is to investigate the anti-state elements that strategically employ violence as force of resistance against centralized power structures reflecting in Pakistani fiction.

I have selected the anarchist perspective of Mikhail Bakunin, the Russian revolutionary theorist, as my primary theoretical lens to analyze the situation of violence and chaos in Pakistani society. Bakunin advocates the violent anarchist uprising to overthrow the oppressive state authority. He propounds his anarchist ideas about violent desecration of state in his two seminal works: *God and the State*² and *Statism and Anarchy*³. Bakunin lays out his critique of state in *God and the State* (1970) and draws a direct link between state exploitation and religious authority. In *Statism and Anarchy* (2005), he further explicates his critique of state and highlights the nature of state as an oppressive apparatus in all its forms. I have explained his theory in detail in chapter three of this dissertation.

Since anarchist themes have largely been unexplored in Pakistani Anglophone fiction, the current study is likely to highlight new dimensions of research on the subject. Moreover, the position of the author of the primary texts as well as that of the reader/researcher in Pakistani society is significant to the meaning-making of the texts. Omar Shahid Hamid presently serves as an officer in the police institution of Pakistan. His works revolve around the inner workings of police as well as the other state institutions that aid the police in maintaining peace in society. Therefore, his texts may prove to be important artifacts that are likely to enable us reach a deeper understanding of the state machinery in general, and that of the Pakistani police force, in particular. In this way, his works lend themselves to an anarchist interpretation.

As this research is exploratory and interpretive in nature, the research paradigm employed is qualitative in nature and the research method used in this thesis is of textual analysis. Chapter three contains a detailed discussion on the research methodology used in this **study**. Just as the position of the author of the works in the society is considered to be significant for analysis, the researcher's place and identity is also a matter of importance for the interpretation of the texts. Therefore, I need to explain my position as a researcher.

1.1 Situatedness of the Researcher

Pakistani Anglophone fiction provides literary representations of violence and terrorism in Pakistani society as an aftermath of 9/11. Pakistan occupies a significant geopolitical location in the global politics. Due to its strategic location in the world politics, Pakistan serves as a major ally in America's '**war on terror**' after 9/11. Pakistan shares its western border with Afghanistan where America carried out military operations against terrorist organizations. Consequently, it faces a regular influx of terrorist elements found to be responsible for spreading terrorism in Pakistan. Karachi being the largest city of Pakistan becomes the hub of these terrorist activities. As a researcher and student of literature, I am keen to investigate how Pakistani Anglophone writers present a counter-narrative on the violent activities generally labeled as acts of terrorism by the Western media. Being a citizen of Pakistan, I am an active agent set to study the situation of violence and chaos in Pakistan as represented in fiction by Pakistani writers. I am at a vantage point to explore the possible motivations behind acts of individual violence and terrorism because of the geography I share with these fictional characters. Consequently, my identity, as a Pakistani Muslim, is likely to affect the analysis of the accounts of violence in the text. Since qualitative is ungeneralisable and subjective (varying from reader to reader), and since I have taken a partially subjective view of texts to valorize my argument, this study is likely to resonate with my situatedness. In this regard, textual analysis as a research method is likely to help me out.

1.2 Delimitation

I have delimited this study to Omar Shahid Hamid's *The Prisoner* and *The Spinner's Tale*. The present study investigates the aforementioned works through the anarchist perspective to map out the dynamics of violence presented in them.

1.3 Thesis Statement

Omar Shahid Hamid's selected fiction presents defiance of centralized state authority in Pakistani society through violent means, though violence used as a strategy by radicalized groups/individuals for reshaping society seems to be problematic as it puts the need for any institutional authority in question.

1.4 Research Questions

1. How does Omar Shahid Hamid map out the dynamics of violence in his fiction?
2. How and in what ways do Hamid's characters stage their protest against organized institutional authority in his novels?
3. How is religious authority conjoined with political authority in Hamid's fiction and to what end?

1.5 Research Plan

I have organized my study in six chapters. Chapter one deals with the introduction of the projects and explains the rationale and the significance of the study. It also outlines its research questions upon which the study is carried out. Chapter two deals with the literature review section. This chapter examines the existing body of literature available in my area of research and also indicates the gaps present in it. It also helps to contextualize my study with respect to the existing literature.

Chapter three of this thesis deals with the theoretical framework and research methodology employed in the study. I have used Mikhail Bakunin's anarchist perspective as my theoretical lens and Textual Analysis as research method in this study. In Chapter four, I deal with the anarchist reading of *The Prisoner*. My research discusses the use of repression by the 'RSA' to deal with the violence and terrorism in Pakistani society as well as the rebellion staged by the non-state characters against the oppressive state authority. Chapter five deals with the anarchist analysis of *The Spinner's Tale*. In this chapter, I have analyzed how terrorist elements in society employ strategic violence in order to destabilize uniform state authority. It also focuses on the socio-political injustices that may prove to be primary causes of instigation of such elements of state antagonism. In chapter six, I

conclude the study, discuss the findings of analysis, and highlight its usefulness with regards to future interpretations of the texts.

1.6 Significance of Study

The current study is significant in that it attempts to investigate the nexus between the rise of violence and various forms of authority in Pakistani society. While discussing this relationship, it highlights the subtle forms of violence inherent in centralized state authority itself and the imbalance in social relations that it entails. It explores the effects of unequal power relations on the marginalized sections of society and its possible link with the radicalization of state subjects. My research is interventionist in nature as it opens a new discussion on the conflict between the state and non-state actors while analyzing it through an anarchist lens.

Notes

¹. See Omar Shahid Hamid, *The Prisoner*, (New Delhi: Pan Macmillan India, 2013). Also see Omar Shahid Hamid, *The Spinner's Tale*, (New Delhi: Pan Macmillan India, 2015). I have selected these two novels as my primary texts. Henceforth, I cite them as *TP* and *TST* respectively across this dissertation.

². See Mikhail Bakunin, *God and the State*, (New York: Dover Publications, 1970). *God and the State* is, in fact, an unfinished manuscript which was published posthumously by two famous anarchists Cafiero and Reclus. For more information on its publication, see pages viii and ix of "Introduction" to this book by Paul Avrich.

³. See Mikhail Bakunin, *Statism and Anarchy*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990). Bakunin originally wrote this work in Russian, and criticized the repressive machinery of state with special reference to Slavic problems. This work is considered to have played a tremendous role in the development of Russian revolutionary thought.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The chapter provides a review of the existing literature available in the concerned area of study. There are two reasons for conducting this literature review: Firstly, examining the existing body of literature produced in my area of research may enable me to properly locate my research and, hence, establish the significance of the current study. Secondly, it may aid in pointing out the likely gaps present in the existing critical corpus on my area of study. This chapter is vital to the study as it helps me understand how other researchers have employed anarchist perspective in various (con)texts.

Before review of literature, a brief overview of my research would be in order. In this thesis, I analyze Omar Shahid Hamid's *The Prisoner* and *The Spinner's Tale* from an anarchist perspective to study the relationship between state authority and violence in Pakistani society. This study also investigates how non-state actors employ violence in order to limit state authority. Review of literature is likely to help me establish a link between my research and the corpus of literature produced prior to this thesis. I have reviewed the following sources in chronological order.

2.2 Review of the Selected Sources

Pierre-Joseph Proudhon's *What is Property* (1840) establishes a link between the concept of property and the resultant exploitation of the non-propertied. Proudhon considers property to be "the very principle of our government and of our institutions" (13). He declares it to be synonymous to "theft" as "every social advantage accorded, or rather usurped under the pretext of superiority of talent and service, is iniquity and robbery" (16). Proudhon considers the reformation brought about by the French Revolution to be "a delusion" as it did not truly revolutionize the state institutions (27). It only altered the nature

of state from monarchy to democracy. He defines monarchy to be “the sovereignty of one man” and democracy to be the sovereignty of the elected representatives of the majority of the nation (28). He points out that nations experience “progress” when monarchy is replaced by democracy “but in the end there is no revolution in the government the principle remains the same” (28). Proudhon declares that although in democracy the representatives have been elected by the people, yet people do not have an actual say in the policies of these representatives who act as the sovereigns of the state. Therefore, being subjects to one sovereign or to more than one does not make a difference as the principle of governance remains the same. The writer believes that the idea of justice, by the government, has been constantly developing with the passage of time. However, its “present state” should not be considered its final evolutionary stage (32). He considers the “institution of property” to be the last “obstacle” in its reformation (32). Therefore, this institution must be attacked in order to “consummate the revolution” (32).

Proudhon argues against the notion of property being a “natural right” of individual on the grounds that if it were, property would have been divided equally among all (42). He considers it to be “antisocial” and advocates for its abolition from society (43). The unequal distribution of property among the people leads to the exploitation of those who do not possess property. He points out that “when the land is divided among a certain number of inhabitants, the result is a monopoly of these against the rest of the nation” (57-8). Therefore, there needs to be a division of property according to the labor performed by each individual so that no single can claim right to the capital (97). He argues against the concentration of property in the hands of a minority as it leads to the exploitation of the majority of people in society.

What is Property sheds light on the exploitation that arises due to stratification of society vis-a-vis the ownership of property. However, it does not highlight how unequal distribution of property may lead to a rise in violent activities by the subjugated individuals. My thesis is likely to fill this gap in literature by forming a link between concentration of capital, sanctioned by the centralized state, and the rise of violence and chaos in society as depicted in the selected texts, *The Prisoner* and *The Spinner’s Tale*.

Mikhail Bakunin's "Letters to a Frenchman on the Present Crisis" (1870), published in *Bakunin on Anarchy* edited by Sam Dolgoff, is considered to be one of his seminal works where he discusses "the theory and practice of revolution" (Dolgoff 183). Bakunin wrote this text during the Franco-Prussian war in which France was met with clear defeat. In the opening lines of the text, he points that the nation of France cannot be saved by "the parasitic, artificial institute of state" (184). Instead, it is only the revolutionary vigor of the masses that may be able to save France from its current misery. He points out that "*France can be saved only by . . . a mass uprising of all the French people, spontaneously organized from the bottom upward, a war of destruction, a merciless war to the death*" (184, emphasis original). He considers state to be completely useless as far as saving the nation of France is concerned.

Bakunin argues that "no army in the world" can defeat a nation when all of its people show resolute determination to destroy everything that comes in the way to their liberty (184). He is of the opinion that the bourgeoisie of France show least readiness to join the revolution and that this bourgeoisie influence has "corrupted the proletariat and other strata of French society. Bakunin points out that the reason for showing the least inclination for revolution by the bourgeoisie is that "they fear that the Revolution will ruin them" (185). He claims that the bourgeoisie of the country has lost "the dynamism, the supreme heroism that carried it to victory" in the French revolution (185). Now, in his opinion, it would not part with its status and property in any circumstance. Therefore, they would never take part in revolution "for the realization of a great ideal" (185).

Bakunin points out that it is not that the bourgeoisie do not have patriotic sentiments for their nation. It is only that their patriotism lies not with the nation itself but with the French state. They defend the state as it safeguards its economic stability on the cost of the exploitation of the proletariat. An anarchist revolution against it would mean being "disowned" by it and the subsequent loss of bourgeoisie privileges (185). The writer points out "if the bourgeoisie had to choose between the masses who rebel against the state and the Prussian invaders of France, they would surely choose the latter" (186).

Bakunin points out that the bourgeoisie demand that all the wealth of the nation must be concentrated in the hands of the state. Moreover, the state should have complete

authority over the regulation of the national army. In this way, it may be able to control the wealth in the society as well as suppress any rebellion against the state (186-7). He illustrates that the bourgeoisie insist that the state can be the only savior of the French nation. Bakunin advocates against this notion and claims that “France can be saved only by drastic measures which require the dissolution of state” (187). Here it can be noticed that the writer begins to advocate for the use of violent tactics in order to disrupt power structures. Bakunin argues that the defeat faced by France could have been reversed if the state had allowed “mass uprisings” to be held all over the country (187). He stresses the need for the French nation to “organize itself into a great army” (188) by ensuring individual autonomy and taking immediate action. He points out that “an army does not discuss and theorize. It does not make revolution, it fights” (188).

Bakunin suggests that the people most capable to carry out mass uprising in France would be the workers and peasants (189). The reason for that, he believes, is that the peasants are capable of reactionary action because they are only slightly corrupted “by the pernicious influence of bourgeoisie society” (189). They harbor antagonism towards the bourgeois class because, in contrast to the peasants, they reap the benefits of the land without ever directly working on it themselves (189). Hence, their patriotism sprouts out of the dedication to their land on which they cultivate tirelessly. Therefore, they readily evince hatred for the foreign invaders that threaten to take away their prized land, their only source of living (189).

Bakunin also stresses that the biggest hurdle in organizing a revolution against the state is the antagonistic void found between the city workers and the peasants despite the fact that both of these factions of society get economically and politically marginalized by the dominant bourgeoisie class (9). He believes that this gap must be reconciled in order for the two groups to take action against state oppression (9). Bakunin emphasizes the need for taking direct action, instead of theorizing about it as some “so-called revolutionary bourgeoisie” do, in order to actualize revolution (195). Therefore, in Bakunin’s view, violent revolutionary tactics carry more significance than non-violent strategies. He pronounces the goal of the anarchic revolution to be the “violent destruction of the State” (202). He argues against the establishment of any type of state, even a transitional one, as he considers the idea of state to be essentially exploitative in nature.

The writer argues that revolution must never be “imposed” upon the peasants by false bourgeoisie revolutionaries. Instead, he believes that it should be “*germinated*” from within the peasants themselves (204, emphasis original). This self-generated revolutionary movement would, then, compel the peasant proletariat to destroy all kinds of authoritative power structure in society (204). Bakunin dismisses the common fear that revolution might plunge the country into chaos and anarchy by declaring anarchy, produced after the obliteration of state, to be favorable for the society. In his opinion, a society without a government and its institutions always faces a danger of falling into civil war which he considers “destructive” only for the state authority (205). It is, however, to be considered “favourable” for the populace as it creates political consciousness and keeps their vigor alive against all kinds of oppression (205). At the end of the letter, Bakunin advocates the proletariat of German to join hands with the proletariat of the rest of the world in combined revolutionary movement against all state authorities in general. The goal of this movement would be to abolish the concept of state on an international level.

“Letters to a Frenchman on the Present Crisis” discusses the importance of violent anarchist action in bringing about reformation in a highly centralized state. However, it fails to address how the violent activities carried out by terrorist organizations may be considered beneficial for a society, as prescribed by the author. In the current study, I intend to fill this gap in literature by analyzing how terrorist violence may be viewed as anarchist in nature in the context of Pakistani society as depicted in the selected works of Pakistani fiction in English.

Emma Goldman’s “The Psychology of Political Violence” (1920) discusses the psychology and purpose of individual acts of political violence in society. Goldman points out that any individual who dares to challenge the legitimacy of political violence is considered either as “a wild beast, a cruel, heartless monster” or as an “irresponsible lunatic” by the “ignorant mass” (61). She believes that, on the contrary, these individuals are the ones who are endowed with “super-sensitiveness” towards the violence and injustices occurring in the society (61). Therefore, acts of subversion that these people commit need to be seen as a means to counter oppression in society.

She further argues that most writers and poets seem to approve of these acts by the “political offenders” since they realize that “beyond every violent act there is a vital cause” (61). Political violence seems to be, in fact, a reaction to the violence by the state itself. In other words the author suggests that state institutions seem to create the situation of social and political injustices that force non-state actors to take action against it. Goldman refers to the concept of “a free Republic” to be a complete “myth” (67). She draws attention to how a minority of “parasites” have largely exploited the American nation over the period of thirty years (67). She points out that these custodians of the American republic have disregarded the fundamental principle of America by endlessly robbing those who they govern in order to accumulate their own wealth. Thus Goldman suggests that instead of criminalizing the perpetrators of political violence, one should search for the underlying reasons that drive them to take such measures. Moreover, she stresses the need to hold the real culprits of political and social injustices, the state and its institutions, accountable for their crimes.

Goldman’s essay investigates the psychology of acts of political violence in society. It highlights the role of government as the source of instigation of political violence. However, it does not point out how state domination and police brutality may be responsible for terrorist violence performed by individuals in society. The current research is likely to fill the existing gap in literature by discussing the role of state behind violence and terror created in society by certain anti-state agents as depicted in Pakistani fiction in English.

Thomas A. Riley’s *Germany’s Poet-Anarchist John Henry Mackay: A Contribution to the History of German Literature at the Turn of the Century* (1972) examines German literature of the time that sprang from anarchist ideals with special reference to the works of John Mackay. Riley points out that there exists an intricate relationship between German literature and political philosophy. Therefore, in order to understand one, one must have a comprehensive view of the both. In this book, Riley is of the view that anarchism has its roots in individualism and is, in fact, “an extreme development of the individualistic trends of the Renaissance” (2). He points out that it is with the realization of individualism¹ that man was able to shun the supremacy of others over him and in this realization lies the core

of the anarchist thought. He believes that Mackay possessed “many characteristics” (2) of the Renaissance man and also exhibited these attributes in his works.

According to Riley, Mackay’s individualism, as reverberated in his work, is in complete opposition to Christianity² which preaches selflessness, whereas Mackay believes in the complete focus on one’s own self. Riley points out that throughout his life, Mackay strived to gain sovereignty over his own personality instead of accepting any external authority over him. The author illustrates that Mackay had a profound love for Greek arts and philosophy that celebrates sensual pleasures and external beauty (9). Mackey’s “hedonistic delight” in everything sensual and beautiful is well embodied in his short stories, one among them that is worth mentioning is “Der Sybarit.” He points out that it was actually his “Hellenistic character” that led him to embrace anarchism (9).

Riley believes that Stirner’s book, *Der Einzige und sein Eigentum*, to be another very important influence on Mackay. This influence can be observed in his writings such as his work *Sturm* that contains poetry that demands for “violent and bloody revolution” (86). Mackay displayed great hostility towards compulsion of any kind and advocated freedom of thought and speech for everyone. Riley demonstrates that nineteenth century was a time when governments were becoming more and more centralized and their authority ever more encroaching on individual life and his privacy. With the constantly rising industrial development and growth of technology, human life was becoming increasingly mechanical and controlled. Mackay became the “mouthpiece” of that minority of people who dared to protest against the “society and the state” (11).

This work shows that Mackay possessed a rebellious nature from the very start and that can be observed in his early work *Menschen der Eh* and also in his poem “Die Grenze des Wissens.” Mackay also happened one of the editors of the famous anarchist journal “Die Autonomie” of his time. He often expressed solidarity with the American anarchists who were executed and imprisoned for their actions. His work, *Sturm*, contained two such poems that discuss this issue of state’s persecution of anarchists. However, Riley illustrates that later when Mackay converted to the individual anarchism of Stirner, he expressed disagreement with the philosophy of these men in his poem “Ein Jahr Spater.” Mackay, nonetheless, considered the brutal persecution of anarchists to be condemnable.

Riley points out that another very significant influence on Mackay's anarchist thought was Benjamin Tucker, the American anarchist, who brought Mackay to accept evolutionary anarchism rather than the revolutionary anarchism of Stirner. Riley believes that the influence of Tucker's famous essay, "State, Socialism and Anarchism," can be easily observed in Mackay's works: *Die Anarchisten* and *Der Freiheitsucher*. The former work presents a strong antagonism towards the regimentation of state and society, yet following Tucker's anarchist philosophy, it demands revolution to be completely bloodless (88). In Riley's opinion, *Menschen der Ehe* is another work by Mackay in which he challenges society's traditions regarding marriage. Riley allocates a large portion of the book to the analysis of Mackay's novel, *Die letzte Pflicht*, which he refers to as one of his "masterpieces" (91). The novel, in his opinion, presents its main character, Schonell, as "a spineless representative of Christian self-abnegation" (95). The protagonist lives in a constant fear of doing anything that even remotely deviates from the societal norms. Mackay wrote a sequel to this novel as well, *Albert Schonell's Untergang*, in which this character eventually meets an "inglorious" (95) end. He is dominated and maltreated by a prostitute and is left deprived of everything he ever owned.

According to Riley, Mackay's most explicitly anarchist novel is *Der Schwimmer* that, he believes, cannot be understood without having prior knowledge of Stirner's *The Ego and Its Own*. In this novel the protagonist, Felder, is shown to be a member of a swimming club, that Riley believes is the representative of society. Felder is shown to be in a constant conflict with society. He develops his personal will and exhibits an egoist attitude that is harshly snubbed by the club as this attitude does not go in its favor. The novel shows how society controls an individual's thinking from the moment he is born for its own benefit. Riley points out that in the novel, the club is shown to be concerned only about its own honor and has no regard for the individuality of its members. Felder realizes that he cannot enjoy agency while remaining in the club leaves it finally but is traumatized because of it for the rest of his life. He is under the impression that he had betrayed the club for choosing to give preference to his own desires. The sense of betrayal is so overwhelming that he is forced to commit suicide at the end. Riley points out that *Der Schwimmer* serves as a warning to its readers about the disparity between state institutions and public interests. Riley illustrates that *Der Freiheitsucher* is another one of Mackay's

works that traces the life journey of an individual, Ernst Forster, in becoming an anarchist. Riley states that the text may be considered not as a novel but as a work of art even though Mackay did not consider it to be as such. Riley illustrates that the work contains both images and narration and there is little discussion on the anarchist theory itself and more attention is reserved to the discussion of “individualistic and anti-government philosophy” (177).

The above-mentioned work discusses the works of a German writer from the anarchist perspective with special attention to the individualist strain present in it. However, this work does not focus on the significance of violent individual action in order to subvert state authority as depicted in German literature. Pakistan’s political situation seems to be similar to that of Germany of the time of Mackay, as far as chaos, terror and lawlessness is concerned. Pakistani fiction is intricately bound with the political scene in the country. However, the situation of violence and anarchy as represented in Pakistani fiction in English has mostly been unexplored in research. This study intends to take the anarchist perspective on Pakistani fiction that represents the chaotic political scene prevalent in the contemporary times in the country. My research intends to see how far this violence and the resultant chaos are related to the anarchist tendencies present in the perpetrators of said violence.

Graham Benton’s “Riding the Interface: An Anarchist Reading of *Gravity’s Rainbow*” (1998) provides an anarchist reading of 1973 novel of the American writer Thomas Pynchon. Benton illustrates that Pynchon often shows anarchist tendencies in his various works such as *The Crying of Lot 49*, *Vineland* and *Mason & Dixon*. He believes that out of all Pynchon’s work, *Gravity’s Rainbow* is the one most pregnant with anarchist thought. Benton explains that Mikhail Bakunin considers “extensive and widespread destruction” to be the most important harbinger of a newly born peaceful society (156). He points out that, following this line of thought, Pynchon depicts “the Zone” as a site of hopes for the rebirth of a new world in the novel (156). The reason for bringing about this re-birth is considered to be precisely war. He points out that the character Francisco Squalidozzi, who calls himself “Gaucho Bakunin,” expresses his concerns over how concentration of power in the South America has led to their “national tragedy” (qtd. in Benton 156). This hegemony has resulted into the over-industrialization of the area and has made it lose its

natural environment. Stressing upon the criticality of the ongoing time, Squalidozzi says that “decentralizing, back towards anarchism, needs extraordinary times” (qtd. in Benton 157). Benton suggests that these “extraordinary times” that Squalidozzi refers to are, in fact, a global revolution to eradicate centuries old hegemonic structures in society (157). Benton discusses another event in the text that may be interpreted through anarchist discourse: Slothrop’s disintegration into the environment as he goes on shedding everything unnatural on his body including his clothes to be merged with nature. He points out that this incidence resonates with the radical ecological strain in anarchism. Moreover, Benton believes that in addition to finding anarchist themes in the text, one can also observe the anarchist impulse at the formal level because at the time of its production anarchist ideas were very much in vogue. He points out that 1960s and early ‘70s was a time when there was a rise of neo-anarchism which encompassed “Civil Right movements, anti-war demonstrations, nuclear disarmament protests and ecological conservation programs” (160). Benton illustrates that various critics of Pynchon express their dissatisfaction with his work because his writings evade to be explored under “banal exegetical practices” and capitulates to be categorized under standard literary genres. This disparate style and form of his writings also connote to anarchist leanings in his works as well. In a nutshell, Benton sheds light on how Pynchon’s novel is charged with anarchist consciousness both stylistically and thematically.

Bentons’s essay dissects the American novelist’s work from the anarchist point of view with special reference to the ecological stain in anarchism. It highlights the need to bring about revolution through direct action. However, it doesn’t discuss the dynamics of violence required to reorganize society along anarchist ideals. In this study, I intend to fill this gap in literature by mapping the dynamics of violence as depicted in the works of Pakistani literature in English from an anarchist perspective.

John Rignall’s “Conrad and Anarchism: Irony, Solidarity and Betrayal”(2005), published in *‘To Hell with Culture’: Anarchism and Twentieth-Century British Literature*, edited by H Gustav Klaus and Stephen Knight, discusses works of Joseph Conrad from an anarchist perspective. Rignall points out that the issue of solidarity, experienced by the characters in these works, seemingly arises because all these characters are shown to be the followers of anarchism. He believes that these characters tend to show no affinity with their

fellow anarchists because anarchism strongly advocates against having a centre and that consequently reflects in the behavior of its followers as well.

Rignall argues that although Conrad criticizes anarchism in extreme severity, yet he also seems to be intrigued by it. Conrad employs satire and irony in both of his stories as he views them to be the only media fit to deal with a subject as evasive as anarchism. The stories repeatedly point at a connection between anarchism and betrayal; various characters are shown to be informing on their comrades and revealing their secrets. For Conrad, in betraying each other, these anarchists also ironically betray one of the most fundamental principles in anarchist tradition: the principle of solidarity³ with other human beings. Rignall suggests that Conrad was not against the principle of solidarity itself, but was rather opposed to the rousseauesque belief in the existence of a benign, meaningful nature of mankind. In portraying the disloyal and hypocritical nature of these anarchist characters, Conrad, in fact, draws attention to the discrepancy between appearances and their actual nature. Rignall points out that Conrad unsparingly criticizes the duality of anarchists especially that of the bourgeoisie anarchists who he finds absolutely despicable in their beliefs. However, he displays “a certain respect” and “affinity” for the extreme forms of anarchism because of their ability to disrupt the monotonous complacency displayed by the stereotypical adherents of anarchism (18). Rignall suggests that Conrad’s texts not only criticize the anarchists beliefs but also the economic and social systems that these anarchists seek to abolish. He points out that both of these extremes, capitalism and anarchism, lay false claim to the essential solidarity of mankind, which in Conrad’s opinion, is a thing of imagination.

Rignall’s essay analyses Conrad’s fiction from an anarchist perspective, yet it does not highlight whether he displays an affinity for the violent strain of anarchism through his fiction or not. This work neglects the significance of violence as a tool to subvert the authority of state and its institutions. My thesis is likely to fill this gap in literature by analysing the significance of violence as a possible strategy to challenge state authority.

Heather Worthington’s “Identifying Anarchy in G. K. Chesterton’s *The Man Who Was Thursday*” (2005), published in *‘To Hell with Culture’: Anarchism and Twentieth-Century British Literature*, edited by H Gustav Klaus and Stephen Knight, investigates

Chesterton's works from an anarchist perspective. In this essay, he discusses "The Telegraph Poles" by Chesterton in which he debates over the need for both anarchy and order for the survival of mankind. Chesterton is well aware of the twofold connotations related with the term "anarchism" as he explores the tensions between the two opposing portrayals of anarchist stereotypes. On the one hand, he presents anarchists having beards and destructive passions while, on the other hand, depicting an anarchist society to be an ideally free one. Worthington states that Chesterton's concept of an ideal society was an anarchical one where state authority would be unnecessary, but he also strongly advocates that, in order to live in a government free society, the individuals must possess a certain degree of responsibility and rationality to be able to self-regulate themselves.

Worthington points out that the issue of identity in association with order and anarchy in society is under discussion in Chesterton's novel *The Man Who Was Thursday*. He argues that the text depicts characters such as Gabriel Syme and Lucian Gregory to be representatives of order and anarchy respectively, of the new world and of the old one. Through these characters, Chesterton seems to depict that both order and disorder are antithetical to each other yet they coexist in the society. In fact, he shows these attributes to be the two sides of the same coin as one of the anarchist characters is shown to be in an unlikely association with the "South African and South American millionaires" (23). Hence, Worthington states that the text "uses anarchy and anarchists as signifiers for the tensions and conflicts which are worked through in the narrative" (Klaus and Knight 24).

Worthington's essay highlights anarchist themes in Chesterton's works while stressing the need for order in society as advocated by the author. However, it does not address the need for violence as a tactic to subvert the order imposed on individuals by the state. My study intends to fill the gap in existing literature by highlighting the significance of violence as a strategy to subvert state authority as depicted in Pakistani fiction in English.

Kathleen Bell's "Ethel Mannin's Fiction and the Influence of Emma Goldman" (2005), published in *'To Hell with Culture': Anarchism and Twentieth-Century British Literature*, edited by H Gustav Klaus and Stephen Knight, discusses Mannin's literary contributions to the political debate of her time. Bell also draws attention to the similarities shared by Ethel Mannin and Emma Goldman. She points out that 1930's was a time when

writers, especially women writers, engaged themselves in the discussions on gender politics, especially with questions of sanctity of marriage, sexuality, etc., and considered these questions to be a significant part of the political debate in general. In her opinion, among these women writers, the most prominent were Goldman, West and Mannin.

Bell states that Mannin's works do not enjoy the status of lasting works in the history of literature. Yet, they cannot be denied as a part of that oft-forgotten literary strand of the mid-twentieth century that is "rooted in a critique of gender relations, opposed to capitalism and setting forward an anarchist agenda" (Klaus and Knight 83). She argues that both Goldman and Mannin shared deep interest in the Spanish Civil War and both of them were disillusioned by the revolution in Russia which they had praised previously. Mannin, in her book *Women and the Revolution* (1938), draws attention to the failure of revolution in Russia in which she believed just a change of dictators had taken place. Bell notes that Goldman, too, had previously expressed a similar disappointment with the revolution in her work *My Disillusionment in Russia* in 1924.

Bell points out that Mannin displays a certain level of obsession with Goldman by representing her in a number of her fictional as well as political works such as *Red Rose*, *Women and the Revolution*, *Crescendo*, and *Brief Voice: A Writer's Story*. In her writings, she also clearly stresses on the essentialist differences between the natures of men and women, and suggests that both are different psychologically as well as physiologically. She believes that men are more intellectually more enhanced, whereas women are more invested in instincts and emotions. Bell points out that this difference, in Mannin's opinion, proves to be a hurdle in acquiring equal rights for men and women. In fact, she places natural impulse and instinct in a higher regard than the masculine intellect, considering it to be more useful in order to take revolutionary action. She points out that while condemning the failure of revolution in bringing about a social change, both Goldman and Mannin "see the new values that which revolution will herald deriving from qualities and instincts already inherent in human beings" (89). Bell explains that both the writers encourage, especially, women to strive for revolution and to work with men "against the common enemy" i.e. "capitalism and the state" (89). Thus, Bell investigates Mannin's works from the anarchist perspective while at the same time paying attention to the influence Emma Goldman had on the writer.

“Ethel Mannin’s Fiction and the Influence of Emma Goldman” investigates Mannin’s works from an anarchist perspective while taking an account of Goldman’s influence on her writings. However, it fails to explore the violent anarchist aspects regarding the writer’s views about revolution. My research intends to bridge this gap in literature by establishing a link between violence and social revolution.

David Goodway’s *Anarchist Seeds Beneath the Snow: Left-Libertarian Thought and British Writers from William Morris to Colin Ward* (2006) contains critical essays on the works of selected British authors from anarchist perspective. Out of these essays, I have only included his chapters on Oscar Wilde and Aldous Huxley in the literature review. In the essay, “Oscar Wilde,” Goodway argues that a huge anarchist tendency is found in Oscar Wilde’s works that has so far been largely ignored in the world of academia. He believes that his Wilde’s political views have been overshadowed by the attention that has been given to his efforts for the achievement of homosexual liberation in Western Europe and North America. Goodway believes that the collection of Wilde’s works published as *Artist as Critic* falsely describes his essay “The Soul of Man under Socialism” as having his “argument for social reform” (63). He believes that this essay is actually completely against such social reforms because Wilde considers such reforms to be merely “remedies” (63) that are not a solution to the problem but are a part of the problem itself. He believes that in order to root out corruption from the society it needs to be totally reconstructed so that “poverty will be impossible” (qtd. in Goodway 63). Goodway also notes that many notable anarchists including Peter Kropotkin, George Woodcock and Peter Marshall among others acclaim this text to be an “important anarchist statement” (63).

According to Goodway, Wilde’s anarchist thought becomes first crystallized in 1890 in an essay named “A Chinese Sage” on the writings of the Taoist philosopher Chuang Tzu whose philosophy is considered to have much in common with classical Western anarchism. He points out that in this essay, Wilde openly criticises the establishment of any kinds of governments. He believes that governments, churches and other forms of dominance are “unscientific” and “immoral” and therefore, unnecessary (71). Goodway believes that Wilde takes an unambiguously anarchist stance in both of his above-mentioned essays. In “The Soul of Man under Socialism,” Wilde clearly states that “the form of government that is most suitable to the artist is no government at all” (qtd. in

Goodway 72). Thus Goodway believes that one can find a strong anarchist voice in Wilde's writing especially towards the last years of life.

In the essay "Aldous Huxley," Goodway investigates the author's writings from an anarchist perspective. He is of the opinion that the novel *Brave New World*, that is a "brilliant dystopian fable" (215) strongly exhibits anarchist thought. He explains that in this novel, the world of future is shown where the society is completely "controlled" and "conditioned" (215). In this world, people live in a restricted, unnatural manner where they are treated as specimens on whom different tests are conducted. They do not reproduce in the natural manner anymore but rather the reproductive processes are now carried out in the laboratories. These individuals are allowed to grow in a very controlled environment that leads to the formation of extremely docile, but at the same time, highly promiscuous human beings as sexual depravity is encouraged here. This kind of society has been adopted throughout the world with the exception of a few primitive, aboriginal peoples. Only one character, John, manages to escape the effects of this society and educates himself on the works of Shakespeare. This is the only character that can be considered completely human. Goodway believes that the society shown in the novel is actually representative of our present day society that is governed and administered by highly concentrated authoritative structures.

Goodway is of the view that Huxley wants to depict how authority leads to the complete corruption and degradation of human life and how it is injurious to any creative and critical thinking. He points out that Huxley, however, is more concerned about the few "dissatisfied intellectuals" present in this society than about the dehumanized masses (215). He believes that the intellectual is given only two options to live in society that is either to live in a completely controlled environment or to live in an extremely primitive, marginalized way (215). Both of these ways are not suitable to anyone who wants to live with freedom. Huxley believes that there should be a third alternative present for individuals; a society where authority is decentralized and science is taught to men for their benefit and not their enslavement and adaptation (215). Goodway's essay highlights that Huxley later changed his views regarding anarchism and started advocating authoritarianism. He seemed to suggest that an ideal society would be a hierarchical one based on intellectual competence.

The above-mentioned essays discuss works of British authors from different anarchist perspectives. However, because of historical/cultural gap none of them discusses the strain of violence anarchism in the works of the selected authors. My thesis intends to fill this gap in the existing body of research by highlighting the violent anarchist tendencies found in two Pakistani novels *The Prisoner* and *The Spinner's Tale*.

Jeff Shantz's *A Creative Passion: Anarchism and Culture* (2010) has a collection of essays that investigates the relationship between anarchism and culture in the works of various authors. It focuses on various artistic and cultural representations within the contemporary anarchist movements. I have reviewed only first three chapters of the book in my literature review. The first chapter in this work is an essay named "Poetic Licence: Hugo Ball, The Anarchist Avant-Garde and Us" by Roger Farr in which he analyses Ball's literary contributions through the anarchist lens. Hugo Ball was a renowned German poet and author and, according to Farr, a proponent of Dada. Throughout his life Ball wrote several books and essays that were rich in discussions of politics, culture, history and aesthetics. Farr points out that Ball was responsible for the establishment of the Cabaret Voltaire that Weir described as "an educational institution with anarcho-cultural aims" (qtd. in Shantz 15). He illustrates that Ball worked as an editor for many notable radical journals of the day along with renowned anarchists of his time such as Eric Musham, Fritz Brupacher, Gustav Landauer, and Otto Gross and published his poetry and critical works in these journals too. However, despite having so much association with anarchist thought, his critics usually do not highlight in Ball's writing and disregard it as unimportant.

Farr points out that Ball was a follower of famous leading anarchists like Stirner and Bakunin and, just like them, regarded state to be the tool of injustice against those who are governed and controlled by it. However, Ball did not consider state to be the sole cause for this oppression but rather regarded it to be more of an effect. He believed that the underlying political discourse is the real responsible factor that legitimizes state. Farr explains that "for Ball, the discourse of politics itself also had to become the terrain of metonymic struggle for autonomy" (18). Farr argues that for Ball, everyday language had become so saturated with the capitalist ideology and that it served as means of its perpetuation. He expressed that "the word has become a commodity. We must give up writing second-hand" (qtd. in Shantz 19). Ball intended to extend his anarchist critique to

language as he believed it to be the site where power relations manifest themselves. Hence he urged the writers, artists and activists to not feel hesitant while using language as they please. He believed that if language could be used as a tool of suppression and coercion, it could also be used as a vehicle of liberation. According to Farr, it was Proudhon who “piqued his interest in extending an anarchist critique of language into an artistic practice” (21). Farr points out that Ball’s “Gadjiberibimba” is one such exemplary poem that defies all rules of conventional poetry as well as that of language.

In the second chapter “The Failure of Civilization from an Anarcho-premitivist Perspective,” Max Lieberman discusses two works of science fiction, *1984* by George Orwell and *Flow my Tears, the Policeman Said* by Philip K. Dick, from the anarcho-premitivist perspective. According to Lieberman, science fiction often represents a future dystopia, filled with destruction and misery resulting due to lack of social and ecological responsibility shown by the mankind. He illustrates that both the novels under discussion depict such future stratified societies that have come into being because of terrifyingly excessive involvement of technology in human life. He is of the opinion that Orwell’s novel provides a critique of the present governing systems, whereas Dick’s work discusses the repercussions of “technological growth, substance abuse, and totalitarian power structure” (32) on society. In Lieberman’s opinion, anarcho-premitivist reading these works is useful as this approach in anarchism aims to investigate the origins of the problems caused by hierarchy and oppression.

According to Lieberman both these works seem to depict societies where human beings have become victims of addiction to physical desires. He explains that in one of the scene in Dick’s novel, his protagonist gets invited to a sort of a phone grid where people go to get their sexual desires electronically amplified as much as they can endure it. These people eventually get addicted to this process and visit this centre of degradation more and more often that results into their physical and mental deterioration. Lieberman points out that a similar kind of case is presented in Orwell’s work where the protagonist is highly addicted to smoking tobacco. He is assaulted by coughing fits so much so that they “emptied his lungs so completely that he could only begin breathing again by lying on his back and taking a series of deep gasps” (qtd. in Shantz 33). Lieberman is of the opinion that exhibiting a huge need for the gratification of physical desires to the extent of addiction

is actually the byproduct of civilization itself. He illustrates Orwell's protagonist, Winston Smith, is shown to be yearning for a bygone life when there was considerably less technological growth and family values were still considered important. Lieberman points out that although Smith is thinking of his childhood, these characteristics are reminiscent of human life in the days of hunter-gatherer societies that brought to an end because of the concept of agrarian societies.

Lieberman illustrates how domestication produced negative traits in the mankind because it developed in it a fear of lack of resources that could not be found in the hunter-gatherer societies. Just as domestication of animals results in them being more sedentary and inactive, it similarly produces a lack of will in human beings as well. He points out that the Western society seems to favor domestication and sedentism as the ideal lifestyle for us, whereas our ancestors clearly prospered in a more natural, nomadic lifestyle. He points out that with the rise of urge to occupy land, human autonomy decreased characteristically. In "domestication and sedentism," he sees "the potential of ownership, hierarchy and oppression" (36). Such unintelligent and submissive human beings can be noticed portrayed in Orwell's work as. Lieberman shows how domestication leads to agricultural societies that eventually lead to the establishment of states (42). In his opinion, one of the by-products of the civilizing process is warfare as it enables states to carry out the process of conquest of other nations and repress those at home. In Orwell's work, war is shown to be a tool of repression and coercion. With his discussion on warfare, Lieberman concludes his essay on these writers' works.

The next essay in this work is "Anarchic Resistance and Bureaucratic Appeal: Edward Abbey, Wallace Stegner, and Literary Approaches to Environmental Defence" by Liam Nesson. This essay explores the writings of both the above-mentioned authors and their philosophical approaches towards the cause of environmental preservation. Nesson points out that one can notice arguments for the preservation and defense of environment from the earliest writings of Edward Abbey. He is of the opinion that Abbey believes that governments and bureaucracy always exploit land, people and resources. He points out that Abbey's work seems to justify certain forms of resistance to centralized power relations in society. Nesson states that Wallace Stegner, on the other hand, suggests a more democratic way to solve the issue of environmental crises. He urges policy makers, industrialists and

environmentalists to resolve this conflict. In a letter to the director of the Wildland Research Centre at the University of California, Stegner writes in defense of the preservation of natural environment instead of using and modifying it for the recreational purposes. Nesson traces the notable works produced in relation to the preservation of land and non-human resources, and demonstrates how Abbey's and Stegner's writings contribute to this body of literature.

Nesson believes that both Abbey and Stegner work for the same cause in their writings but employ different approaches for it. Abbey adopts a sardonic tone while dealing with such a serious theme whereas Stegner uses a grave one. Abbey "sensationalizes the situation, creating a brief drama of life in the wild" (66). He appeals to the emotions of his readers by making a "plea" for the conservation of environment but this method, Nesson believes, usually works on those who are already in favour of his argument. Those who are "unsympathetic to his cause" often find his tone to be rather "scathing" (66). Stegner and Abbey differ in their approaches in that Stegner leaves some space for compromise for all the parties involved in the environmental issue whereas Abbey prefers resistance to authority.

Nesson is of the opinion that these writers' perspectives can be easily traced in their non-fiction writings but Abbey's perspective is more easily noticeable in his fiction. In his opinion, Abbey's novel *The Brave Cowboy* represents his ideology about wilderness preservation in South America. His protagonist is a cowboy named Jack Burns who exhibits a desire to have the idyllic life back that was lost with the end of frontier age. Nesson points out that Burns attempts to go on a rather "idiotic journey" (67) to restore life to its prior state. There are several instances in the novel that depict Burns showing resistance to authority just for the sole purpose of infuriating them. Nesson is of the opinion that "Burns' inability to adapt is representative of Abbey's approach to environmentalism" (67). In his work, Abbey aims to demonstrate how overwhelming control by the authorities results in frustration of those subjected to it. This frustration eventually leads to tenacious resistance against authoritarian structures.

Nesson points out that Abbey's other notable works such as *The Monkey Wrench Gang* and *Desert Solitaire* romanticize "extremist environmental activism" by portraying

characters that seize every opportunity, including using explosives, to sabotage industrial progress (67). He argues that with the publication of *The Monkey Wrench Gang*, Abbey advocates “an ideology for active wilderness defence” (68). Such violent acts of ecological sabotage which have been depicted in his fiction and non-fiction have been labeled as “eco-tage” (68). Nesson illustrates that it is debatable whether Abbey purposely incited violence against those who aim to harm environment or not but this movement of ‘eco-tage’ certainly gained more popularity after the publication of his novel. Critics like Lee Rozelle believe that there are better ways to help promote the cause of wilderness preservation than by advocating violence.

Nesson mentions that some of his non-fiction works such as *Slickrock: Endangered Canyons of the Southwest* and *The Hidden Canyon: A river Journey* present less destructive approaches to environmental defense. Both these works are dedicated to present the sanctity and beauty of the American Southwest and how it is endangered by an ever-increasing expansion of technological and industrial projects in the area. Nesson illustrates that in both his fiction and his non-fiction, Abbey appeals to the emotions of his audience. He uses dramatic and provocative style to inculcate a consciousness in his readers. Stegner’s style of writing, on the other hand, is more even handed and less aggressive. In his book *This is Dinosaur: Echo Parks and Its Magic Rivers*, that is a collection of essays by other authors too, he presents argument in defense of the preservation of Utah’s Dinosaur National Monument and urges governmental authorities to prevent converting it into a water reservoir. Concluding the essay, Nesson illustrates that both these writers had different ideologies towards the cause of environmental preservation and that is very evident from their writings as well.

The above-mentioned work is a collection of essays that are based on anarchist readings of various authors’ works. However, these essays do not discuss the significance of terrorist violence in subverting oppressive state authority. In this study, I attempt to fill this gap in literature by carrying out an anarchist interpretation of Omar Shahid Hamid’s first two novels *The Prisoner* and *The Spinner’s Tale*.

Diarmuid Hester’s “Queer Cryptograms, Anarchist Cyphers: Decoding Dennis Cooper’s *The Marbled Swarm: A Novel*” (2012) interprets Cooper’s work from an

anarchist perspective. Hester is of the opinion that Cooper's novel is often pigeonholed under the genre of "transgressive writing" (95). Yet, it would be unjust to confine his fiction to only one category because its richness and variety demands to be interpreted from various different angles. He points out that the very use of transgressive strategies in his work and his exploration of personal freedom against social norms are "in fact symptomatic of a more profound identification with anarchism" (96). That is probably the reason why the writer himself openly acknowledged his affiliation with anarchist thought. Hester explains that the plot of the text is extremely complex, with a number of narratives and storylines intertwined in the plot. Large portions of the text contain codes and clues that need to be deciphered by the readers in order to reach a sane understanding of the narrative. He believes that this peculiar, multilayered structure of Cooper's prose is in fact representative of the "oblique systems of communication" employed by sexually marginalized subcultures in the twentieth century (99). However, on a deeper level it signifies the "deception and duplicity" used in anarchist propaganda in general (99).

Hester is of the opinion that due to the severe surveillance of any type of seditious writings and publications in America, anarchist ideas could not be openly expressed by writers. Hence most anarchist writers, in order to evade persecution, chose to express their thoughts in codified language. Thus it became a common practice with anarchists to convey their propaganda in codes and ciphers. Hester illustrates that this kind of codification and complication that is characteristic of anarchist writing is seen at work at the formal level in Cooper's text. Hester points out that a possible reason for not categorizing Cooper's work under anarchist writing may be that his work does not encompass anarchism thematically but rather stylistically and structurally. Hester concludes his essay by pointing out that the complex structure of *The Marbled Swarm* "offers another instance of Cooper's formal engagement with the history of anarchism" (108-9).

The forgoing essay elaborates how anarchism can be traced in the text not only at the thematic level but also at the structural and formal levels. However, it does not focus on the violent anarchist strains found in Cooper's work. In this thesis, I intend to fill this gap in the body of literature by conducting an anarchist reading of the violence and chaos depicted in Omar Shahid Hamid's novels *The Prisoner* and *The Spinner's Tale*.

2.3 Conclusion

The review of literature has enabled me to understand anarchist theory in detail. It has further helped me understand how different anarchist perspectives may be applied to various types of literary works. Studying these works closely has offered me an insight as to how to investigate anarchist perspectives in Pakistani fiction. In view of the literature review in the foregoing pages, I am in a position to affirm my theoretical perspective and research methodology (in the next chapter) in order to analyze my primary texts.

Notes

¹. See Thomas A. Riley, *Germany's Poet-Anarchist John Henry Mackay*, (New York: The Revisionist Press, 1972). Especially see page 3 for further reading on anarchism as an extreme development of individualism of the Renaissance period in Europe.

². Ibid., See pages 8-9 for further reading on Mackay's views on Christianity's ethical values.

³. See *'To Hell with Culture': Anarchism and Twentieth-Century British Literature*, (eds.) H. Gustav Klaus and Stephen Knight, (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2005). See especially page 16 for further reading on the 'principle of solidarity' as one of the fundamental principles of anarchism.

CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

Review of the existing literature on anarchist theory has helped me decide my theoretical framework for the ongoing study. The theoretical perspective that I have selected to apply on the primary texts is anarchist theory as elucidated by Mikhail Bakunin. In this chapter, I discuss his theoretical views in detail. Furthermore, in this chapter, I discuss the research methodology as well as the research methods employed in the upcoming analysis chapters.

3.2 Theoretical Framework

For the application of anarchist theory, I have based my analysis on the anarchist perspective as theorized by Mikhail Bakunin in his works *God and the State* and *Statism and Anarchy*. In his work *Statism and Anarchy*, Bakunin is of the view that the state apparatus is, in fact, a “wild beast” that uses “the most terrible weapons of destruction, and is always ready to use them to wipe out not just houses and streets but entire cities with all their inhabitants” (159). In other words, he points out that the state uses repression in order to maintain unchallenged domination over its citizens. He points out that, in order to deal with the unjustified repression perpetrated by the state, “one needs another wild beast, no less wild but more just” (159). This “wild beast” refers to an individual that takes up arms against the state to perform acts of political violence to challenge oppressive state authority. Bakunin believes that such acts of “widespread and passionate destruction” need to be employed as strategic ways to obliterate state domination in society. I use Bakunin’s theory of state, as cited above, to analyse the ways in which the state employs force to establish unquestioned control over its citizens in the selected works of fiction. Moreover, in light

of the above-mentioned lines, I analyze the ways in which the non-state actors use violence to defy the state in an anarchist manner. While analyzing the texts from an anarchist perspective, I investigate how the use of violence to target the state, as per anarchist ideals, may be considered beneficial for society since it proves to be detrimental for its socio-political fabric. In order for this to be considered at length, one needs to investigate the terrorist elements involved in the perpetration of violence against the state. While conducting an anarchist analysis, seeing violence, particularly large-scale terrorist violence, only in the context of resistance against the state needs to be avoided since it tends to greatly harm both political and public life of the state subjects in general. Thus violence by radicalized individuals/groups as a means to bridle the state authority needs to be re-evaluated keeping its paradoxical nature in mind.

In addition to Bakunin theory of anarchism, I use Louis Althusser's theory of state as a repressive apparatus as my sub-lens to analyse the role of Pakistani state institutions portrayed in the selected texts. Althusser, in his essay "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses," points out that the state presides over a set of institutions that include "the police, courts, and prisons" as well as the "army" that help keep the state subjects obedient to the prevailing law and order (70). He refers to these institutions as 'Repressive State Apparatuses' (RSA). He points out that the 'RSA' are not the only means responsible for maintaining law and order in the society, there is yet another set of institutions that aids the state in maintaining its authority over its subjects. Althusser refers to those as the "Ideological State Apparatuses" (75). The 'ideological state apparatuses' include the institutions of family, church, school etc., and are responsible for the ideological indoctrination of state subjects in order to maintain unequal power relations in society. The basic difference between the 'RSA' and the 'ISA', according to Althusser, is that the former use direct "physical violence" in order to ensure state control in the society whereas the latter does not (75). These apparatuses "lend one another a hand" to guarantee an absolute control of the state over the society (88).

In my analysis, I use Althusser's term 'repressive state apparatuses' to analyse the role of state institutions, especially the police, in relation to the increase of violence in Pakistani society as represented in Hamid's novels. The texts demonstrate how instances of subjective violence challenge state authority and how the repressive apparatuses come

into action to deal with the perpetrators of such violence using even greater force and repression. The use of force on the part of state also invites an analysis of how the state itself strategizes violence to control terrorist threats to stabilize society. It draws focus on the question of justification of the use of violence by the state when faced with existential terrorization by non-state elements from within the society. Although Althusser is a Marxist theorist, I have adapted his ideas about state repression in order to use them for my anarchist analysis of the texts.

In order to explain Bakunin's anarchist theory that I use as my primary theoretical lens, I now want to explain his anarchist ideas scattered across his two aforementioned works. I first explain his anarchist theory explicated in *God and the State*. Then, I move on to his other book, *Statism and Anarchy*, to examine his anarchist ideas.

In *God and the State* Bakunin formulates the criticism of authority in all its forms because he considers it to be contradictory to the very essence of "humanity" (9). He considers 'humanity' to be "the last and supreme development" as well as "the highest manifestation of animality" (9). He is of the opinion that the process of evolution from the lowest living being to the highest one "necessarily implies a negation" (9). Hence, to achieve the next level of animal development, the previous level must be negated. In this way, Bakunin appropriates Hegel's dialectics on the phenomenon of social change while laying stress on the element of negation in the process. He argues that this dialectical change seems to be logical only because it occurs in a natural manner in the following lines:

[H]umanity is at the same time and essentially the deliberate and gradual negation of the animal element in man; and it is precisely this negation, as rational as it is natural, and rational only because natural – at once historical and logical, as inevitable as the development and realization of all the natural laws in the world – that constitutes and creates the ideal, the world of intellectual and moral convictions, ideas. (9)

In his opinion, 'humanity' essentially refers to a gradual and dialectical process that, in order to reach its highest stage, needs to constantly negate its own essential element, its inherent 'animality'. As Paul McLaughlin points out, two central components formulate

the basis of Bakunin's anarchist philosophy: "a negative dialectic or revolutionary logic; and a naturalist ontology, a naturalist account of the structure of being or reality" (2002: 1).

Bakunin, then, bases his critique of the state, which is the highest manifestation of hierarchical social relations, on the naturalist ontology that completely negates authority. Bakunin theorizes that the 'animality' in human beings is of great value as it is the very foundation on which our social progress has been erected. He argues that "our first ancestor" were different and elevated from the rest of life forms because they had been endowed with "two precious faculties" namely; "the power to think and the desire to rebel" (9). He believes that it was due to these faculties, combined with "progressive action," that human beings were able to advance socially as well as intellectually in history (9). He stresses upon the element of rebellion against authority to point out that it was this resistance against the command of God that granted our 'first ancestors' their freedom. Therefore, he believes that rebellion against any form of authority constitutes the key element of social development. In this research, I apply his stance that 'the desire to rebel' creates the necessary conditions for social life to progress to analyze acts of subversion against state authority in the texts (9). While discussing the element of rebellion as an important factor in social progress as per his ideas, I also analyze how it may also prove to be anti-humanist in nature as it targets human life without reservations. Moreover, I investigate how violent uprising against authority may create hurdles for the social progress itself that Bakunin advocates time and again throughout his works.

Bakunin considers state to be the most significant hierarchical structure that imposes control over its subjects with the help of its institutions. He illustrates that state makes "systematic efforts" to keep the masses ignorant in order to ensure its complete control over them (16). Keeping people ignorant solidifies the state's authority over them since it makes them unable to question its illegitimate domination and removes the possibility of rebelling against it (16). In other words, in his opinion, the state proves to be the biggest obstacle in the social development of 'humanity' since it makes continuous efforts to keep people enslaved to its power.

Bakunin primarily criticizes religion because he believes that it also aids the state in maintaining its control over the masses. It also vindicates the right of state over individuals and threatens to condemn those, who dare rebel against its authority, to perpetual damnation. Thus, it helps to inculcate a blind obedience in individuals that results into their unquestioning support for state authority. Hence, among the “tormentors” and “oppressors” of every nature he considers state and church to be the two most pernicious ones (17). He points out that “slaves of God, men must also be slaves of Church and State, *in so far as the State is consecrated by the Church*” (24, emphasis original). In the current study, I intend to keep my focus on all the institutions of state instead of just focussing on the role of religion in people’s subjugation.

Bakunin theorizes that the only authority that may be considered legitimate is that of nature as it does not come in contradiction with the liberty of human beings. All other forms of authority that undermine human dignity and freedom need to be discarded and abolished. The only laws that people should obey are those of nature “which manifest themselves in the necessary concatenation and succession of phenomenon in the physical and social worlds” (28). He believes that these are the only laws against which revolt is “impossible” because “they constitute the basis and fundamental conditions of our existence” (28). Conversely, the laws of nature are different from the illegitimate man-made ones of the state or church because obedience to them does not entail submission to an external authority but only to our own selves. Thus, submission to, and knowledge of, natural laws essentially liberates individuals from the slavery of every other external authority over him.

Bakunin points out that the masses are ignorant of these laws, and are deliberately kept in ignorance, due to the “watchfulness of these tutelary governments” (29). In anarchist theory crystallized by Bakunin, all authority is considered illegitimate unless it originates from nature. The state authority is considered to be the most oppressive in nature as it demands complete subjugation of its subjects. Therefore, Bakunin deems rebellion against this oppressive authority to be necessary in order to actualize human freedom (30).

Bakunin considers it important not to confuse authority of natural laws with that of science. He believes that science has yet been unable to fully grasp the laws of nature that

is why it must not assume absolute authority over individuals. In *God and the State*, he states that when science finally does realize these laws and “then from science, by means of extensive system of popular education and instruction,” they will become known to the masses (29). Once they have been passed into the “consciousness” of all, “the question of liberty will be entirely solved” (29). He believes that this will be a time when “stubborn authorities” will realize that there stands no justification for their existence and, hence, will finally be disintegrated (30). Hence, education may be considered an alternate non-violent solution to end the subjugation of masses. However, state largely controls means of education in society and manages its dissemination among its subjects. In my analysis of the selected texts, I examine how the state exerts influence over the institution of education in Pakistani society and what seem to be the results of this influence. In Bakunin’s opinion, the ultimate abolishment of the hierarchical state structure becomes the only solution in order to ensure public access to scientific education. I use his criticism against authority as my theoretical lens to see how authority, in all its shapes, leads to ignorance and exploitation of the state subjects.

Moreover, Bakunin advocates rebellion to be primarily directed against the state in order for it to be successful. Any other revolution, in his opinion, would fail to effectively reform society as long as the state apparatus remains intact. He considers the French Revolution carried out by the bourgeoisie class of France to be a failure. He is of the opinion that the revolution did not deliver to people what it had promised to because the bourgeoisie did not destroy the state. He believes that after the revolution, the bourgeoisie replaced “the old nobility in the seats of power” and established themselves as the new aristocracy (82). This establishment resulted into the same exploitation of the subjugated majority, but now by the bourgeoisie minority. The very people who called themselves the representative of the cause of liberty became “the defender and preserver of the State” (83). In this manner, the state became “the regular institution of the exclusive power of that class” (83). Therefore, the aim of every rebellion must be the desecration of the state as, according to the anarchists, it is the root of all oppression in society. Keeping this lens in mind, I analyse how the seemingly revolutionary elements in society may turn into oppressive ones after seizing the state apparatus. Hence, on the one hand, “revolutionary” acts of violence and terror, performed by the characters in my selected texts, possibly prove

successful in dismantling state authority. On the other hand, such acts by anti-state elements may only serve to reduce state authority in order to exert their own domination on state subjects.

God and the State is an unfinished manuscript that does not have a proper conclusion to its anti-state argument. Therefore, I have cemented my theoretical framework with the help of Bakunin's other work i.e. *Statism and Anarchy*. This work provides me with the lens to view the violent anti-state actions of Hamid's characters in the context of resistance and subversion to centralized authority. *Statism and Anarchy* has proved to be vital to my theoretical framework as it is in this work that he theorizes the mechanisms of violent revolution required to uproot state authority in a much more elaborate manner. I will now explain his theory of state as propounded in the book.

Bakunin refers to state institutions as "idols" that aid the state in controlling its subjects according to its political agenda (4). These institutions include "God, the Church, the pope, the patriarchal right, and, above all, as its most reliable means of salvation, police protection and military dictatorship" (4). Therefore, in Bakunin's opinion, the most useful means employed by the state are those of repression and violence. In my analysis, I investigate whether the state uses repressive means as a strategy to ensure state domination. In order to investigate these repressive institutions in state domination in detail, I also take aid from Althusser's views about the 'RSA'.

In *SAA*, Bakunin condemns state in all its forms including the "despotic constitutional power" of a democratic state (9). He argues that "as long as [a society] remains a state, regardless of any pseudo-liberal, constitutional, democratic, or even social-democratic forms" (9), it will be an oppressive one based on hierarchical power relations. The presence of state machinery itself entails the subjugation of its subjects. Hence, no revolutionary struggle may be effective in the presence of state and its repressive institutions. An effective reorganization of society may only be brought about if the masses "strive first of all for the complete destruction" of the centralized state structure, since "as long as the principle of the state, in whatever form, hangs over our people, they will be poverty stricken slaves" (10). In my analysis, I discuss how the characters in my primary texts depict state to be the real cause of its subjects' suppression. I also examine how these

characters direct their violence as revolutionary means against state institutions to abolish the state apparatus itself.

Anarchists view state as a self-sustaining structure that regulates the unequal economic relations in society. Hierarchical social relations, in turn, solidify state authority over its subjects. Bakunin theorizes that state serves “to organise the most intensive exploitation of the people’s labour for the benefit of capital concentrated in a very small number of hands” (12). It accomplishes the manipulation of its subjects through democratic government that Bakunin refers to as “the parliamentary game of pseudo-constitutionalism” (12). He points out that the “despotic” nature of a democratic government may be evident by its predominant reliance on the institution of military (12). In his opinion, the military readily employs violence and coercion, legitimized by the state itself, to keep the citizens under its fear and intimidation. Thus, anarchists consider the democratic form of state that supposedly caters to the will and desires of its people to be incompatible with economic and social autonomy of its citizens as well (13). Bakunin repudiates such a government in the following lines:

This latest form of the state . . . combines the two main conditions necessary for their success: state centralization, and the actual subordination of the sovereign people to the intellectual minority that governs them, supposedly representing them but invariably exploiting them. (13)

A democratic government, for this reason, does not stand much different in its role than other more overt forms of authoritarian states such as monarchy.

Bakunin points out the “only one essential difference” between monarchy and democracy is in the ways in which people are exploited. In the former, “the world of officialdom” exploits the resources of people for the benefit of “the privileged and propertied classes” in the name of a single monarch whereas, in the latter, they are exploited “in the name of people’s will” (23). This difference, however, does not make it easier for people to bear to be “beaten” with a “cudgel” if it is called “the people’s cudgel” (23). Therefore, a democratic state, too, goes in complete contradiction with the anarchist principle of bottom-up organization of society. It is, instead, erected on the principle of

centralized governance of society. The stratification of government renders “real” economic autonomy impossible for the people (3).

In this thesis, I investigate the role of repressive state apparatuses in the seemingly democratic forms of Pakistani society in the primary texts. After explaining the exploitative nature of all governments, Bakunin moves towards discussing the possible reactions of state subjects to this exploitation. He points out that state exploitation may not be borne readily by people as they are, in fact, aware of the injustices that are inflicted upon them no matter how “docile” they may appear to be (13). However, the state procures their silence and compliance by subjecting them to “coercion” and “compulsion” achieved by the means of two of its most known weapons: “police surveillance” and “military force” (13). These two institutions, therefore, form the most essential pillars of the state apparatus as they ensure its stability and the perpetuation of its dominance. In the current thesis, I primarily focus on the workings of the police institution in Pakistan as the selected texts feature the police more than the military. I investigate whether or not violence plays a part in establishing and maintaining state authority for this institution in Hamid’s work. I also discuss how it may be viewed as an unavoidable measure taken by state institutions to eradicate anti-state terrorist violence in Pakistani society.

I use Bakunin’s views about modern state as a “military state,” that essentially works as an “aggressive” apparatus, in order to analyse the nature of Pakistani government in the selected texts (13). Bakunin points out that a ‘military state’ constantly exhibits an attitude of conquest towards other less powerful states as it exists under the threat of being conquered and perished at their hands. In the selected primary texts, the USA may be viewed as a military state that employs violence to maintain hegemonic control over weaker states such as Pakistan and Afghanistan. The weaker state, in turn, is forced to exhibit the similar combative characteristics of a military state as an “indispensable condition for its preservation” (3). Hence this cycle of violence and coercion continues and marginalized elements in society get further subjugated at the hands of centralized powers. In my analysis, I discuss how Pakistan seems to mirror the characteristics of the USA’s military statism in order to overcome the existential threats posed to it by the terrorist entities on its soil.

Bakunin notes similarities between the aggressive centralized state structures and ruthless capitalist production. He argues that the modern states work aggressively in a militaristic fashion in order to gain as much power as they can over other states just like a capitalist regime strives to accumulate as much capital as possible to enjoy economic domination over others. He elaborates on this point in the following lines:

The modern state is analogous to capitalist production and bank speculation (which ultimately swallows up even capitalist production). For fear of bankruptcy, the latter must constantly broaden their scope at the expense of the small-scale production and speculation which they swallow up; they must strive to become unique, universal, world-wide. In just the same way the modern state, of necessity a military state, bears within itself the inevitable ambition to become a world-wide state. (13-4)

Therefore, militarism becomes a significant feature of modern states in order for them to ensure unchallenged domination over possible dissenting elements in society. In my analysis chapters, I explore how state repression may be directly linked to the economic domination of state subjects.

Bakunin sheds light on the different attitudes of the bourgeois and proletariat classes regarding patriotism and nationalist sentiments. He believes that the two classes have very different ideals and occupy different realities and therefore can never reconcile their interests with each other. He sheds light on the impossibility of “reconciliation” between the two classes in the following lines:

There can be no reconciliation between the wild, hungry proletariat, gripped by social-revolutionary passions and striving persistently for the creation of another world . . . and the well-fed, educated world of the privileged classes, defending with desperate energy the state, legal, metaphysical, theological, and military and police order as the last stronghold now safeguarding their precious privilege of economic exploitation. (20)

The state apparatus functions to ensure the constant exploitation of the working classes for the benefit of the privileged elite. Therefore, the bourgeois elite strive to preserve the state machinery and, more importantly, its capitalist structures for their own

sake whereas the proletariat struggles to tear it down (14). The difference in their objectives renders unity between these classes impossible. The impossibility of compromise between the government and the governed creates the circumstances essential for revolution on the part of the marginalized majority. In my analysis, using textual evidence from the primary works, I demonstrate how Hamid portrays the political and economic divide between the two economic classes. I also discuss how this unbridgeable gap between the upper and lower classes in Pakistani society, as portrayed in the novels, promotes sentiments of violence in the oppressed classes against the ruling elite.

Bakunin prescribes the violent strife of the oppressed, which results due to the economic and social exploitation of the class, to end the despotic rule of the state to be a “war to the death” (15). He points out that the state takes extreme violent measures in order to silence, “subdue and enslave the elemental force of the rebellious people” (20). The military and the police institutions represent the “force of bayonet, knout, or rod” which the state employs to control the rebellious nature of its subjects (20). Therefore, according to Bakunin, suppression of the people leads “directly to the full restoration of the state” (20). In Bakunin’s view, therefore, the anarchist solution to the oppressive state domination can only be “the triumph of the social revolution, the obliteration of everything that bears the name of the state” (20). Thus, according to his ideals, revolution is successful only when it results in the abolition of state (20). In the analysis chapters, I examine how non-state elements in society strategize violence to obliterate the state. I also discuss the problematic nature of these violent activities as they put the sanctity of human life in danger by targeting ordinary state subjects. Additionally, obliteration of the state through violent means also inevitably involves the destruction of infrastructure of the country. Such destruction, then, may prove hazardous for the development and progression of the society. Therefore, I challenge the usefulness of the destructive means for revolutionary purposes with special reference to Pakistani society as illustrated in the texts.

In my thesis, I particularly focus on the role of the proletariat in carrying out revolt against the state. As Bakunin points out that “a popular uprising,” against the state, would always be “elemental, chaotic, and merciless in nature” (28). In other words, violence exercised by the state must be met with violence at the hands of its subjects to end this illegitimate domination. Bakunin sees the proletariat to be the most potential agents of

violent revolutionary action. This is because “they have very little property or none at all and are therefore not corrupted by it” (28). Therefore, when the proletariat realize that property comes in the way of their freedom, “they frequently evince a real passion for destruction” towards it (28). Using Bakunin’s anarchist theory as my lens, I view the violence performed by marginalized proletariat as acts of subversion instead of those of random violence to create chaos in society.

While discussing the methods to attain the reorganization of society along a non-hierarchical structure, Bakunin admits that it does not rely solely on the destructive passion exhibited by the oppressed state subjects. He points out, “this negative passion is far from sufficient for achieving the ultimate aims of the revolutionary cause,” nor may it be considered entirely beneficial for society as it damages everything around it (28). Yet, he considers violence to be of paramount importance in bringing about a revolution because without it, revolution would be “inconceivable” (28). He argues that “there can be no revolution without widespread and passionate destruction, a destruction salutary and fruitful precisely because out of it, and by means of it alone, new worlds are born and arise (28). Thus, in Bakunin’s view, for the creation of a new world to become a reality, old hierarchical social structures must be razed to the ground through a “fierce and bloody struggle” (49). This sanguinary struggle may lead to the anarchist ideal society that is free of unequal and oppressive power relations.

Bakunin believes that state and its institutions, especially the forces of police and military, prove to be the greatest hurdles in the realization of the ideal anarchist society. Revolt against the state machinery may not be an easy task as it is capable of exercising violence on a large scale. Therefore, in order to confront such a power, the revolt must also be of an equal magnitude. Bakunin prescribes the magnitude of violence necessary for such a revolution in the following words:

To contend successfully with a military force which now respects nothing, is armed with the most terrible weapons of destruction, and is always ready to use them to wipe out not just houses and streets but entire cities with all their inhabitants — to contend with such a wild beast one needs another wild beast, no less wild but more just: an organized uprising of all the people, a social revolution which, like military reaction, spares nothing and stops at nothing. (159)

The above-mentioned lines hold great significance to my thesis as I use the criterion described in them for a successful revolution in order to analyse the acts of violence performed by Hamid's characters to confront state authority in the texts. While clarifying the nature of the supposedly revolutionary acts of violence as prescribed by Bakunin, Paul McLaughlin points out that the destructive action needed to be taken in the revolutionary process "is expressed in the so often woefully misunderstood final line of *The Reaction*: "The passion for destruction [the revolutionary passion, the negative side of democracy, the politics of revolution] is a creative passion [an affirmative passion for democratic order], too" (2002: 30). I use Bakunin's anarchist theory as my theoretical framework in order to view the acts of violence and terror in the context of subversion to state authority. While viewing the anti-state violence in the framework of resistance, I also point out to the unavoidable destructive effects of it as well. I use Bakunin's anarchist views in this research as I find them to be the most suitable one to interpret the selected texts. An anarchist reading of the texts allows us to analyse the dynamics of violence, portrayed by the writer, in Pakistani society.

3.3 Research Methodology

Elizabeth Jackson defines research methodology as "the approach taken to the research design as a whole in relation to reaching answers to the research question(s)" (55). Research methodology, then, is an over-arching design which the researcher follows throughout his/her project in order to carry out the analysis of the selected works. It basically defines the itinerary taken by the researcher for the purpose of collecting answers to the research questions posed in the beginning of research. Due to the interpretive-investigative nature of the current study, it follows the qualitative research methodology. Sibghatullah Khan, in his doctoral thesis titled "Between Homes and Hosts: Life Narratives

of South and Southeast Asian Diasporic Academic Women in America,” points out that the qualitative research methodology allows an understanding of the human nature to be reached “from the researcher’s point of view or that of the researched” (181). In other words, it gives the researcher liberty to work out the meanings of the text according to his/her subjective interpretation of it while making use of the selected theoretical framework. As I have chosen the anarchist perspective as my theoretical lens in this study, it facilitates me as I attempt to construct the meaning of Hamid’s texts according to my understanding of it. Using qualitative research methodology, I have tried to search for answers to my research questions by examining anarchist themes and strains in the selected author’s works.

Relying on the subjective understanding of a text, however, is problematic since human ‘subjectivity’ itself may not be considered a definite phenomenon and is something continuously influenced by the historical context of individual existence. In his work, *Being and Time*, Heidegger discusses the lack of fixity of human existence and how time forms an inseparable part of its being. Terry Eagleton explains Heidegger’s concept of subjectivity in the following lines:

[Human] existence, Heidegger argues, is in the first place always being-in-the-world: we are human subjects only because we are practically bound up with others and the material world, and these relations are constitutive of our life rather than accidental to it. The world is not an object ‘out there’ to be rationally analyzed, set over against a contemplative subject: it is never something we can get outside of and stand over against. We emerge as subjects from the inside reality which we can never fully objectify, which encompasses both ‘subject’ and ‘object’, which is inexhaustible in its meaning and which constitutes us quite as much as we constitute it. (5)

To reach a subjective understanding of the primary texts, therefore, means to simultaneously take into consideration various influences that are likely to affect my interpretation. The subjective analysis of the selected works does not suggest their rigid and biased interpretation by the researcher but instead involves an active inquiry into the meaning of the texts while treating them ‘phenomenon’. As Eagleton points out that

“human existence is a dialogue with the world, and the more reverent activity is to listen rather than to speak” (54). Thus keeping the phenomenological nature of the current study in mind, I do not try to impose my isolated worldview upon the meaning of the works; I, instead, attempt to look at the works from an anarchist perspective while investigating the meaning Omar Shahid Hamid has presented in his novels regarding the use of violence as tool of resistance against the state authority.

3.4 Research Method

Gabriele Griffin, in her book *Research Methods for English Studies*, points out that “research methods are concerned with how you carry out your research” and that choosing a particular method “will depend on the kind of research one wants to conduct” (3). In other words, research methods provide us with the exact tools to conduct our research in light of the over-arching research methodology of choice. Since I aim to investigate Omar Shahid Hamid’s two works in order to look at the use of terrorist violence as a means to challenge authoritative structure in Pakistani society, I have chosen textual analysis as my research method.

The reason for selecting textual method for reading Hamid’s texts is that, as Mckee points out, “the word ‘text’ has post-structural implications for thinking about the production of meaning” (4). In post-structuralism, meaning is defined as an unfixed entity, something that is in a constant flux. It also implies a multiplicity of meaning as far as a work is concerned. Terry Eagleton describes the post-structural multiplicity of meaning of a text in the following lines:

Meaning ... is scattered or dispersed along the whole chain of signifiers: it cannot be easily nailed down, it is never fully present in any one sign alone, but is rather a kind of constant flickering of presence and absence together. Reading a text is more like tracing this process of constant flickering than it is like counting the beads of a necklace. (111)

In the current study, I try to make sense of Hamid’s text while keeping in mind the transient nature of meaning itself. This also suites the qualitative nature of the study as its results cannot be generalized to other researches. Hence, I treat my selected works as ‘texts’ that are inlaid with meaning and aspire to draw an objective interpretation of them which

leads me to a better understanding of the dynamics of violence portrayed in the writer's works. By an objective interpretation, I mean simply to reach an understanding not overly influenced by affected fallacy since the researcher's subjective position in the society is bound to affect the analysis of the works in one way or another.

Catherine Belsey, in her essay "Textual Analysis as a Research Method" in Griffin's above-mentioned book, points out that textual analysis is "indispensable" for English studies since "it focuses on texts, or seeks to understand the inscription of culture in its artefacts" (157). This means that by using textual analysis, I take the author's novels to be cultural 'artefacts' inscribed with meaning which needs to be explored to understand the culture in question. Therefore, I take these texts as windows to the culture of anti-state violence in Pakistan as depicted in the selected works. I have chosen textual analysis as a research method as it favours the individual reader's interpretation of the text by validating their point of view. In her afore-mentioned essay, Belsey elucidates Roland Barthes' idea of the reader as "the 'destination' of the text" (161) in his famous essay "The Death of the Author." This basically implies that Barthes allocates the reader a superior position when it comes to deriving the interpretation of the text. She explains that Barthes, in his essay, suggests that the reader may ignore the author's biography and his possible intended meaning for the text and focus on the text as an autonomous entity and his own subjective understanding of it. While analyzing the texts, I have tried to ignore the writer's position a state representative and investigate the workings of the state institutions as depicted in his work.

Belsey, however, points out that Barthes' essay does not suggest complete liberty of the reader over the text under study. It rather warns against the idea of reducing a text to "vague subjectivism" of the reader "in which the text means whatever it means to *me*, and there is nothing to discuss. On the contrary: 'to read' is a transitive verb. We read *something*, and that *something* exists in its difference" (163, emphasizes original). She further points out that "Barthes urges us to be more rigorous, not less" (163). An interpretation of the texts, therefore, cannot be reached unless other sources aid in the process of this analysis. Belsey refers to these sources as "extra-textual knowledge" (160). The sources enable the researcher to widen his/her perspective regarding the problem under analysis. For this purpose, I have utilized the theoretical perspectives of various other

anarchist theorists and critics to strengthen my interpretation of the texts and also to render it more objective in nature.

In a nutshell, the texts under discussion in the study do not dictate how they are to be interpreted by the researcher; I am rigorously involved in the meaning making process of the texts. However, the texts do play a great role in this interpretation as they participate “in the process of signification” of meaning (Belsey in Griffin 164). That is to say that the research carried out in this project is not solely based on the subjective interpretation of the primary texts but is informed by the outside sources of critical knowledge as well. The texts have definitely helped in specifying the space for the signification of meaning and in that space, I have chosen the anarchist perspective to aid my analysis. Like Eagleton, Belsey also locates textual analysis in a close relation with the post-structuralist interpretive paradigm and considers the text to be a locus of multiple meanings; the text may never signify a stable meaning. So, as mentioned previously, the interpretation drawn by my reading of the texts may not be applicable/generalizable to other studies.

3.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have discussed the theoretical framework that I employ in the upcoming analysis chapters of this study. The theoretical framework comprises Mikhail Bakunin’s anarchist theory as laid out by him in his seminal works *God and the State* and *Statism and Anarchy*. Due to interpretive nature of research, the research methodology followed in this thesis is qualitative in nature. The research method that I have selected to analyse the primary texts is textual analysis. The discussion on theoretical framework and research methodology in this chapter has enabled me to use them in the analysis of my primary texts. I have carried out an anarchist study of the selected texts in the forthcoming chapters.

CHAPTER 4

“A CREATURE OF INSTINCT”: REBELLION AGAINST THE STATE AUTHORITY IN THE PRISONER

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, using Bakunin’s anarchist perspective as my theoretical lens, I analyse Omar Shahid Hamid’s *The Prisoner* in order to explore how and to what extent his work depicts the Pakistani state as an apparatus that maintains its domination over its subjects through strategies of control. In his work *Statism and Anarchy*, Bakunin refers to the state apparatus as ‘a wild beast’ that is equipped with “the most terrible weapons of destruction . . . to wipe out not just houses and streets but entire cities with all their inhabitants” (159). Hamid’s *The Prisoner* seems to valorise Bakunin’s view. Therefore, in the ongoing chapter, I am concerned to investigate the role of state institutions with respect to rise of terror and violence in Pakistani society as portrayed in Hamid’s text.

Omar Shahid Hamid published his first work, *The Prisoner*, in 2013 while on sabbatical from his career as a police officer in Karachi. This crime thriller was well-received by the audience both in Pakistan as well as abroad as it lets the readers in on the complexities of relationship between police institution of Pakistan and the non-state actors that seem to pose a threat to state stability. After the publication of this novel, Hamid resumed his position as senior superintendent of police (SSP) in Karachi. Moreover, Hamid also published two more novels, *The Spinner’s Tale* and *The Party Worker*, that also seem to portray scenes of crime and violence in Karachi in particular, and in Pakistani society in general. The author’s position in the state machinery makes him privy to the inner workings of the police and other state institutions. Therefore, his novel, that largely deals with the conflict between the hands of state repression and those elements that directly challenge it, lends itself to an anarchist interpretation.

The Prisoner seems to highlight how the state apparatus assumes the role of Bakunin's "wild beast" in order to carry out acts of authoritarianism to maintain its authority in society. Bakunin points out that "one needs another wild beast, no less wild but more just" (2005: 159) in order to defy this oppressive state authority. In other words, to challenge uniform state domination, individuals need to use violent tactics of similar nature to subvert its authority. In this chapter, I investigate how the characters in the text stage their protest against the authority of state and its institutions using organized violence. Furthermore, the use of violence to obliterate hierarchical power relations that manifest themselves as the state apparatus demands critical evaluation. That is because such violent acts bear serious repercussions for the well-being of a country and its citizens. Bakunin, on the one hand, considers the spread of knowledge and scientific development to be the most authentic solution to the "question of liberty" (1970: 29). On the other hand, his notion of violence and terrorism as useful means of reorganization of society fails to take into account their obstructive effects on social, political and scientific progression of the state subjects. Therefore, this chapter examines how instances of violence intended to threaten state domination may also prove counter-productive for the 'liberty' of the state citizens in general. In line with my intension stated here, I want to discuss *The Prisoner* under the following headings:

- State as a Machinery of Violence
- Akbar, the Violent Gendarme
- "The Strangest Bedfellows": An Abrupt Change in State Alliances
- State vs. the 'Unbridled' Rebel

4.2 State as a Machinery of Violence

The Prisoner portrays Pakistani society as one that is festered with the incidents of terror and violence. It particularly focuses on the exchange of violence between non-state agents of chaos (terrorism) and the state institutions. This portrayal highlights the use of violent strategies by the state in order to curb violent political threats in society. Ramzan Aras points out that the state, as a "hegemonic apparatus," exercises violence through its subordinate apparatuses "in order to govern its citizens and to control subordinated oppositional ethnic, religious and ideological groups" (Aras 19). *The Prisoner* depicts the

Pakistani state as a machinery that systematically uses force through a set of institutions to eradicate social and political disagreement in society. The state employs its citizens in these institutions to carry out its repressive operations against dissenting bodies. Paul McLaughlin, in his book *Anarchism and Authority*, points out that the state enjoys complete authority to exercise violence in the following lines:

[The state] command[s] its subjects to perform ‘legitimate’ acts of violence in its name; these subjects are, in principle, duty bound to obey such a command. Thus, the citizenry is often compelled to kill in . . . the interests of an elite ‘political class’.
(76)

In this way, it reduces its citizens, including common people or civilians as well as individuals in service to the state institutions, to the roles of pawns to carry out the political agenda at its behest. McLaughlin’s statement particularly draws attention to the individuals who work as state’s agents of repression and how they are forced to use violence on other state subjects.

Anarchism challenges the right of state to command such authority over its subjects as Mikhail Bakunin declares its authority to be “false, arbitrary and fatal” (1970: 34). Thus from the anarchist viewpoint, the legitimacy of the state to reduce the status of its citizens into its agents is considered to be entirely dismissible. In the selected text, Hamid illustrates how the Pakistani state employs its citizens to use violence against fellow citizens to perpetuate its political interests. On the other hand, the text also highlights the situation of terrorism and chaos created by non-state actors that incites this punitive state violence. In this way, the text lets us examine the need for employing violence on the part of government to maintain concord in Pakistani society as well as the repercussions that it entails.

The narrative of the text brings to light the complex workings of state apparatus from the perspective of a police officer, Constantine. The point of view of this character is significant as it provides us with the state’s perspective on the use of violence against political dissent. It also lets us examine the significance of violence as a strategy, on the part of state, to check situations of chaos and lawlessness in society. The case that binds the whole narrative together happens to be the kidnapping of an American journalist, Jon

Friedland, by some extremist religious groups. The text highlights, what may be defined as, an act of subjective violence against the government authority from the very start of the text: The terrorist groups in question make no demands from the government; they only threaten the government by declaring intentions of making “a horrible example of him” (*TP* 13). They claim the abduction to be an act of “retribution for the government operation in the tribal areas” (13). The word ‘retribution’ is important here since it indicates the presence of systemic violence administered by the state in the tribal areas of Pakistan during the ‘war on terror’. Hence, an act of subjective violence seems to stem out as a reaction to these operations. From an anarchist point of view, it is state repression, in this instance, that becomes the source of instigation of violence from its subjects. The instance of abduction, then, becomes the tribal subjects’ way to challenge the repressive state apparatus. It is also important to note that this abduction takes place in Karachi which shows how the results of state operations in the peripheral areas of the country seem to spill into its urban life and inevitably disrupt it.

The act of American’s abduction by the tribal people is not only anarchist in nature in that it challenges the state authority, but also in a way that it prompts an inversion of established hierarchy¹ within its subordinate institutions too. Hamid depicts the hierarchical positioning of the military and the police by the way the military officer, Major Rommel, behaves with Constantine. Colonel Tarkeen, the head of a military intelligence agency, sends Rommel to the prison to seek assistance in the case as a representative of military authority in the country. The Major presumes himself to be the “ultimate authority” in the matter and commands Constantine to fully cooperate with the military intelligence (*TP* 10). He orders Constantine to “hand over” the prisoner, Akbar Khan, to him for interrogation “on the matter of utmost national urgency” (*TP* 10). The military-man’s overbearing behaviour towards the police officer indicates his superior position in the machinery of state. In this research, however, I am concerned with the ways Hamid’s novel shows resistance to authority in both blatant as well as subtle forms. For example, Constantine refuses to assist Rommel in the matter by telling him that the prisoner they are after serves as a police officer currently and therefore cannot be taken into the military custody. The unwillingness to obey military authority registers Constantine’s defiance to accept its superiority over other state institutions. However, the refusal prompts Rommel

to declare his institution's superior status by saying that he is "from the agencies" and can "interrogate whomever [he] like[s]" (TP 10). The attitude of the officer illustrates the extent of military control over other institutions.

Constantine's rejection to obey the command is anarchist in nature as it indicates subversion of the institutional authority. His defiance prompts further outbursts from the Major who expresses his disdain for the non-military state officers by calling him a "bloody civilian" (TP 11). The use of the term 'civilian' as a derogatory one for the non-military state subjects indicates the hierarchical standing of the army in Pakistani society. However, the fact that Akbar might prove helpful to solve the case tips the balance toward the police's favour. Constantine's refusal to grant access to Akbar challenges authority and forces Rommel to shed his airs of superiority. Thus, the single act of subjective violence, the abduction, seemingly becomes a source of instigating anarchy within the state machinery. Moreover, the abduction sets a series of acts of subversion in motion against the established institutional hierarchy.

Akbar khan, the protagonist of the novel, is an A-class prisoner at the prison with "unrivalled" information sources in the city (TP 14). The novel focuses on Akbar's journey from being the most valuable asset to the police in maintaining state hegemony to being a useless, abandoned individual incarcerated in the prison by the same forces. However, Akbar's abandonment by the state also indicates his freedom from the state apparatus as he makes the choice of refusing to comply with the demands of the agents of state upon being asked to aid in the case by the Major. It signifies his position as an outsider to the state apparatus that, consequently, implies that he is not obligated to obey its order. It also shows that exclusion from the state acts as a crucial factor in realizing his agency as a free individual. Therefore, inclusion in the state apparatus entails his status as its puppet, whereas exclusion from it means his freedom as an individual.

Akbar asserts his individual agency by refusing to assist the military in the abduction case. Rommel attempts to deny him the right to "withhold" information as "*the nation's honour is at stake*" (TP 20, emphasis original). Rommel's "indignation" at Akbar's assertion of agency indicates his inability to imagine resistance against the ideological state agenda. On the other hand, Akbar's refusal to comply with his demands

indicates his disillusionment with it. Debra Thompson points out that the state “is a conceptual abstraction that dominates while simultaneously conjuring ideas of loyalty in its organic connection to and representation of the people and the nation as the whole” (11). Akbar’s refusal to believe in the notion of nation’s honour suggests his rebellion against the state power to inculcate loyalty in its subjects.

Akbar rejects of the abstraction of “nation’s honour” by pointing out that the state uses “words” like ‘honour’ and ‘country’ to force its subjects to carry out its agenda (TP 21). However, after the completion of its agenda, it discards them “like a used condom” (21). The use of ‘words’ to make people fulfil its political agenda indicates the “anchoring” of “ideology” by the ‘ISA’ that “ensures its systematic unity” (Althusser 77). Akbar’s incarceration indicates the physical violence exercised by the ‘RSA’ to confine his individuality, whereas the use of words to make state subjects comply with its demands indicates the role of symbolic violence, ‘ISA’, in the smooth functioning of state apparatus. It also affirms how both ‘RSA’ and ‘ISA’ “lend one another a hand” to ensure state domination (Althusser 88). His refusal to be influenced by the words of state representatives shows his rejection of the ideological state apparatus as well. Akbar expresses his willingness to aid the state only on the condition of guarantee of freedom in return of his services. Akbar’s ability to barter his freedom with the state indicates that he occupies his own place of power outside the state. However, from an anarchist viewpoint, the fact that he still needs the state to grant him his freedom reveals the all-encompassing nature of the hegemonic state apparatus.

The plot of the novel partly concerns itself with the reasons behind Akbar’s imprisonment which seems to result due to the state persecution of a powerful political party, United Front, in the year 1996. The reader gets to know the back story as Constantine reminisces about Akbar’s past which led him to his present fate. He recalls the year in which violence in society rapidly increased with the increase in the UF’s power. The rise in a political party’s power implies the increase in its claim to authority in the state apparatus. It, subsequently, points out a challenge to the uniform state domination over its subjects. Constantine describes the time prior to the UF’s rise to power as “simple” (TP 23). He explains to Major Rommel that in those times “policing was very simple” (23). Simple policing in fact points towards the prevalence of unchallenged politico-legal order

in the city. Constantine describes the nature of crimes taking place in the society as fairly diminutive and easily dismissible. He points out that “no one challenged the authority of the police” (23). The society that he describes appears to be a utopian one where minimal criminal activities take place. However, one needs to keep in mind that the narrator here is a state representative and from the point of view, this state of affairs may seem to be ideal. From the anarchist point of view, however, his description indicates the complete domination of repressive state apparatus that no one dares to question.

Constantine recalls the time when the state seemed able to exercise complete control over society with only occasional disruptions in its domination. These challenges, too, were corrected with minimal physical intervention on the part of police (*TP* 23). This seemingly uniform society, however, hints at the presence of all-encompassing systemic force that keeps everything under control with the help of both ideology and repression. Slavoj Žižek points out that the apparently ordinary state of society is itself a form of violence in the following lines:

[W]hen we perceive something as an act of violence, we measure it by a presupposed standard of what the “normal” non-violent situation is – and the highest form of violence is the imposition of this standard with reference to which some events appear as “violent.” (64)

Thus, the orderly society that Constantine describes may not be taken as an entirely peaceful one since it may hint at the presence of more subtle forms of violence present in it. However, as the text clearly demonstrates, state rule seldom enjoys uniformity since it often has to deal with political disruptions ever present in society. These disruptions are considered to be violations of law imposed by the state and are, therefore, termed as violent and abnormal. Despite operating a powerful apparatus, complete with its formidable repressive institutions, the state still has to face the oppositions posed to its domination by radical political groups. Debra Thompson points out the presence of competition between different loci of power in state apparatus in the following lines:

The state monopolizes the legitimate use of violence through institutions such as the police and military, but the cartel is never fully without competition from multiple forms and loci of authority, themselves often fragmented and contested by internal and external forces. (11-12).

As far the text is concerned, the UF's rise to power symbolizes steady disruptions in the systemic order imposed by the state on society.

Hamid illustrates that the purpose of the UF's violent contest for political power is to seize the state apparatus and, by doing that, consolidate its own rule over the citizens of Karachi. It brings "a new brand of goonda [thug] politics" that causes a spread of violence and vandalism throughout Karachi's society (23). Constantine tells Rommel that the leader of the party, the Don, "created the system of the UF's ward and ward bosses" (23). These wards and the ward bosses act as party representatives and their job is to keep everything under control in their allotted areas. Constantine points out that "they created a parallel government" in the city that enjoyed complete authority over its citizens with the use of force (23). As far as the use of repression is concerned, the UF seems to mimic the structural hierarchy of state apparatus in order to contend for its control. In this way, the violent threat that the UF poses to the government seems to be detrimental for the well-being of society since it mainly targets ordinary citizens to show its muscles in front of the state authority. In a way, it chooses to make hostages of the dwellers of Karachi in order to strengthen the UF's control over the city. From an anarchist viewpoint, the UF may be referred to as the bourgeoisie elite that only challenges state power in order to exploit it for its own agenda (Bakunin 2005: 24). Hence, the use of violence to oppose state authority may not always prove useful for society as it may serve as an instrument of coercion and terror for the political contenders of state apparatus against its subjects.

The central issue to note here is how aptly Hamid's novel reveals the nature of the statist structure of society by drawing attention to the similarities shared by the state and the said oppositional group. The UF not only mimics the structural organization of state apparatus, but also adopts its techniques of repression as a potent tool to establish control over the people. Constantine recalls the "terror" that the UF unleashes on citizens of the city in the following lines:

That's when the terror began. Kalashnikovs started coming into the city from Afghanistan, brought by Pathan truck drivers . . . Then the campus violence began between the UF boys and everyone else. We didn't know how to confront these new criminals. (*TP* 23-4)

The text shows how the UF wreaks havoc in the city by disrupting the previously established social order. The police institution remains powerless in the face of rising chaos, and instead becomes a facilitator for the perpetuation of the violent party's domination in Karachi. The impotency of state to exert authority over the UF reveals the weakness present in its apparatus. *TP* illustrates how the debilitation of the state control gives rise to "a wave of violence" (24) in Karachi. Constantine describes "the rule" of the UF as follows:

When the UF came to power, it was as if a mafia had taken over the city. Their rule was absolute . They made fake cases against their opponents and had them locked up. But all politicians do that . . . They had hit squads to bump off their rivals. No case could be registered against their workers in any police station .The ward bosses extorted money, ran gambling dens, carried weapons openly, kidnapped people's daughters. (24)

The UF employs violence to expand its control over the citizen. It exhibits the characteristics of Bakunin's 'wild beast' necessary to destabilize state authority. However, destabilization of state through violent means also proves to be catastrophic in nature for the state as well as the inhabitants of the city alike as ordinary people become the main target of said violence. Moreover, the narrative depicts how the weakening of state control over the city leads to the deterioration of the urban life in general as violent elements ultimately replace it with their own rule. Therefore, after successfully obliterating the existing rule, the UF attempts to make the previous state apparatus an organ of perpetuation of its own political interests. The Marxist claim made by Engels that the after revolution, the state does not need to be "abolished'. It withers away" proves to be false here as the state perennially seems to serve as the organ of the next political elite's interests (qtd. in Lenin, Chretien 12). In fact, the state institutions function as the most useful means to establish domination over the newly acquired territory.

Under the UF's rule, the police stations become effective loci for people's political and economic exploitation. The police institution as whole facilitates the UF in multiple fashions. For example, police stations economically aid the domination of the provide the UF with a share of money extorted from people by the use of coercion. The police officers, who readily become the organs of the powerful elite, get posted at the desired stations and carry out profitable "business deals" (27). Constantine has "pathetic career prospects" (28) because he has "no influential political connections" and therefore, does not hold the office of a Station In-charge at the station (*TP* 27). Thus, police stations serve two-fold purposes for the ruling elite: acting as tools for securing capitalist interests by economically exploiting citizens of state as well as repressing those who resist the exploitation. One such example of extortion is the fixed amount of money received every month from a famous brothel in the locality. Ali Hassan, Constantine's fellow police officer, refers to the head of the local brothel as the "guarantor" of "economic prosperity" of the police station (*TP* 28). The police station also plays an active role in deciding the "monthly rates" at the brothel (28). The police officers stay compliant to the "UF ministers" and regularly pay their "respects" at the "ward office" in order to ensure political as well as economic benefits (29). Hence, the UF uses already existing coercive state apparatus to effectively achieve its purpose i.e. accumulation of capital with the use of force. The text shows that both the political elite and the state institutions mutually aid each other in this exploitation.

Besides looting the oppressed citizen, the police also actively serve as a tool of silencing resistance against the UF. Hassan tells Constantine that the UF is not "happy" with the Station In-charge because of the way he "handled" the case of a girl who committed suicide because she was raped by the UF party workers (29). The party workers "confiscate all the copies of the paper" that publishes the girl's story (29). This indicates the level of coercion exercised on the citizens to ensure silence. The dominating political party does not even allow the oppressed citizens to protest against the violence inflicted upon them. Confiscation of the newspaper mimics another of the state techniques to ensure control over the governed. Crispin Sartwell points out that "government could replace deadly force with other techniques" (26) to maintain hegemony over its territory. These techniques include "universal surveillance, control of media, and control of educational and medical systems" (26-7). As the UF forms a temporary government over the territory,

it employs all the techniques of repression generally used by centralized states to ensure unchallenged domination.

The repressive state institutions in this case become the organs of criminality and violence against the civilian subjects. Constantine refers to the policemen as “a bunch of cockles hijras [eunuchs]” for their inability to intervene in the actions of the party (29). The use of term “hijras” (29) indicates the impotence of the state machinery to function properly in society in the presence of a violent political threat at domestic level. Hassan responds to this by telling him that the In-charge Sahib had been posted there solely “to handle situations like these” (30). Thus, the violent party ensures officers positions of power in the police institution to make sure that its political goals are achieved without trouble.

The party also uses coercion against the serving policemen themselves to make their compliance a continued possibility. Hassan tells Constantine that he obeys the UF because he does not want the party workers to rape his own daughter as they raped the old man’s (30). *TP* demonstrates how, in the absence of state control, the violent anti-state elements force the minor police officers to obey their authority. Hassan emphasizes that their “duty is to obey the ruling party, not the law” (30). It indicates complete surrender at the part of state officers to the locus of violent authority. It, therefore, signifies the momentary superiority of the UF as a locus of power as compared to the state authority. One example of a state facilitator to the ruling elite’s program of capitalist exploitation is the character of Maqsood Mahr, the Deputy Inspector General of the Karachi Police. He serves as the chief enabler of economic exploitation for the ruling party by turning “extortion into an art” (50). Jeff Ferral points out “the state operates as a vast revenue machine, an elaborate extortion device serving itself and those who operate it” (6). The novel portrays how Maqsood Mahr reaches his “present exalted position from the lowliest of ranks” by serving the capitalist goals of the ruling elite and how his success seems to be “meteoric” in nature (*TP* 50). Thus Hamid highlights how a state officer proves to be an agent of extortion for those in power is explained in the following lines:

Along every step of the way, he filled the pockets of his superiors and never said no to any order, legal or illegal . . . He delivered the results that the people in power wanted. When those people wanted to punish their political opponents, Maqsood would forge false cases against them. And when the same victimized opponents came to power, he would provide the same services for them. (*TP 51*)

The text illustrates how ‘RSA’ becomes “capable of subjecting millions” to “economic exploitation” with the use of coercion (Bakunin 2005: 13). Maqsood Mahr represents the independent cog of state machinery that is not dictated by any singular locus of authority, but rather facilitates hierarchical relations in general in the society. His loyalties do not lie with one particular economic class in society but with every ruling party that guarantees his personal economic stability. Thus, the anarchist idea that power relations do not necessarily translate into economic relations in the society holds true in this case. Maqsood Mahr reflects on the “nature of power” in the following lines:

The nature of power, and of those who wielded it, did not change, whether it was a village or a cosmopolitan city like Karachi . It didn’t matter if it was an illiterate feudal wadero or a highly educated, seemingly sophisticated army general. (*TP 52*)

Mahr’s critique of power may also serve as a critique of the state itself. Bakunin points out that it does not matter whether the government is dictatorship or is “based on the pseudo-sovereignty of sham popular will” (2005: 13). Hamid’s novel also depicts that the state, in all its forms, would always be inevitably synonymous to “coercion” (*TP 24*). Mahr knows that everyone makes sure to pay “lip service” to concepts such as “rule of law, human rights and public duty” but nobody really worked for the establishment of these things because “no one really gave a shit about what the people wanted” (52). Thus, from an anarchist perspective, all the concepts of human liberty become mere illusions in the presence of hierarchical power relations that the state endorses. Maqsood Mahr’s character represents the agents of repression that are “indispensable to those in power” (*TP 52*) to carry out their agenda of domination.

The Prisoner illustrates how the UF also employs surveillance as an important tool to exercise authority over the police officers. The Central Prison of Karachi is a place “crawling with informers and turncoats” (4). It also aids the party to root out criticism

directed at it from within the institution. Constantine fears that his criticism of the “great Don” would be reported to the ward office by his own colleague (*TP* 30-1). Hence, an air of mistrust and betrayal is purposely propagated within the institutions to consolidate the dominance of the political elite. However, the UF’s tactic of surveillance depicts only a weak imitation of the larger surveillance machinery of the state itself. State’s operation of surveillance works at various levels within its apparatus. The said “informers” (4) in the police stations work for multiple loci of authority such as the intelligence agencies and other contesting political entities. Ernesto Laclau points out that the state apparatus is constituted of a “complex fabric of relations of domination” that indicates “the plurality of networks” “through which power is constituted” (Laclau vii). Constant surveillance functions as an efficient tool to keep other contesting political powers in check. The major surveillance body depicted in the text is that of the military intelligence in the country. However, the intelligence force is not constituted by a unified body but consists of different agencies working under it, “the Kaaley Gate wallahs and the Bleak House wallahs” (*TP* 36). These organizations sometimes work jointly, and at other times in contradiction to each other.

The intelligence forces work to ensure the perpetuation of state domination regardless of the political elite in power. The violent threat to state domination by the UF prompts the intelligence agencies to increase their operations against it. Akbar tells Constantine that “there are forces more powerful than” the UF in Karachi (36). Akbar confides in Constantine about his “top-secret” mission given to him by the intelligence agencies to oust the UF from power (36). He tells him that “the agencies are never under any part or government. They are above the government. They decide who gets to rule and who doesn’t” (36). The state intelligence agencies regulate the power relations in the society and actively take measures to maintain state domination. This refers to the anarchist critique of the Marxist theory of state that considers the state to be a direct translation of economic relations in society. On the contrary, the anarchists consider the state to be repressive machinery with a logic of its own. Saul Newman points out that for anarchists:

Oppression and despotism exist in the very structure and the symbolism of the state – it is not merely a derivative of class power. The state has its own impersonal logic, its own momentum, its own priorities: they are often beyond the power of the ruling class and do not necessarily reflect economic relations at all. (26)

The Prisoner portrays the state apparatus as an autonomous power structure that is not controlled by the economic relations in society. On the contrary, economic relations are shown to be one of the various manifestations of the power relations in society.

Just as the state fails to enjoy complete dominance in society, the UF's influence in the state machinery also keeps on fluctuating. Sometimes, the state works in coalition with the party, and at others, excludes it from the apparatus. However, even when the party does not occupy a significant locus of power in the body of government, it still exerts a considerable control over some of its repressive agents. Akbar tells Constantine that “there were those in the government who still wanted the United Front's political support at any price” (*TP* 41). The interplay of power among the contending forces in the government results in dire consequences for those who do play the role of agents for the vested interests of these forces such as Akbar.

4.3 Akbar Khan, the Violent Gendarme

In order to eradicate violent political threat exhibited by the UF, the state employs its equally violent agents. Akbar Khan is the “gendarme” deployed on a state mission to restore its hegemony to its dominant place of power. The use of repression to counter violence in society draws attention to the stark similarity between state and the violent anti-state elements. Althusser points out that “the gendarme is the violence of the state cloaked by an inoffensive uniform” (69). Akbar's task to check UF's domination in the city leads to a series of conflicts between the political party and the state machinery.

When Akbar gets appointed at the “god forsaken locality” (*TP* 40) of Orangi as the Station In-charge in 1998, he finds the station to be under the control of the UF. The policemen live in terror of the UF's ward boss. Whenever a new police officer is appointed at the station, the local ward boss greets him by firing a rocket at the station. Throwing a destructive weapon at the state institution signifies open challenge to the state authority and makes a mockery of its claim to power. It also serves to affirm the UF's dominance

over the state in the territory. The agents of repression seemingly give in to the violent threat of the dissenting political party. The police constables at the said station do not wear uniforms because they do not wish to be “identified as a police officer” (TP 41). Not wearing the police uniform signifies rejection of state authority and acceptance of the UF as the dominant locus of power. Akbar points out that the policemen cooperate with the party in order to avoid being a victim to its violence themselves. He tells Constantine that “either our people have been frightened off, or they’ve become collaborators” (TP 41). The fear of betrayal and its subsequent repercussions force the police to bow before the UF’s authority. The state employs Akbar as a violent gendarme to restore the status quo to its original position as he displays ample courage and aggression to confront the UF. Constantine tells Rommel none of the other police officers had the courage to defy the power of the UF, “except for Akbar. He was the only one who stood up against them” (TP 25).

The novel also shows the state uses Akbar as a last resort since the party becomes a threat to the stability of the state apparatus itself. Therefore, Hamid shows that it becomes necessary for the ‘RSA’, personified by Akbar, to come into action. Paul McLaughlin comments on the repressive measures taken by the state to restore its authority in the following lines:

The state *primarily* works through authoritative utterances (legislation for example); but when these utterances fail to secure the compliance of the citizens or ‘order’ more generally, the state *then* resorts to threats and *ultimately* to physical force. Such is the state’s method of maintaining order (its own politico-legal order), or of re-establishing order when it is challenged. (2007: 76, emphasis original)

Akbar embodies the ultimate solution that the state employs to re-establish its politico-legal order threatened by a contesting polity. The narrative traces several encounters that take place between the violent forces of the state and the UF. These conflicts demonstrate the repressive measures taken to suppress the political threat of the UF.

One of the first clashes between the state and the UF takes place when Akbar persecutes a UF ward boss for kidnapping young boys in a neighbourhood. In this case, Akbar makes use of sheer force to take punitive actions against the UF worker. He tells Constantine that “I took the madarchod ward boss and dragged him by his hair down to the street I thrashed him in front of everyone” (*TP* 34). The party worker’s humiliation in front of the public serves to demonstrate the party’s authority overruled by the state domination. Here the contest of power between a challenging polity and the state apparatus occurs at the individual level and Akbar’s aggression towards the UF symbolizes the state’s repressive attitude towards other polities. It may be noticed that both these parties use violence to establish their authority over each other. Thus, this contest reveals the violent nature of the state apparatus as much as it does of UF. It becomes evident that the police institution functions as an instrument of violence and is as repressive in nature as the “mafia” it seems to oppose (McLaughlin 2007: 76).

Hamid shows that the state strategizes violence in order to eliminate the UF as a contestant for authority and reclaim its domination over the territory. During the reign of the UF in 1998, no labourer or policeman seems willing to work at the police station for fear of being punished by the party for being associated with the police. This indicates the extent of the UF’s control over the state subjects. Akbar tells Constantine how he forces the labourers, who previously showed reluctance to obey the police’s commands, to accept the Police authority. He tells him that “I held a pistol to the foreman’s head and told him to get to work You have to show everybody that you are the bigger badmash [gangster]” (*TP* 42). Akbar, working as a proxy of state, uses threat and coercion to make the labourers work for the state. The collision between the state and the non-state actors serves to highlight the state’s ability to use violence as effectively as any other mafia present in society.

The UF so far enjoys complete authority over Orangi and runs it “like a feudal fiefdom” (*TP* 43). It controls the locality from the “ward office” that is established in an “abandoned school” and people refer to it as the Hajji Camp (*TP* 43). Constantine tells Akbar that the Hajji Camp is “virtually a fortress. They have a massive arms dump there, living quarters for their men and torture chambers in the basement” (*TP* 44). The weakening of the state authority allows the UF to “establish security zones within the

territory of the state from which they can sustain an armed challenge to the state” (Mason 118). Hajji Camp serves as the parallel repressive apparatus for the UF as a police station does for the state. It, therefore, poses a direct challenge to the police’s domination over the area. The fortified repressive structure erected by the UF also serves to secure its capitalist interests. It results in a decrease of “money in the thana [police station]” made by extortion of local businesses (*TP* 43). Now all the money extorted from “gambling and prostitution dens” is claimed by the UF ward boss. The people who run these dens “recognize that the real power lies there” (43). The challenge to state authority results in the diminishing of revenue made from extortion as well. The UF’s capitalist production is directly linked with its repressive domination over the territory. Therefore, as Bakunin points out, “enormous centralized states” serve to secure capitalist interests for the ruling elite as only a state is capable of subjecting a majority of people to economic exploitation (2005: 13). It becomes necessary for the state to reclaim its ‘right’ over the extortion money with the use of force. Thus, the contest between the state and the UF may also be directly linked with the struggle to restore capitalist relations in the area.

In order to restore state authority, Akbar launches a heavily armed raid on the UF security zone. The attack on the camp proves to be successful in re-establishing state domination over the locality after an exchange of violence by both the parties. On a later visit to the locality, Constantine finds the fortress erected by the UF to be completely broken and won over. The words “torn down” and “smashed open” reveal the aggressive nature of the combat between the contending parties (73). The contest of power between the state and its opposing force proves the status of the state to be the more violent apparatus in nature. Thus, an anarchist perspective on the situation indicates that the violent conflict with the UF serves to highlight the nature of Pakistani state as Bakunin’s “aggressive state” (2005: 13). Nevertheless, the text also highlights the peaceful environment that prevails after the police operation against the UF. The operation seems to have helped abate the terror that the UF enforced over the area. Now the scene shows children playing in the yard of the Hajji Camp “where previously prisoners” were held captive by the UF ward bosses (73). The use of force by the police, in this case, seems to be empowering for both the state and the society in the face of violence.

Persecution of the anti-state polity by the state serves to highlight the role of legal state apparatus in aiding state hegemony. In this case, Akbar dismisses the law to carry out his violent operation against the UF. He intends to eliminate the arrested UF workers by killing them in cold blood without allowing them their legal right of trial at court. Akbar tells Constantine that “I don’t care whether he gets out of jail or not I want him dead When I’m done with them, they’ll never dare open fire on another police officer ever again” (*TP* 79). The intelligence agency also endorses Akbar’s repressive treatment of the representatives of the UF as well. Tarkeen and Akbar “shared a look and smiled” at the prospect of killing the prisoner without a trial (*TP* 78). Crispin Sartwell points out that “the agents of the government, the bottom-line enforcement agencies, have access to deadly force. They are both armed and authorized in the use of arms in enforcement” (26). Thus, the state apparatus legitimizes the use of deadly force in order to eliminate political dissidence in society.

The UF rebels against the state authority by calling “a general strike” and “shut[ting] down half the city by force” (*TP* 80). However, its resistance against the state fails to reassert its authority over society. This signifies the state’s victory over the UF in re-establishing domination. In this manner, the ‘RSA’ manages to overpower the violent threat of the UF using the “tactics” of force and terror (*TP* 80). The text demonstrates how the state machinery reveals itself to be progressively violent and aggressive with the development of the narrative. Akbar’s violent tactics get further approval by a senior police officer Dr. Death, the new IG of Karachi. He is known as such because “he had given the police a shoot-to-kill policy for all criminals,” and is someone after Akbar’s “own heart” (*TP* 84). Dr. Death occupies a prominent locus of power in the state apparatus and, therefore, does not show “the same obsequiousness” (85) to the UF ex-minister as the other policemen. Once again, the text depicts the state machinery as occupying a separate body of its own regardless of the ruling elite. Akbar gets called to the “Durbar” (court) at the Police Headquarters to be questioned by the IG about the killings of the UF party workers. All the police officers as well as the representatives of the UF attend the “durbar” (83). The UF representatives demand Akbar to be “placed under arrest” for killing their “activist” “extra-judicially” (86). In response to their allegations, Akbar defends his actions by telling Dr. Death that these people “want to hold this city hostage” and to keep the police

intimidated by their power (86). So, both the parties accuse each other of using violence to disrupt each other's domination in the city.

Akbar presents the counter-argument about the extra-judicial murders of the UF members to criticise of the legal state apparatus. He points out that "these are legal terms, made up by judges and magistrates and senior police officers sitting in air-conditioned offices. All I know is that the people who use these words don't live on the streets of this city" (86). The legislators in the government belong to the dominant strata of the society and, hence, laws always tend to be biased against the subjugated classes. Brooks Adams points out that "the dominant class . . . will shape the law to favour themselves and that code will most nearly approach the ideal of justice of each particular age which favours most perfectly the dominant class" (qtd. in Pound 97). Although Akbar serves as the organ of state, yet his words serve as an anarchist critique of the state's legal system. The law authorizes the 'RSA' to use violence on the state subjects. Colin Ward points out that "it is, after all, governments which make and enforce the laws that enable the 'haves' to retain control of social assets to the exclusion of the 'have-nots' (19). In this case, the state, represented by Akbar, criticizes its own legal apparatus for the perpetuation of the interests of the dominant elite. In other words, the legal system remains effective as long as it serves to strengthen the dominant elite's control over the proletariat.

The intra-state contest for domination between the state and other polities results in violence perpetuated against the working class agents of the state. The violence by the anti-state elements in society usually targets the lower class state-workers whereas those occupying the positions of power remain largely unaffected by it. Consequently, it points out the problem with the use of violence by the UF to dismantle state authority as it generally only manages to harm lower class citizens working for the state machinery. Akbar declares open persecution against the violent political elite in the following lines:

These big shots have never heard the threats that were made to anyone who made the mistake of standing up against these madarchods It's the law of the jungle out there. Either we survive or they survive. So yes, sahib, if you want to know, yes, I killed him. He opened fire on my men, and he would have done it again had he gotten the chance. I got my chance and I killed him. (86-7)

Akbar's comments demonstrate the possible utility of strategic use of violence by the agents of state in order to combat agents of chaos in society. However, an anarchist reading of his comments demonstrates that he misplaces the violence perpetuated at the behest of the state as the proletariat's violent revenge upon the political elite. He uses of the collective pronoun 'we' for both the agents of state and the subjugated state subjects. The misidentification of the state as the victim of violence shows his ideological indoctrination by the 'ISA' while his violent disposition makes him the perfect instrument for the repressive state agenda. It also highlights how the state legitimizes the use of force by its agents against other political elements in society in a totalitarian manner in order to sustain state authority.

The text shows how the state uses Akbar's allegations of violence against the UF as an excuse to further its mission of repression. Dr. Death commands the police that "if any criminal, belonging to any party, attacks a police officer, he is to be hunted down and killed" (88). He also orders the police to replace the slain body of a police officer with a body of the UF party member. Thus the state authorizes violence to be used against the UF till all political dissent is rooted out. The state's order to use violence on the dissenting political party results in more violent tussles between the state agents and the party representatives. One such encounter takes place between Constantine and the UF's party member, Ateeq Tension. Tension is a "big man in UF circles" and is at the top of Constantine's "most-wanted list" (*TP* 90). He may be viewed as the UF's equivalent to state's violent gendarmes. In fact, the narrative shows that Tension once "served in the army for a while" before joining the UF (77). The fact that he is trained by the military itself reveals the similar violent nature of the state gendarmes and the UF's "cold-blooded killer" (90). The following lines describe his character:

He is one of the most dangerous men in the city, a trained, cold-blooded killer. He had become the leader of the UF's most vicious hit squad If the Don called Ateeq Tension and gave him a name, it was equivalent of a death warrant He was absolutely ruthless, a high priest of murder, the chief enforcer of the reign of terror the Don had unleashed on the city. (*TP* 90-1)

Tension, as the UF's violent gendarme, in fact, basically exhibits the same qualities as Akbar; both of them ensure the establishment of the apparatuses they serve with the use of violence and coercion; both of them are authorized by the apparatuses to use violence to root out political dissent in their respective systems.

The crime that makes Tension the most-wanted criminal by the police is the rape of the daughter of a murdered police officer which prompts Constantine "to violate his own rule about not killing criminals (91). Constantine represents the lesser violent face of the police force in comparison to Akbar. However, the prospect of catching Tension makes him fantasize "about what he would do when he did catch him" (*TP* 91). Thus, the state's sanctioning of violence against dissident parties exponentially increases the likelihood of use of force by its agents of repression. Upon arresting Tension, Constantine "grab[s] Tension by his hair and start[s] raining punches on his still naked body. He raise[s] his gun again and point[s] it at Tension's chest" (101). He does not pull the trigger but humiliates Tension enough to make him realize that his authority no longer stands unchallenged. He drags his pleading figure down the street "in front of dozens of stunned onlookers" and Tension's gunmen who are shocked at "seeing their boss being so publicly humiliated" (101). Constantine's act of repression against the UF symbolizes the complete and final negation of the UF's challenge to state authority. Thus from an anarchist perspective, both the state and the other elite polities employ violence to establish their respective dominance over society. The only difference between the two parties is that the violence by the state is legitimized by its legal apparatus whereas the violence by other polities is criminalized by the state.

4.4 "The Strangest Bedfellows": An Abrupt Change in State Alliances

The shifts in the state policies directly influence the degree of the state-sanctioned violence exercised upon different polities in society. The policies in turn are influenced by change in the governments. Each new government formulates its own policies and may make "friends" of the previously known "enemies" of the state (*TP* 103). The change of government in *The Prisoner* casts the UF in a new role in the state apparatus. Colonel Tarkeen appreciates Constantine for not killing Tension on the spot as it would not have been appreciated by the "new government" (103). He informs Constantine about the

changing policies of the government regarding the persecution of the UF in the following lines:

We are evaluating the ongoing operation against the UF. It is possible that the government may require the services of the party sometime in the future Therefore we are suspending the shoot-to-kill policy for a while, though we will continue to monitor the situation. Had you killed Tension, it would have complicated things for you. (*TP* 103)

The change in the government results in the change of position of the UF's authority in the state apparatus. It is no longer looked upon as a political threat but as a possible ally whose 'services' may yet prove useful for the state agenda. The fact that the UF easily becomes an ally to the government once again stresses upon the similar nature of the state and its opponent violent mafia. The new alliance between the state and the UF also complicates things for the minor agents of state, such as Akbar and Constantine, who hold no significant power in the hierarchical state structure. Constantine thinks that the renewed status of the UF in the government would entail that "the UF will be out for our blood" as a revenge for the previous government policies (*TP* 103) .

In response to his concerns, Tarkeen points out to him that "politics makes the strangest bedfellows" and, therefore, the state agents must change their operations according to these new alliances (*TP* 103). This indicates the dismissal of Constantine's concerns for personal safety unimportant by the state. After being assimilated in the state machinery, the UF puts pressure on the government institutions to persecute Akbar for previously exercising violence against its political activists. Tarkeen tells Constantine that "it's true that they are urging the new government to take actions against certain police officers Their main target is Akbar. Our intelligence has indicated that they are planning to assassinate him" (103). As a result, the change in government policy changes Akbar's position from an agent of state repression to a possible victim of state violence itself.

The state abandons the operation against the UF and directs its attention to “other targets” (104). Thus it now directs its repressive institutions to persecute a newly emerging violent polity in society. Tarkeen introduces Nawaz Chandio as the state new target who is the brother of the opposition leader, Yousaf Chandio. Nawaz has been in “exile” for several years because of his contacts with the “anti-state forces” in the country (*TP* 104). The brothers’ aspiration to hold state offices makes them a likely threat to the present state authority. State’s aggression towards Nawaz Chandio registers his rejection by the state into the state fabric. Tarkeen informs Constantine that the state fears that Chandio is “secretly building an underworld army that may ultimately even rival the UF’s wards” (*TP* 105). The state’s allegation against Nawaz of possibly preparing an anti-state force signifies the formulation of a political narrative against him to legitimize/authorize his subsequent elimination.

This point in the narrative reveals the complex fabric of power relations of the state apparatus. One locus of authority in the state intends to “use Chandio’s thugs against the jihadis,” whereas another one considers him “as a potential threat” to the state stability (156). Some forces in the “want to start an operation against the jihadis . . . The [UF] party is a partner in this War on Terror and so all their sins are forgiven and forgotten” (155). Tarkeen wishes to use Akbar in the operation against the extremist religious groups in the city. Akbar, however, does not wish to have “enmity” (155) against them as he is already in the hit-list of the UF. He decides to side with the segment of state power that aims to target Nawaz Chandio as he is “desperate” “to find a target” (157). Akbar needs to prove himself “useful” for the state in one way or another in order to avoid being assassinated by the UF. Thus Akbar’s assent to continue working as the violent gendarme may be an attempt to avoid complete exclusion from the state apparatus. Hence, he is forced to participate in violent state operations in order to ensure his survival. The state, however, chooses not to directly target Chandio himself as his brother holds the office of CM. It instead commands its agents to “neutralize” some of his “friends” (156). This shows the stark contrast in the state’s attitude towards the dissenting elite and the lower class political dissenters. Violence towards Chandio’s “friends” is deemed acceptable as they occupy a lower power status in the highly centralized state machinery (156).

TP demonstrates how the police strategically choose Chandio's "front man," Shashlik Khan, as their prime target to weaken the political threat posed to the state by him (156). Playing the role of the state's violent gendarme, Akbar arrests Shashlik Khan in a raid at his house. Shashlik Khan tries to negotiate his way out of the arrest and tells Akbar that "this is a game being played by others to trap Nawaz Chandio. You and I are just pawns" (*TP* 167). His statement shows how he interprets the situation and tries to make Akbar see the reality of their role as mere 'pawns' in the contest of power of bigger hegemonic structures. An anarchist view on the situation illustrates how the state as well as other powerful political apparatuses largely dictate the actions of their 'pawns' and, therefore, stand in contradiction to human agency. Akbar's choice to side with the state agenda and arrest the Khan reveals his role as the unthinking hand of the state that fulfils his duty as he is commanded to do so.

4.5 State vs. the "Unbridled" Rebel

The state's next target, Nawaz Chandio, symbolizes uncontrollable violent reactionary threat to the state authority. His family history also presents a series of violent rebellion against established hegemonic order in the country. He belongs to "the oldest and most powerful tribal family in the country" (*TP* 169). His family "had been an established force even before the British arrived in these parts, tribal sardars who ruled as absolute monarchs and depended upon banditry to feed their people" (170). Crispin Sartwell defines government as "a group of people who claim and, to an effective extent, exercise a monopoly of coercion resting on deadly force over a definite geographical area and the artefacts and procedures by which they do so" (27). By this definition, Chandio family enjoys the status of a government over the tribal areas. So its "prolonged struggle" (*TP* 170) against the imperial power may be viewed as an attempt to protect its own hegemony over the area.

The Chandio family's eventual acceptance of the "suzerainty" of the British rule indicates its domination by the centralized authority (170). As a reward "for laying down their weapons" the British awarded them "large tracts of the most fertile land along the banks of the Indus" (170). In this way, "in addition to their tribal lineage, the family also became one of the largest landowners in the province" (170). This makes a comment on

how the centralized state authority, the British Empire in this case, legitimizes its hold over individuals by making contending polities partner in the central authority. This partnership in authority, firstly, kills the seeds of rebellion and, secondly, concentrates power in the hands of a minority that is given complete freedom to exploit the state subjects. Moreover, as Bakunin points out that rebellion is always carried out by the proletariat as they do not own property and “are therefore not corrupted by it” (2005: 28). The text illustrates how ownership of property proves to be directly antithetical to the spirit of rebellion. The British government uses this tactic of corruption to suppress rebellion in the Chandio Family. The partnership in land and power with the Chandio family does not seem to be completely successful in eradicating “the streak of rebellion” in the “family’s genes” (170). Nawaz’s grandfather joins “Gandhi’s Quit India movement during World War II, at a time when no other landowner in the region was willing to risk taking on the Imperium” (170). Here the fact that no other landowner dared challenge the authority of the British is significant as it indicates that these polities became complicit to the state oppression for the reason that they had been granted political benefits and land ownership by the British. *TP* shows how the British won their compliance by including them in state machinery and capitalist exploitation.

The British imperial state chose to put an end to Chandio’s rebellion by executing him. The repressive action by the British incited his devotees so much “that the lands of the lower Indus became aflame with revolt” (170). By narrating the history of the colonial rule and its violent administrative tactics, Hamid illustrates how repressive measures taken by authoritarian state structures generally tend to result in more violence and bloodshed in society. The British chose not to take away any of the lands from the family because of their engagement with the ongoing global war, but instead “decided to whisk away the new Sardar, then barely a boy in his teens, to boarding school at Winchester, to be properly anglicised” (*TP* 170). The state, thus, made use of the ‘ISA’ of education, instead of repression, to inculcate “submission to the rules of respect for the established order” (Althusser 51). The narrative reveals how the state authority alternately uses violence and ideology to inculcate submission in the state subjects. The account of the oppressive role of the British imperialism in the Subcontinent in the past calls for a comparison with the current democratic government in the text as both the governments use violence and

coercion to perpetuate their respective agendas. So the anarchist concept of state holds true as far as the comparison of the two forms of state is concerned as Bakunin argues that any form of “state means coercion” (2005: 24).

The “anglicised” Chandio comes back to Pakistan as an “even abler politician than his father” to rule as “the country’s first populist Prime Minister” (*TP* 170). He, too, was killed like his father “by an illegitimate government who thought that the mystique of the Chandios could be snuffed out with the death of a single man” (170-1). The Chandio family history signifies a constant resistance against the established state order, and also foreshadows Nawaz’s challenge to the current state authority. However, his violent resistance is concerned more with gaining domination over other contending polities than with dismantling centralized state authority for the freedom of its subjects. The young Chandio sardar left two sons after his death who “had very different ideas about keeping the flame of their father’s legacy alive” (171). The older son, Yousaf, symbolizes compliance to the state authority in order to be a part of its machinery since acquiescence to the state apparatus guarantees his inclusion in its system. Hence, by giving political favours in return for obedience to state authority, the democratic government repeats the tradition of the imperial one by making contending polities partner in its exploitative program.

Nawaz, on the other hand, symbolizes the anarchist element of negation to the state authority. He is a “fireband” and “like his grandfather a generation before, he raised the red flag of revolt, escaping into the tribal hinterland to wage a guerrilla war” (171). His escape into the wilderness of the tribal lands indicates his rejection to be assimilated into the civilized system of the state. Moreover, his attempt to ‘wage a guerrilla war’ signifies his inclination to use violence to dismantle centralized state authority. His fellow rebels and devotees do not want him to be executed like his forefathers before him so they advise him to seek asylum outside of the country during the military regime. He leaves the country to avoid persecution; his physical abandonment of the country, in fact, symbolizes his exclusion from the state apparatus. Even from outside the country, he manages to engineer several “several acts of terrorism,” through his devotees, “during their self-styled insurgency, acts that had led to the deaths of police and paramilitary officers” (171). Nawaz embodies the violent revolutionary force that challenges state authority by using violence

against its institutions. He represents the unbridled anarchist rebel who invokes the spirit of insurgency within the hearts of other individuals through ‘propaganda by the deed’. His violence against the police and other institutions, however, clearly results into the deaths of various officers, as mentioned above, and seems to be equally repressive in nature as the ‘RSA’ it targets. Moreover, the way he dictates his devotees back in Pakistan to launch attacks against the state official also exhibits his own authoritarian nature. Therefore, seemingly revolutionary violence to abolish the state authority inevitably turns out to be just as contradictory to human agency as the repressive apparatus they claim to oppose.

The state allows Nawaz back into the country only after his brother manages to attain an influential position in the government. Upon returning to the country, Nawaz gather a huge following of violent insurgents who call themselves “fidayeen” [devotees] (*TP* 172). These are the people “who had been with him in the barren hills during the insurgency (172). They treat Nawaz as “a conquering hero” upon his return. Thus Nawaz emerges as an anti-state political power that is also experienced in directing organized violence. He demonstrates no fear towards the repressive agents of the UF as he takes his political seat as an MP. He “publicly” slaps a member of the party who clashed with him “on the floor of the House” (172). The incidence indicates his ability to take on influential politicians fearlessly and increases his popularity among the masses which is described in the following lines:

Common people, and more than common people the media, liked his plain-spokenness, his willingness to speak his mind about all matters, his insistence on following an unorthodox path and his unashamed cultivation of those who were deemed ‘dangerous’ friends. They seemed to like the fact that he generally avoided the skulduggery and back stabbing that was the mother’s milk of politics. (*TP* 172)

Nawaz represents the dissident revolutionary force in society that is “unashamed” to use violence to contend with the state authority (*TP* 172). His brother Yousaf does not appreciate Nawaz’s rebellious attitude towards the state but he also knows that he needs the support of his brother and his followers for the stability of his own political career. He initially opposes “Nawaz’s contacts with the criminal underworld of the city,” yet he knows that one day he might “need such people” (172). Thus the novel shows how violence

becomes a crucial element in maintaining one's domination over others, and also in challenging centralized authority.

The state's arrest of Shashlik Khan proves to be a direct assault on the revolutionary politics of the Chandios. The man seemingly holds great significance for the politics of Chandio family because he is the "linchpin of the entire deal" (*TP* 172). He is the person who has the "underworld contacts" whereas Nawaz is "a pretty face, a brand name to attract people" (172). Shashlik is the one who directs and organizes violence in the party; he also serves as a bridge between two brothers; it is he who explains "to Yousaf the utility of being friends with his friends" (173). Therefore, losing Shashlik to the agents of state basically means Chandios' defeat in the face of authority. On the contrary, the state tries strike a deal with Nawaz on Shashlik's release on the condition that he collaborates with the government by giving it his men (173). However, Nawaz refuses to do the state's bidding because he "just saw a man in khaki (Tarkeen), a colour he had learned to hate since his father's death. He had lived his life railing against the military and he wasn't about to change his tune for some short-term political benefit" (173). His refusal to be a part of state machinery signifies his resistance to it. In this context, Shashlik's arrest by Akbar complicates things for Nawaz as he is not yet in collaboration with the state, and, thus, is an easy target to be eliminated.

Shahlik's arrest makes Nawaz realize that he is a target to "forces implacably opposed to him" (*TP* 173). Nawaz wants Yousaf to make arrangements for Shashlik's release by the police but he is unable to exert significant power in the state apparatus. At this point Nawaz realizes that "there were forces behind this gambit, forces implacably opposed to him, and forces that Yousaf was not willing, or able to cross" (173). Once again the narrative presents the state to be the most dominating force when it comes to the determination of power relations in the society. Moreover, from an anarchist point of view, the dominating force of state power seems to be antagonistic to individual force symbolized by Nawaz. The Chandio family represents the political elite here but still it seems unable to influence the political decisions to their favour. As a response to state persecution of his men, Nawaz chooses to make use of sheer violent force to oppose the 'RSA'. For him, it seems to be a matter of proving his human dignity to "his legions of devotees" (174). He prefers to oppose the state than betray "the men whom he had always surrounded himself

with, violent, untamed men who had fought for him in the mountains” (174). He decides that “the enemy had made their move and they needed to respond with equal strength” (174). Therefore, to contend with the ‘wild beast’ of the state, Nawaz decides to use equal proportions of violence.

Nawaz launches an attack on the Special Investigation Cell, accompanied by a group of his *fidayeen*. The attack at a state institution symbolizes his attempt to desecrate the state apparatus itself. Upon realizing that Shaslik has already been taken by Akbar to “a secret location” (183), he thrashes Maqsood Mahr and threatens to “hang” him “from a streetlight” (179). Here parallels may be drawn between his treatment of policemen and Akbar’s treatment of the UF ward bosses: both of them represent oppositional forces, yet both resort to the same kind of strategic violence to challenge the authority of the other. Thus the ‘wild beast’ that Nawaz symbolizes appears to be equally violent and aggressive as the violent apparatus of the state. Nawaz’s open challenge to the state draws serious backlash from the state. Dr. Death feels that it is his moral duty to persecute Nawaz and “his group of hoodlums” or else he would lose all “moral authority” to persecute the UF criminals or the jihadis (184). Maqsood Mahr convinces Dr. Death that he “must give this task to Akbar” (184) and Death agrees with him as well because he is the “only one” he can trust with this (185). Thus Mahr uses the event of his humiliation to frame his arch rival, Akbar, in a task in which he knows there is no hope of victory. The state, once again, employs its most ‘violent gendarme’ to crush the anti-state polity.

Constantine’s character holds great significance here as he seems to observe the whole situation unfold before his eyes. He warns Akbar to back out of Chandio’s case and to refuse to act as the state’s organ of repression. He cautions him about the repercussions of attempting to go after a huge “political icon” as Nawaz. Constantine tells Nawaz that the state intends to “crucify” him in order to secure political gains (185). Constantine uses the word “crucify” to signify the reality of Akbar being dehumanized to the status of a mere pawn by the state. Thus, the state forces Akbar to sacrifice his individuality in order to salvage the state’s domination. To a certain extent, Akbar does realize that he is being used thus as he says that “I know that going after Chandio is suicidal” (*TP* 186). However, he still feels obligated to do the state’s bidding as he takes it to be his moral duty. He aims to pursue the task for the IG as he feels unable to refuse the commands of Dr. Death when

stands in front of him “wearing those crossed swords on his shoulders and all his decorations on his chest, and he calls [him] son and tells [him] that his honour is in [his] hands” (186). The instilled sense of honour and duty by state ideology forces him to obey the state agenda despite its possible repercussions for himself. In other words, he prioritizes the “false and fatal abstractions” (Bakunin 1970: 60) set up by the ‘ISA’ over his natural instinct to avoid this case.

Arresting Nawaz Chandio becomes an exceptionally difficult task for Akbar because of the “ludicrous rules that Dr. Death had devised” for his arrest (*TP* 237). Akbar is ordered to “disarm” his followers but not Nawaz. According to these instructions Nawaz is not to be “humiliated” by being arrested “by a lowly DSP” like Akbar (237). Here, once again the disparity in the state’s attitude towards the privileged elite and the governed class becomes obvious. Both the devotees and Akbar do not occupy significant places of power in the hierarchical ordering of society and therefore their elimination does not bear any consequences. Whereas Nawaz belongs to the elite class and, so, his fate carries significance for the state machinery in general. The state aims to put an end to Nawaz as a political threat, yet at the same time, it does not wish to make an enemy out of his political force. Constantine casts a doubt at the resolution of the IG who previously claimed that he “never accepts any kind of political interference in his police work” (237). This indicates the flexibility of the legal state apparatus to accommodate variations in state agenda. Dr. Death’s inability to be unbiased in the treatment of two different anti-state elements, that are the UF and Nawaz Chandio, indicates ineffectiveness of the institution of law when it comes in contradiction to the state agenda. Saul Newman points out the hollowness of the institution of law in the following lines:

A deconstructive interrogation of law reveals, the absence, the empty place at the base, the edifice of law, the violence at the root of institutional authority. The authority of law can, therefore be questioned: it can never reign absolute because it is contaminated by its own foundational violence. (128)

Hence, Dr. Death’s hesitation in implementing the same rules for Nawaz Chandio reveals the “contamination” that exists in the legal state apparatus that exercises different rules for different people depending on how much power they have.

On the other hand, Nawaz displays a strong resolve to not bow down before the state authority. One of Yousaf's aides suggests to him that he "hand over a couple of his fidayeen" to the police to mitigate the tension between him and the institutions but Nawaz considers it to be an "unconscionable" move (*TP* 244). He refuses all options of negotiation between him and the state. The fact that Nawaz gives more importance to "his own code" signifies his rejection of the law of the state (244). In other words, he prioritizes his individual code over that of the state's and this excludes him from the state apparatus. This also makes him directly antithetical to the state's gendarme, Akbar, who prioritizes state agenda over his individual agency. His exclusion from the state apparatus entails his necessary elimination as well.

Akbar proves to be the "repressive force of physical intervention" that finally successfully subdues the reactionary force of Nawaz (Althusser 69). Thus, Akbar intervenes on state's orders to put an end to the resistance to the state power. During the encounter between the police and Nawaz's men, both sides open fire at each other and it results in the death of Nawaz and his fidayeen (*TP* 248). However, after the violent encounter which results in Nawaz's death, Akbar thinks of him as "truly regal in character" for not bothering to duck in response to the attack by the police (248). His admiration of Nawaz's courage signifies his appreciation of his resistance to power. Nawaz's brutal death indicates the extent of violence exercised by the state to uproot dissent and rebellion. Nawaz's elimination serves to instigate an extreme violent reaction from the public against the state. Escriba-Folch points out that "violent repression may have pernicious consequences since it may bring about a violent escalation, the radicalization of positions, and so unleash a violent response" (10). Constantine reflects on his assumptions about the strength of the state that seems to be under "intense pressure" and is about to "topple" because of the anarchy produced by Nawaz's death in the following lines:

Constantine had always believed in the inherent strength of the State and its institutions He had always held that no one could overthrow the State, no matter how powerful they were, because the state would always be more powerful The UF had been a perfect example. For all the party's street power and its scores of ruthless militants, ultimately they were no match for the resources of the State. (256)

The novel represents state as a self-perpetuating body with the ability to crush all anti-state entities with ease. Nawaz's resistance, even in the form of his death, proves to be the anarchist element of negation that finally overthrows state authority. His personal destruction indicates the destruction of the negative element itself in the revolutionary process.

The 'popular uprising' instigated by Nawaz's individual violent actions successfully brings down the seemingly unshakeable state system. The police remain unable to crush the rebellion as the "usually resolute Dr. Death" refuses "to order the police to intervene" (*TP* 257). It again, just as in the case of the UF, points towards the weakness of state domination in the face of mounting violent threat by non-state actors. Moreover, it also points towards the spread of chaos during the lack of state power. The state's destabilization also reveals its nature as a machinery whose actions are as violent as any other contending polity. Due to the changed status of state authority, Akbar comes to be seen as "no better than a hired killer" (*TP* 257). The police department also becomes accused of being "little better than a gang of criminals who were incapable of being controlled by the current political administration" (257). Elizabeth Stanley and Jude McCulloch point out that "from the perspective of state crime scholars, the state is also 'criminal'" (1). The resistance shown by Nawaz's followers serves to put the legitimacy of violence perpetuated by the state in question.

At the time of crisis, the state decides of to withdraw its support of Akbar and "have him punished" for his violent actions (*TP* 262). The blame of the state's repression against the dissenting polities falls entirely upon Akbar. Akbar protests against this punishment by pointing out to Dr. Death that he "carried out [his] orders without question" (262). The state first directs his actions to perpetuate its violent agenda and then discards him right after he has accomplished its mission of repression. Akbar finally comes "face to face with the reality of his illusions" (263). He realizes that "if you're good at the job then everyone wants you every time there's a crisis. When things go back to normal, you get discarded" (141). Akbar's abandonment by the state results in his eventual incarceration. Akbar's physical imprisonment by the state, however, represents the liberation of his individuality and the exclusion from the state apparatus. It makes him realize his status as a pawn in the hands of the state. Nester Makhno points out that when "man frees himself"

from state domination “he immediately sees that his former life was nothing but loathsome slavery” (4). His disengagement with the state machinery, then, allows him to realize his status as a tool of the state agenda. Makhno further points out that the free human being “sees that this life has turned him into a beast of burden, a slave for some and a master over others, or into a fool who tears down and tramples on all that is noble in man when ordered to do so” (4). Thus Akbar exercises violence over his fellow citizens on state orders and eventually becomes a victim of its violent persecution. His status as a victim of state apparatus instigates in him a desire to rebel against the oppressive state domination.

In order to undermine state authority, Akbar devises a strategy from his prison cell to use the violent “human spirit” (*TP* 129) possessed by the religious extremist groups in Karachi to ‘contend’ with the ‘wild beast’ of state. He seeks help from the extremist organizations to kidnap the American in order to pose a threat to state authority so that he might be able to get his freedom back. The religious fanatics, in this context, may be viewed as Bakunin’s ‘another wild beast’ that “spares nothing and stops at nothing” (2005: 159). Akbar utilizes the violent religious vigour evinced by the zealots to threaten the state authority. Major Rommel also reaffirms the capability of violent ‘human spirit’ of challenging authority in front of the FBI agent, who seems “extremely confident that his computers and electronic gadgets would the case for them” in the ‘war on terror’ in the following lines:

The one thing that I’ve learned is that the greatest weapon that you can use is the human spirit. These men, however misguided they may be, believe that they are on a divine mission. And they are willing to die for it. I’m a soldier and I live to fight. But this war we’re fighting isn’t going to be won by your technology or your smart bombs. It’s going to be won by the side whose spirit is the strongest. (*TP* 129-30)

Akbar strategizes the “human spirit” displayed by the frenzied fanatics to register his own resistance against the state. By using Friedland’s abduction as leverage, he forces the representatives of state to bow down before him and seek his help. He employs violent threat to the state authority as a way to “barter” his freedom out of the state-imposed incarceration. In this way, Akbar successfully challenges state authority and disrupts hierarchy by making it subservient to his will instead of him being subservient to it.

The American's abduction brings Pakistani intelligence severe criticism by their American counterparts especially in the context of the 'war on terror'. The blame of the abduction falls on the intelligence agency, "the Kaaley Gate wallahs," as "they weren't happy" with what John Friedland was reporting about the tribal areas (66-7). Tarkeen informs Constantine that:

He gave widespread coverage to some of the excesses committed there — villages that were accidentally bombed, civilians killed by government forces, things like that. Didn't really go with what was given in the official press pack . . . [The intelligence agency] sent in a confidential memo saying that his presence was compromising national security, and had him expelled. (66-7)

This reveals the degree of surveillance exercised by the state on the media. *TP* shows that Friedland diverges from the official narrative of the state activities in the tribal areas. His coverage to the violence perpetrated by the state apparatus on the civilians presents a challenge to its narrative. Moreover, his choice to side with the peripheral forces of the tribals, rather than with the centre, makes him antagonistic for the state. Therefore, he is "expelled" from the tribal areas on the government orders. Keeping in view the antagonistic relationship between Friedland and the state, the blame of his abductions falls on the state of Pakistan. The state's overly keen efforts to resolve the case of abduction reveals its subservient status to the international hegemonic power, the USA. Hence, Akbar's strategy to get the American abducted by the tribal religious organizations not only challenges the state but also registers his decision to side with reactionary forces in order to disrupt international hegemonic forces after the 'war on terror'.

The narrative also focuses on the reasons for the jihadis' resistance against centralized national and international authority. The economic exploitation of the masses at the hands of the political elite seems to be the major reason for the poor to conduct a reactionary uprising against the state. The text demonstrates "abject poverty and the hopelessness" makes the Pakistani society "a rich recruiting ground for the jihadis" (*TP* 273). The madrasas provide the starving proletariat to have at least an opportunity to have some education. Constantine reflects that "the madrasas represented an affordable means for the inhabitants to enable their children to gain some sort of basic education if it was just

the rote learning of the Quran” (*TP* 273). Thus, an anarchist interpretation of the situation indicates that violent resistance against the state seems to be directly bound with the dismal economic conditions of the proletariat majority of the country.

The text demonstrates how some tribal individuals view jihad as a way to resist the imperial authority of the USA over the citizens of Pakistan. A tribal known as “Kana” exhibits blatant hostility and suspicion towards the FBI agent and refers to him as the “damn gora [white man]” (287). He tells Constantine that “they are evil, sahib. They want to break up our country and they want to enslave our religion” (286). He refers to the Americans as “our sworn enemies” (287). This indicates the mistrust about the American agenda to dominate and enslave the people of Pakistan in the name of the ‘war on terror’. Discussing post-9/11 violence and terrorism in Afghanistan in the context of anarchist reaction, Uri Gordon points out that “the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq . . . certainly generated renewed protest, only this time against the backdrop of extremely violent actions by the [American] state” (*TP* 87). Similarly, violence in Pakistan by terrorist organizations, largely based in the tribal areas, may be referred to as anarchist “rage” against the state operations. Therefore, the act of the American’s abduction seems to be a way to register an anarchist challenge to the domination of America’s authority in the region.

Moreover, *TP* illustrates that the state of Pakistan works as proxy for the USA in its own country. The use of violence against the people of tribal areas seems to further promote the anti-state sentiments within the citizens of the region. Kana says that “the government forces were bombing our villagers and killing innocent women and children” (287). The state seems to use its narrative of the ‘war on terror’ as dictated by the USA to exercise repression on its own citizens. Diken points out that “in the twenty first century state terror is called politics of security which justifies itself with and thus mirrors terror” (4). In this instance, the state uses the ‘war on terror’ as a justification to employ force against the marginal forces present in the tribal areas of Pakistan. Thus violence on the part of state instigates further instances of terror by the affected people of these areas who, sometimes, resort to terrorist activities to strike back. While discussing the terrorist elements present in international metropolitan cities, Jeremy Tambling points out that 9/11 brought about the need to recognize “‘the other’ within the city” (xi). I have adapted his concept of ‘the other’ present in the western metropolises for the anti-state elements present

in Karachi portrayed in *The Prisoner*. These elements use violence as a means to assert their agency over the centralised state and thus force the state to recognize their presence in society. They are “the others” of Pakistani state trying to show their muscles in the face of institutional authority. Akbar’s choice to use the peripheral anti-state forces of militancy to counter the state apparatus reveals his strategic anarchist thinking. The religious fanatics prove to be the best tool to defy state authority as “they frequently evince a real passion for destruction” (Bakunin 2005: 28). Moreover, their economic and political marginalization by the centre renders them the most violent tool to resist state authority. Thus, the protagonist in *TP* channelizes their destructive passions in order to register his own resistance against the state apparatus.

4.6 Conclusion

The Prisoner by Omar Shahid Hamid illustrates the strategic use of violence by the anti-state forces in Pakistani society to disrupt uniform state authority. It also demonstrates how the state uses institutional violence to cope with these acts of violence and terrorism in society. Akbar, the violent gendarme of the state, personifies the repressive face of the state apparatus that exercises force as a tool to suppress violent challenges posed by the agents of chaos. In the light of textual analysis of this novel, on the one hand, acts of political violence seem to check state authority but, on the other hand, also disrupt the very flow of social life by causing destruction and chaos. As far as the selected text is concerned, non-state players in society generally use acts of political violence as a way to strengthen their own hold over a territory by limiting state domination over it. Furthermore, the novel also reveals the dictatorial nature of these dissenting political parties as they strive to impose their own political will over state subjects with the use of violence. An anarchist reading of the text, then, serves to highlight the impact of violence by anti-state forces in the context of Pakistani society. In the next chapter, I carry out a textual analysis of Hamid’s second novel, *The Spinner’s Tale*, from an anarchist perspective in order to map out the dynamics of violence in his works in further detail.

Notes

¹. See Ayesha Jalal, *The State of Martial Rule*, (UK: Cambridge University Press, 1990). The institution of military is considered to be the most superior one among all other state institutions in Pakistani society. Pakistan's history demonstrates a recurrence of phases of military dictatorship as well.

CHAPTER 5

“A REAL PASSION FOR DESTRUCTION”: VIOLENCE AS A TOOL OF RESISTANCE IN THE SPINNER’S TALE

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I analyse how Omar Shahid Hamid’s *The Spinner’s Tale* (2015) depicts its protagonist as an individual engaged in violent terrorist activities against the state in order to obliterate existing social order. The struggle to demolish the corrupt existing socio-political structures is carried out in a clearly violent yet strategic manner, aimed to erect a new classless social order by replacing the older corrupt one. In *Statism and Anarchy*, Mikhail Bakunin stresses on the need to strategize “widespread and passionate destruction,” as a tool to annihilate the old hierarchical ordering of the world in order to make way for “new worlds” to be “born and arise” (28). Using his perspective regarding violence as a tool for reconstruction of society, I analyse the work to explore the dynamics of violence presented in it. as discussed in the previous chapter, the use of violence as a means to reorganize society invites critical analysis of the acts of terrorism as it carries various repercussions with it. First of all, terrorist elements may greatly endanger innocent civilian life by using violence indiscriminately. Secondly, violence as a tool of resistance also entails an existential threat to the society that it aims to reconstruct by demolishing its infrastructure that is its very means of survival. Therefore, an anarchist exploration of the selected text serves to highlight the depiction of anti-state violence presented in it.

Before starting the analysis of the selected text, I would like to once again point out that the author’s position as a member of the Police Service of Pakistan (PSP) is critical to the reading of the text as it makes him a useful source of information on the inner workings of Pakistani state and its subordinate apparatuses. *The Spinner’s Tale* represents a tug of war between state institutions, particularly the police, and its protagonist, thereby making

itself suitable for an anarchist reading. Consequently, an anarchist perspective on the text allows us to investigate the role of state in the spread of said violence and terrorism in Pakistani society.

In this chapter firstly, I examine *The Spinner's Tale* to explore how high social stratification contributes to the marginalization of the unprivileged class and how this discrimination may be related with the rise of terrorism in Pakistani society. Secondly, I discuss how violence is used strategically in the novel as a tool to challenge authority at different levels. More specifically, I investigate how Hamid portrays the use of destruction as a tool of resistance to state authority by non-state actors. While discussing the use of violence as a tool of resistance, I also explore the negative impact of anarchist violence on the stability of a society in general. Thirdly, I discuss how anti-state elements strategically manipulate religious zeal to achieve their multiple ends. In accordance with my intentions stated above, I want to discuss *The Spinner's Tale* under the following headings:

- Ausi as “Homo Sacer”: The Journey from Oppression to Rebellion
- State Oppression as a Cause of Anarchy
- The Road to Destruction
- Finding the “True Path”
- The Proletariat Brotherhood
- Individual Violence Vs State Violence
- State: The Real Target of Violence

5.2 Ausi as “Homo Sacer”: The Journey from Oppression to Rebellion

The novel traces the transformational journey of Sheikh Uzair, also referred to as Ausi throughout the novel, from an ordinary middle-class citizen of state to the leader of the “biggest jihadi group in the country” (5). I refer to him as “Ausi” across this chapter to avoid any confusion. From the beginning of the book, the narrative points out that Ausi’s terrorist activities cause “grievances against the state” (11). Since the text describes the state as the direct target of his violent activities, an anarchist interpretation of his actions is in order. Being a thriller, the text is primarily concerned with the investigation to find out the reasons that may have prompted his conversion from an ordinary youth “wearing the uniform of the most prestigious and anglicised educational institutions in the country” to

“the bearded, turbaned decapitator of a pregnant woman” (*TST* 14). The reasons of his evolution need to be considered important from an anarchist point of view as they reveal his rationale to choose the state as the target of his violence and destruction.

The novel begins with Ausi’s incarceration at the “Forestry Department’s School of Animal Husbandry” (4) that is temporarily converted into a prison cell and is “the largest and most isolated facility in the area” (10). According to the ideals of anarchism, Ausi’s imprisonment itself by the police may be considered as state’s encroachment upon his freedom. Noam Chomsky explains the anarchist concept of human freedom in the following lines:

For the anarchist, freedom is not an abstract philosophical concept, but the vital concrete possibility for every human being to bring to full development all the powers, capacities, and talents with which nature has endowed him, and turn them to social account. (2)

Therefore, Ausi’s physical confinement in a completely secluded area hints towards the nature of state authority to be contradictory to individual freedom. On the other hand, his terrorist activities that provoked his arrest by the state in the first place also demand attention.

The novel reveals that Ausi has previously been student at the most prestigious elite school in the country referred to as “The School” (13), also known as “the Eton of the East” (*TST* 13). This piece of information sparks SP Omar Abassi’s, who is in charge of Ausi’s place of confinement, interest in him as a criminal. It prompts his curiosity to discover more about the protagonist’s past and, more importantly, to understand the motives behind his terrorist violence. Abassi believes that a letter, that is discovered on Ausi and was originally meant to be passed on to his school friend Eddy Shah, could prove to be the key to unravel “the terrorist mastermind” (*TST* 23). Ausi later tells Omar that that there is not only one letter but a series of letter that the two friends exchanged with each other. He thereby proposes Omar to make a “deal” (90) with him to tell him about the letters and that would eventually lead the ASP to “the truth” (66) about him. Thus, the letters that the ASP eventually discovers provide background information about Ausi. The private correspondence between Ausi and his friend becomes a medium through which Hamid

depicts how a ordinary state subject takes up the journey towards the path of terrorism. However, these letters do not simply provide a gateway to Ausi's past and to his transition into a terrorist, they also constitute a part of his strategy to mislead the ASP to get himself out of the prison.

The narrative describes Ausi's character as an "unwavering" satanic figure who has "black smouldering eyes that burned with a fire that surely must have been forged in the depths of hell" (11). Unlike his accomplices in the terrorist activities, he poses an uncompromising defiance in the face of police authority at the time of his arrest. He emerges out of "the building with his head held high" and looks into the TV cameras with "those black eyes burning without a hint of remorse" (11). Describing Ausi in these images reminds one of Milton's Satan and his fallen angels in his epic, *The Paradise Lost*. Presenting Ausi as a satanic figure of resistance is significant as Bakunin refers to Satan as "the eternal rebel" (1970: 11). Satan and rebellion are considered to be perennially bound in the anarchist tradition¹. The text presents Ausi as victor in the contest between him and the state institution as compared to the other "defeated" terrorists, even though he gets arrested by the police (1). The words "pathetic and defeated" indicate their acceptance of state domination on part of the other prisoners, whereas Ausi's defiant demeanour shows his subversive nature in the face of state authority (11). Thus, Hamid portrays the protagonist as a quintessentially anarchist character with a strong inclination to challenge state authority even when physically subdued by the police.

During his imprisonment, the police force seems to be constantly engaged in an attempt to dehumanize Ausi in order to subdue his rebellious nature and to register its control over his freedom by keeping him in complete isolation and confinement. The nature of the place of his incarceration, the animal husbandry, also indicates the below-human status imposed on him by the police. The "shed" that is used for his confinement is "wide enough for a four legged animal to stand in" and is not a place suitable for "human habitation" (21). Moreover, the fact that Shahab, A CID official, seems "pleased with the filthy condition of the cell" (*TST* 21) signifies the police's attempt to humiliate and dehumanize the captive to make him subservient to the police. Due to his animal-like treatment by the police, Ausi may be referred to as 'Homo Sacer', a term used by Giorgio Agamben² to refer to the secluded terrorists. Agamben points out that according to

Pompeius Festus in the Roman law, ‘homo sacer’ is someone “whom the people have judged on account of a crime. It is not permitted to sacrifice this man, yet he who kills him will not be condemned for homicide” (qtd. in *Homo Sacer* 47). In this instance, Ausi becomes ‘homo sacer’ because the ‘RSA’ chooses to dehumanize him with impunity. His animal-like status, however, is important from an anarchist viewpoint since it stands as a symbol for his freedom from the confines of human civilization. Crispin Sartwell points out that “to be an animal is to live in anarchy; to be a civilized human being is to live in thrall to state power” (41). Therefore, Ausi’s dehumanization, albeit imposed, represents his symbolic liberation from the repressive state apparatus.

While viewing the state’s treatment of him, one must not ignore the reasons due to which it imposes this dehumanized status upon Ausi; his solitary confinement seems to stem due to his violent behaviour at his previous place of incarceration. He not only unabashedly commits violence but also displays an ability to instigate it by effectively “preaching” it to others (*TST* 18). He, therefore, demonstrates the anarchist ability to organize “a popular uprising” that is “chaotic and merciless” in nature (Bakunin 2005: 28). At his previous confinement station, he brainwashes the guards and passes “messages to his comrades on the outside, using the stupid guards as couriers” (18). He seems to have such an effect on them that they made plans “to blow up the jail” (18) to facilitate his escape. This, firstly, exhibits Ausi’s ability to incite rebellion among the agents of state institution itself which, as a result, also indicates the presence of seeds of anarchy within the state apparatus. To further elucidate the “diabolical genius” (19) of his captive to Omar Abbassi, Shahab points out that:

[The guard] was willing to take his own life, as well as the lives of dozens of his own colleagues whom he had known for years, just to get the Sheikh out of prison. Another guard had prepared lists of his co-workers’ families, along with their addresses, to pass on to the Sheikh’s followers so that they could take them hostage. (19)

Ausi’s ability to convince others to do ‘propaganda by the deed, then, illustrates his ability to strategize violence against the state. His successful attempt to brainwash the guards, on one hand, signifies Ausi’s refusal to bow down before the state authority while

on the other hand, the guards' willingness to cooperate with him hints at their affinity with the idea of violence against the state apparatus.

However, it also highlights the disastrous effects of Ausi's unrelenting violence as it seems to mindlessly target innocent civilian lives "co-workers' families," as well (19). It signifies a lack of respect for human life on part of the terrorist mindset. Ausi's disregard of human life goes directly against the anarchist ideals of human freedom as mentioned above by Noam Chomsky. Furthermore, his attempt to use the "stupid guards" as a vehicle for his own ideological agenda signifies his denial of their individual agency and also points out their status as an object in his eyes (18). In this way, his imprisonment by the state and his below-human treatment by it seem to be punitive in nature for his aggressive terrorist tactics against the state and his fellow state subjects alike. His seemingly senseless terrorist nature, then, intrigues the SP's interest to know about the factors that led to his depraved psychological transformation.

5.3 State Oppression as a Cause of Anarchy

Ausi's past correspondence yields important information about the factors that contributed towards his transition into an anti-state revolutionary. His letters draw attention to the economic and social injustices he has to bear from very early in life because of a corrupt and hierarchical social system. He temporarily gets to experience the "privileged life" of The School only due to a scholarship granted to him because his father works for the government (*TST* 32). However, going to the elite school does not guarantee his incorporation into the elite lifestyle as he doesn't belong to the "same background" as all the other students there (32). The reality of this alienation from his schoolfellows deeply influences his later life experiences as he confides in Eddy that The School "intimidated" him (32). Being admitted to the school gives him the vantage point to witness the class divide from the very centre of power. The awareness of his own economically inferior background heightens his feeling of being a pariah in the elite society.

His sense inadequateness deepens even more as he grows older and realizes how different his life turns out to be from those of his school friends. Both of his rich friends, Adnan Shah and Sana Safdar, get admissions in American universities whereas Ausi cannot even afford to entertain the prospect of having a similar future. Thus, from the beginning

of the novel, Ausi remains conscious of the irreconcilable divide between “the well-fed, educated world of the privileged classes” and the proletariat class (Bakunin 2005: 20). The socio-economic divide lays the foundation for an ever-increasing hatred in Ausi towards the ruling elite.

The text presents the state as an active agent in creating and perpetuating the divide among the masses. After his father’s retirement from the civil services Ausi’s family is forced to move out to an underprivileged locale, Lalookhet, because “some politically connected colleague of his father” gets their house allotted to himself. When his father tries to challenge the decision, they send a “police mobile over and we were told to clear out in a week or else [they’d] be thrown out on the street” (*TST* 75). In this manner, the political elite threaten to use the police force to intervene in the conflict of property (between the privileged and the unprivileged) in order to subjugate the unprivileged class. Thus, the text shows that the state institution seems to favour the domination of the political elite over the oppressed proletariat. Ausi’s exclusion from the privileged locale is also symbolic of his exclusion from the centre of power itself i.e. the state. Ausi expresses his inability to imagine “our other friends who never ventured beyond their palatial houses” (76), coming to his current place of residence as “it’s such a dump” (75). This indicates the disparity between the two economic classes in the Pakistani society as represented in the text. Ausi is forced to occupy a marginalized space in the hierarchical society due to his unprivileged economic as well as political status. The state, in this instance, serves to “perpetuate, rather than resolve, the contradictions in capitalist society” (Newman 17).

Ausi’s economic marginalization increases with the progression of his journey as a state subject. After getting admission at the medical college he faces alienation due to his financial background by more influential groups in the college. He does not get selected for the college cricket team because of a lack of “sifarish” [recommendation] (*TST* 77). He explains to Eddy that “every slot in the team was doled out on a quota basis . . . I didn’t fit into any of these slots. In school, I had been one of the best players on the team and here, I didn’t even merit a place as an extra” (77). His inability to “fit into” the categories of the hierarchical social structure indicates his powerless status as an individual. The stratified structure of the college may be taken as a microcosm for the capitalist Pakistani society itself. The sense of exclusion imposed on him due to economic injustices sows in

his heart what Bakunin refers to as the “germs” (qtd. in Newman 29) of social revolution. Emma Goldman also agrees to Bakunin’s view and points out that “the social and economic influences are the most relentless, the most poisonous germs of crime” (87). An analysis of Ausi’s letters reveals that socio-economic discrimination experienced in his life highly contributes to his radical transformation.

The sense of alienation does not arise exclusively due to his unequal economic status at the college. He also suffers violence at the hands of religious “goons” as he attempts to subvert their dictated code of conduct by making the “mistake” of interacting with one of the female students at the college (78). The violence doled out to him by the “bloody mullahs” serves to profoundly terrorize him (78). He, as an economically and politically powerless individual, faces repression at the hands of the ‘mullahs’ because of their superior hierarchical positioning. Their oppressive treatment of him fills him with a sense of humiliation that is accompanied by revulsion towards their unjustifiable domination. This indicates how dominant groups use religious authority as a coercive ideological tool to further subjugate the unprivileged individuals in society. Ausi becomes a target to the religious groups because they wield more authority in the highly religious Pakistani society and, hence, enjoy the right to dominate him.

The text illustrates that the college authorities do not intervene to stop the violence that indicates the uselessness and duplicity of law in a hierarchical society where violence by the dominant class is considered acceptable. Furthermore, it sheds light on the failure of state as a law enforcing body as it claims to be. It instead signifies the role of “state as an organized authority” that comes into being as an “outcome of the conflict and prevalence of the more powerful groups at economic and political level, whose interests are reflected in laws” (Georgoulas 17). The fear of violence by the dominant religious group seems to directly instigate Ausi’s aggressive reaction towards them. Vernon Richards points out that “violence as a means breeds violence” (49). Therefore, the violence Ausi endures at the hands of the religious authority generates more violence that later manifests itself in the terrorist activities. The text demonstrates that the fury that he feels towards the society may, in fact, be reactionary in nature. In other words, the destruction he unleashes on to the society may be the product of the violence that he has internalized as a powerless state subject.

The only characteristic that he possesses that makes him stand out from the rest of the marginalized students in the college happens to be the “real passion” (*TST* 79) that he demonstrates at a college event. Sohail, the student leader of a political organization for people belonging to the “lower middle class,” like himself, praises him for his passion (79). He tells Ausi that “we could use people like you in our party” (79). He claims the purpose of the party’s establishment to be the safeguard of the rights of the underprivileged. Therefore, in order to survive in the oppressive society, Ausi solely relies on his ‘real passion’. This passion may also be considered just another form of aggression that he possesses as an oppressed individual in society.

Ausi’s decision to join the political party marks his attempt to be able to exert some power in the social structure. It also indicates an effort on his part to protect himself from the violence of more powerful groups. Thus, the novel shows that, in order to exercise individual sovereignty, one has to be affiliated with a political party in a highly centralized society. Joining the party makes him realize the importance of occupying a locus of authority in the hierarchical social structure. More importantly, it allows him to resist the religious power structures in the college. It helps him get rid of his status as a “pariah” because he now enjoys “the backing of the largest political organization in the city” (80). To fully exhibit his newly acquired social status, Sohail deliberately makes him “speak to the same girl” he had spoken the day he was “manhandled” by the religious goons (80). This time, however, he does not suffer abuse from the violent mullahs as “the Beards kept staring at us from a distance but they didn’t dare touch us” (*TST* 80). From an anarchist viewpoint, the act of demonstrating power thus may also be viewed as a form of resistance as it is carried out to undermine the authority of the dominant group.

The narrative draws attention to the ways in which the ‘RSA’ exercises violence on the dissenting politics to perpetuate uniform state domination. Ausi joins the political party with the hopes of being able to exert agency in the social structure. Conversely, joining politics exposes him to even severe state repression in the form of police brutality. He hears stories about how the police arrested innocent political workers and “tortured them into confessing all sorts of ‘acts of terrorism’”. When the police have made enough cases on a party worker, they pick him up and kill him in a ‘police encounter’” (81). The novel depicts that the state systematically eliminates political workers that express dissent with the state

agenda by implicating them in terrorist activities. Therefore, the ‘war on terror’ serves as an excuse to employ force against political contenders. In this manner, the police stations become the loci for exercising violence on the dissenting polities.

One significant instance of state repression, that holds importance for Ausi’s transformational journey, takes place when the police kill Sohail in an extra-judicial encounter. Ausi remembers him as “he lay in the mortuary, his body filled with bullets” (94). The following lines describe the scene where Ausi comes face to face with Sohail’s half-dissected dead body:

On that cold metal table, his face half blown away, his hair hanging awkwardly on top of his exposed cranium, it is undeniably Sohail. Ausi sees an ant crawl over his flesh and deposit itself in what is left of his jaw. (95)

The morbid image of Sohail’s mutilated body signifies the extent of violence exercised on the state subjects through its ‘RSA’. His murder by the police indicates the elimination of the ‘weak’ voices of dissent through the state institutions from the stratified fabric of the state machinery. Sohail’s rotten body also symbolizes the exploitation of the powerless proletariat political activists by the ruling political elite. The disregard for human life is indicated when Ausi comes to know that the police killed Sohail off merely to get “reward money” (96). The state’s agents of repression seem to prefer material gains over an individual’s life that indicates the capitalist nature of state apparatus. Later on, Ausi’s unconcern regarding the sanctity of human life mirrors the one shown by the police itself. Yet, his violence against humanity comes to be viewed as criminal whereas the one perpetrated by the police is legitimized by the state apparatus.

The narrative presents that even the death of the proletariat political worker is used by his party for its propaganda. Hamid shows how the party declares Sohail a “martyr” for its political cause to secure its own position in the state apparatus (*TST*97). The party that previously claimed to safeguard the rights of the proletariat does not protest against Sohail’s death or demand justice for extra-judicial murder by the police. It also financially abandons his family, consisting of his mother and a sister, that it pledged “to keep like their own” (97). The experience of losing Sohail for the interests of the political party makes him understand the pseudo-democratic nature of the political organizations. He realizes

that “all political parties are the same, that they use workers for their own ends and then discard them” (97). Bakunin points out that the “freedom” of people in a representative government can only be a reality if they are capable of exerting “real and effective control” in the state apparatus after the elections (Bakunin in Dolgoff 219). He argues that if the people are not endowed with any control in the system and are governed by the representatives “invested with public and repressive authority” then “the freedom of the people becomes likewise a complete fiction” (219). Hamid also presents the nature of the political parties to be fundamentally exploitative of the working class. *TST* shows that Different polities incite the revolutionary sentiments of the proletariat to gain popularity in the representative government. However, after achieving their political gains, they discard the workers they supposedly represent. Moreover, the unjust elimination of these workers also serves to perpetuate the political agenda of these parties as the dead workers get to be labelled as the “martyrs” for the party. Accordingly, the incident of Sohail’s death serves twofold purpose in Ausi’s life as a political individual. Firstly, it makes him aware of the exploitative nature of the political parties. Secondly, it brings him face to face with the state repression.

5.4 The Road to Destruction

This particular event of state repression towards the proletariat also proves to be the source of instigation of violence by him in the college. Since these actions result due to the political and social injustices, they may be considered as reactionary in nature. After facing disappointment from the party with regards to seeking justice for Sohail’s murder, Ausi decides to resort to direct action. He plans to “shut down the college for a week, as a mark of respect for Sohail” but his “proposal” is rejected by the principal (*TST* 97). The fact that he seeks approval from the authorities at the college indicates that he still accepts the authoritative structure in society. However, refusal of his demands by the authorities illustrates rejection of his political needs by the repressive authority. To get his proposal registered, “he does the only logical thing and holds a gun to the principal’s head until he agrees to his demands He experiences true power, when a man his father’s age . . . sinks to his knees and blubbers in front of him like a baby” (97-8). Hence, the rejection of individual agency by repressive authority proves to be the instigator of violence. Moreover, recourse to direct action proves to be successful in realizing his demands against unyielding

authority. Thus anarchic resistance to authority and the use of violence prove to be empowering in the face of institutional authority.

However, *TST* also highlights the destructive effects of his violent resistance side by side with the empowering ones. Hamid portrays that “Ausi and his fellow political activists take over the college, beating up lecturers, setting fire to tables and chairs, and forcing students out of their classes to attend compulsory ‘memorial services’ for Sohail” (91). His protest against the authorities, then, makes the fellow state citizens the primary subject of his violence for his political agenda. In this way, he makes the teachers and the students his hostage in order to register his political demands to the state. In addition to violating the freedom of the ordinary people, he destroys the infrastructure of the college as well. This shows violence, as a tool of resistance, harms the social life of the state subjects. The political party to which he belongs encourages the student activists to carry out more radical action. Thus the text reveals the ulterior motive of the party behind the protest for Sohail’s extrajudicial murder. In this instance, Ausi’s aggression serves as a mere organ for the political agenda of the party he serves. Thus acts of political violence may not always challenge authoritative structures in society but instead sometimes serve to replace them in dominating common state citizens.

The novel also demonstrates how the violent strike by the radical students becomes a cause for the state to exercise further repression upon people. In order to put an end to the violence by the political activists, the police respond “with a vengeance, with tear gas and lathis [batons], breaing heads and arresting whoever comes within their grasp” (98). This, firstly, demonstrates that as a reaction to indiscriminate violence, the state also employs repression on whoever they can easily dominate. This, consequently, implies that non-violent civilian may also needlessly receive punishment by the government. Secondly, the protest for Sohail’s extra-judicial murder leads to more innocent state subjects being arrested and punished by the police. This illustrates the use of violence, even for reconstructive purposes, inevitably binds the individuals in a net a repression.

Hamid illustrates the all-encompassing effects of state repression on an individual through the exploitation of Sohail’s family by the political elite. One such example is Sohail’s younger underage sister, Kiran, who undergoes sexual exploitation at the hands of

a powerful politician (*TST* 100). The politician in question belongs to the very party Sohail used to serve in his life. So the proletariat exploitation does not just end with the death of the worker but also has ramifications for the people related to the individual. The influential politician forces Kiran to pay him with sexually favours in order to provide her mother with the “quality medical care” (102). The mother suffers a “stroke on hearing the news of her son’s death” (97). Sohail’s death leaves the entire family in a financially bankrupt condition. Kiran considers prostitution as the only possible way for her to survive in society. *TST* demonstrates how political exploitation proves to be invariably responsible for other kinds of exploitation in Pakistani society. Kiran bears sexual exploitation because of her inability to resist political authority. Yet, she considers prostitution to still be a more respectable way of earning a living than being disillusioned by the party’s ideals. She expresses her disgust for Sohail’s disillusionment for believing in the “stupid ideal of the party that never existed in the first place” (102). This is a direct critique on the political parties, in democratic systems, that promise “fictitious freedom” to the “sovereign people” (13). Bakunin points out that such political parties “supposedly” represent the will of the people but, in fact, “invariably” exploit them (2005: 13). Kiran compares her sexual abuse and Sohail’s political exploitation in the following lines: “They fucked Sohail for years, but he never got any benefit out of it for himself. The only difference between me and him is that I know how to get something back for myself after being fucked” (102). Throughout the novel, sexual domination of the proletariat by a politically superior individual has been used more than once to indicate infringement of individual agency³. Sohail’s extrajudicial murder as well as Kiran’s sexual exploitation may be viewed as instances of domination of the proletariat by the concentrated state authority.

Although the state institutions label Ausi as a religious fanatic/terrorist, yet his past letters with Eddy reveal his disgust for the religio-politically driven “armchair revolutionaries” (*TST* 122). He believes these people to be incapable to bring any change in the society due to their privileged social status. These revolutionaries dream to “overthrow the government and bring Shariah”, yet do not have enough courage to take direct action (122). He comes across such people in London where he takes asylum in order to avoid being arrested in Karachi. He believes that these are the people “who would make big statements about what we should do, but when the time came to do something, they

couldn't be found anywhere" (122). The main reason for the inability of such people to take up arms against the government arises due to the economic support they receive by the same government. Taking actions against the government would mean the loss of privilege to these people.

TST highlights the hypocrisy of the young Muslim preacher who delivers a passionate speech against Israel's atrocities upon Palestine by revealing that he lives "on a dole" (122). This reveals his dependence on the state. Therefore, the substance of his speech against the state turns out to be meaningless in nature. Ausi tells Eddy in the same letter that "Sohail had a good eye for them [armchair revolutionaries], 'if you don't have courage to spill someone's blood, you cannot bring about any sort of revolution. Ideology shydology, that's all bullshit. This is the only thing that matters'" (122). Ausi views direct violent action to be the only effective strategy capable of bringing about change in the existing socio-political structure. He considers other political strategies to bring about social revolution to be ineffective in nature. Therefore, he stresses the need to take individual action to bring about change in the existing social order.

The novel presents Ausi's awareness of marginalized economic status as one of the primary reasons that cultivates strong revulsion in him against the ruling elite. The realization of the contrast between his life and that of Sana's, who he is "madly in love with," increases his sense of inadequateness when surrounded by the people belonging to the elite class (*TST* 126). He believes that there is no possibility for them to get together as he is not her "equal" (126). This consciousness that he and Sana belong to entirely "different realities" intensifies the impossibility of reconciliation between the two classes when he visits her London apartment "which reeks of luxury" (157). Ausi takes the apartment to be "a holiday home for some wealthy desi businessman, or perhaps a corrupt politician's or a bureaucrat's hiding hole, a place where they can display the fruits of their ill-gotten gains" (157). Ausi links the elevated economic status of the ruling elite with the corruption that it involves in. Therefore, the privileged lifestyle of the elite class seems to directly result due to the socio-economic exploitation of the proletariat class from which he belongs. Hamid depicts the stark contrast between Sana's luxurious apartment and Ausi's bleak flat in Whitechapel which he shares with five other immigrants from Pakistan. He believes their worlds to be "a universe away" from each other (157). Difference in

economic status may be indicative of the different levels of power these two classes are able to exert in the state apparatus.

The class divide between him and Sana's elite friends becomes more pronounced when she takes him to an elite dinner with her in London. Going to the dinner makes Ausi realize that his best friends occupy completely different economic positioning in society. He becomes conscious of the fact that Eddy and Sana share a "commonality" with the ruling elite whereas "he can never fit in their world" (*TST* 158). This reiterates the anarchist impossibility of reconciliation between the "wild, hungry proletariat" and the "well-fed, educated world of the privileged classes" (Bakunin 2005: 20). Ausi finds out that he had been "allowed" to experience the elite lifestyle at The School "by a quirk of fate" and that he never actually belonged to the privileged life (*TST* 158). The fact that Sana "doesn't introduce her as her boyfriend" makes him wonder if "he is her little social science project. A one-man outreach to convince herself that she can slum it with the underclass" (159). This indicates Sana's hesitation in incorporating him, an individual belonging to the proletariat class, in her life as her equal. It reinforces the hierarchical difference that exists between her and Ausi. He always considers himself as a pariah when surrounded by the elite class and, even when he is "accepted in that world," he feels as if it he is treated not as a human being but as a "strange social experiment" (158). This again refers to Ausi's dehumanized status in the society. Sana, as a member of the elite class, uses Ausi as a tool to reassure herself of her humanist position in society, thereby exploiting his unprivileged social identity. The tacit humiliation at the hands of his best friend triggers "an irrational anger within him" against them (158). From an anarchist point of view, his resentment, in fact, signifies his "social-revolutionary passions" against the exploitative ruling elite with which he strives "for the creation of another world" (Bakunin 2005: 2s0). Ausi's eventual un-explained abandonment of Sana actually indicates his first resistance to her authority over his life. It suggests the rejection of the emotional control that she exercises over him. Thus socio-economic injustices instigate in him a violent rage towards the privileged elite. Ausi's exclusion from the elite circle of his friends contributes towards pushing him into an identity crisis. He feels as if "he doesn't know where he belongs" (158). However, Hamid also presents a few other elements that intensify his lack of belonging-ness in the society he inhabits. One of the reasons seems to be his mother's worsening illness whom

he cannot visit because of state persecution at home. His mother's illness may also be considered as symbolic of the emotional death he experiences in his personality due to the social and political injustices in order to become the ruthless terrorist at the end of his transformational journey.

Another factor that seemingly heightens the crisis within his personality seems to be his marginalized status as "an asylum-seeking immigrant" (159). The narrative points out that in order to escape being "racially taunted" in the foreign British society, he finally decides to "travel to Kosovo with his cousin's Islamic friends" (160). In this way, Ausi's existential angst, that arises due to his unstable social and political standing, prompts him to seek his true identity. It may be noted that all the above-mentioned factors in fact denote his marginalization and abandonment in a hierarchical society. All these factors make him realize his insignificance as an individual and, hence, the wish to leave his current life indicates his attempt to discard his powerless individual status. The primary reason which forces him to shed his previous identity and strive for a new one, then, apparently does not happen to be religious fanaticism but an attempt to escape social and economic ostracisation in the society. The news of his mother's death further heightens the feeling of being "lost" (160). It severs his last link with his previous life and makes him accept his new identity as a "jihadi."

5.5 Finding the "True Path"

TST illustrates that joining the religious organization provides Ausi with a platform to channelize his revolutionary passion. The Sheikh (leader) of the organization tells Ausi that he is "lost" and "rudderless" and that he is there "to help you find your true path" (161). He recognizes Ausi's potential for destruction and suggests him to utilize it in the way of the 'true path' by which he means the path of resistance against the oppressive authority. He highlights the atrocities inflicted upon "a Muslim town in Bosnia, where all the men were murdered by the Serbs and the women and children were either raped or sold into slavery" (162). The "barbarity" of the violence "numbed" Ausi (163). The accounts narrated by the leader instantiate "violence of the Serb army against the Bosnian Muslims" (Keil 64). Soeren Keil considers violence perpetrated against the Muslims of Bosnia to be the direct consequence of the formation of a "highly centralized state" that ensured Serb

hegemony in the state⁴. The text demonstrates how the religious leader seems to manipulate Ausi's individual aggression against the social injustices for his collective revolutionary struggle against the repressive authority of the Serbs.

The Sheikh also links the oppression of the Bosnian Muslims to that of the Kashmiri Muslims. He narrates him the story of his joining the jihad in Kashmir and how the "passion" in a young firebrand speaker ignited "a fire" in his soul (*TST* 164). He tells him how "he joined the resistance" (164) in Kashmir to aid "our brothers and sisters [who] stood up against the oppressive yoke of the Indians" (163). The Sheikh informs him that "all of these things are happening to good people, just because they are Muslims. Islam is under attack" (165). Ausi, who himself belongs to the under-privileged class, feels solidarity with these people who are being tortured, harassed and raped by the dominant political forces. The Sheikh suggests to him to channel his sorrow and aggression towards a bigger cause i.e. striving for the freedom of the oppressed to set up "a world no longer plagued by domination and degradation" (Amster 44). He further convinces Ausi to join his revolutionary cause because of his identity as a Muslim and as a Kashmiri. He tells that "you have a double duty to wage against those who have occupied their country" (*TST* 166). In joining the movement with religious group, he finds himself shaped into a palimpsest of struggle and resistance by departing with his old identity and embracing a new religious one. Thus for Ausi, joining the Kashmir struggle in fact means the articulation of his individual passion of resistance in a more organized struggle to dismantle the oppressive state authority.

Joining the organization gives Ausi a chance to observe hierarchy even within the resisting organizations as well. Ausi demonstrates an anarchist rejection of all kinds of authority at the militant training camp. The organization is known as "Camp Suleyman Farsi" in Afghanistan "where the best of the best, the chosen few from all the various militant groups, from all over the world, congregate" (*TST* 173). He finds his trainers' order to "perform" in the impromptu parade organized for the "distinguished guest," Osama bin Laden, to be highly "distasteful" (175). Unlike other trainees, who regard bin Laden to be the ultimate authority in the organization, Ausi does not exhibit obsequiousness in front of "the tall Arab" (175). Referring to him as such registers Ausi's refusal to acknowledge Osama as a figure of authority (175). Ausi refuses to consider bin Ladin as one of the

revolutionaries against the ruling elite. He instead believes him to be a part of the same exploitative elite that exploits the working class for its own interests. He refers to him as one of the “self-important, pompous madarchods with an inflated sense of their own worth, while all this time, it is others who make the sacrifices and take the risks” (176). Ausi points out that he has encountered many such people “in my father’s department” and even more when he joined the political party (176). Thus for Ausi Osama bin Laden stands no different than the elite politicians who “exploit nationalistic and xenophobic, even racist, enthusiasms of common folk to make them perform in a [certain] way” that mainly furthers their own political and elitist interests (Yoder 26).

Ausi points out his hypocrisy and renounces solidarity with bin Laden by saying that “when the Soviets were here, he was sitting in a comfortable guest house in Peshawar, sending other recruits to the front line. The instructors kiss his arse because he shits money. He’s a spoilt rich boy looking for thrills. He’s not a jihadi. He’s not one of us” (176). His rejection of bin Laden as one of his own signifies his “anger and defiance for authority” (181). His criticism of bin Laden is, in fact, a criticism of centralization of power present even in the resisting anti-state organization. By representing bin Laden as one of the ruling elite, the text also draws attention to how people use religious authority to exploit others for their own political agenda. Ausi’s rejection of his authority indicates his resistance to being exploited by the religious authority in society.

Instead of obeying to the authority of bin Laden, Ausi stresses the need of acts of “random violence” by individuals as the most effective tool to reorganize society (TST 177). He believes direct action to be the only way “to grab people’s attention. You have to shock people, deliver a 2000 watt jolt to their system. That is how you change the world” (177). Ausi’s plan to reform the society involves destruction of the existing hierarchical structure in order to “create a new world” (197). The cited lines indicate that the protagonist believes “widespread and passionate destruction” (Bakunin 2005: 28) to be an essential tool to reorganize society along a more just order. The extremist organization provides Ausi with the means to channelize his individual passion for destruction into the revolutionary direction. Thus, “turning to religion” proves to be a “seminal point” in his life in that it helps him discover his “focus” in life (TST 181). Yet, the cause of his resistance does not seem to originate from religious fanaticism, or even nationalism, but

instead an urge to question authority in all its manifestations with the use of force and destruction.

5.6 The Proletariat Brotherhood

From an anarchist perspective, Ausi's violence does not seem to be religiously motivated. This is made evident by his refusal to direct violence at religious minorities, such as Hindus, in the city even after becoming a well-known jihadist. Omar Abbasi goes to Ausi's school to get more information regarding his past. There he finds an old Hindu janitor, Ram Lal, who reveals information about his childhood. He informs Omar that Ausi "was different from all the other kids in school. He wasn't pampered, he came from the real world, not the rich people's cocoon" (186). His belonging-ness to the 'real world' results due to his unprivileged economic status among the children of the elite class. His proletariat status makes him share solidarity with the other people of the lower class such as the janitor himself. Ausi evinces this brotherhood with the janitor as he declares Ram Lal and his son to be under his "protection" from the religious fanatics of the local madrasas (191). These extremists beleaguer other religious minorities due to the religious differences. He warns them not to persecute them any further or they would be "answerable" to him (191). His defence for the janitor and his son indicates the commonality Ausi shares with the people of the poor class. Ram Lal tells Omar Abbasi that "it wasn't the jihadis who changed him. It was something else. Something broke inside of him" (192). Hence, once again, the reason for Ausi's violence towards the society turns out to be 'something else' than religious bias towards people belonging to other religions.

Omar Abbasi's investigation to discover more about Ausi's background reveals the degree of state repression exercised on his family. This violence results as a punishment meted out to the family for Ausi's anti-state activities. The police arrest his older brother, Rameez, several times to investigate him for Ausi's crimes; the investigation renders Rameez mentally unstable. They break "all the bones" in his fingers and the torture escalates even more after Ausi's attempt to assassinate the president (197). Ausi's subversion to state authority seems to give the 'RSA' an excuse to exercise violence on the innocent citizens. It serves to reveal the violent nature of the state institutions that are authorized to use violence on its citizen without evidence. Thus "police brutality" may be

regarded as a source that ignites “chain reactions of violence” that only provokes “even more spectacular assassinations and terrorist bombings” (Kilroy 173). It may be deduced, then, that repressive tactics on the part of state seem to result into an increase in the activities of violence and terrorism. Furthermore, Ausi’s violent activities give the police a chance to subjugate his family to economic exploitation. The police inspector threatens Ausi’s father that if they “didn’t pay, he would implicate Rameez as being a member” of Ausi’s organization (*TST* 197). Hamid, just as in Sohail’s case, shows that state’s agents of repression use terrorism as an excuse to physically and economically exploit Ausi’s family as a punishment for the crimes they didn’t even commit. Thus his family acts as a body-substitute for Ausi to receive state punishment in his stead.

5.7 Individual Violence Vs State Violence

In Indian-occupied Kashmir, Ausi finds violence to be an empowering tool of resistance against the repressive military authority. The Indian army arrests him for militant activities in the region where he captures and executes “the entire CRPF platoon” in Shopian (*TST* 216). He believes his choice to kill the platoon to be an instinctive one, “a spur of the moment decision” (216). The novel depicts how he enjoys murdering the members of Indian army in order to “send a message” to the Indian military (216). He initially intends to kill only the head of the platoon but “when he slit the commander’s throat in front of his men and [sees] the naked fear in their eyes, some primal instinct took over him” (216). He therefore uses sporadic violence as a counter strategy to dismantle military occupation in the region. According to Randall Amster, “use of violence in a social movement context — especially when it directly targets obvious symbols of the dominant culture — is like a mirror held back up to society” (44). His acts of violence against the Indian military forces basically reciprocate the state-sponsored violence against the Muslims of Kashmir.

On the other hand, his arrest by the military illustrates the more powerful and violent nature of the concentrated state authority in comparison to his individual violence. The humiliation and torture he suffers in the jail demonstrates how state uses violence as a strategy to suppress resistance. The “interminable humiliations” (*TST* 218) include being repeatedly raped by Jinn, “a hulking pederast” who is employed by the army “to break his

spirit” (215). Ausi’s sodomy at the hands of the Indian state’s agent of repression is symbolic of the state’s penetration into the individual’s life. In fact, the figure of the pederast may be symbolic of the Indian state itself. The way Jinn dominates and violates Ausi may also be suggestive of the powerful invasive nature of state upon the individual freedom of the Kashmiri citizens.

Ausi’s time in the prison also serves to reveal to him the hollowness of the narrative of “the struggle” in Kashmir. He discovers that “ninety per cent of this war is fought for the propaganda” (*TST* 217) to keep people on both sides engaged in a never-ending war. He finds out that people on both sides are fed with different versions of narrative according to the requirements of state agenda:

The lalas try and convince people that Pakistani terrorists . . . are invading the peaceful land of Kashmir to stir up trouble. On the other end, his people stick to the version that it is the unending cruelty of the Indians that has led to this uprising, and men continue to risk life and limb, in order to protect the honour of their mothers, sisters and their homesteads. (*TST* 217)

The hegemonic forces on either side of the Line of Control⁵ perpetuate their political agenda against the other to maintain their authority over the state subjects. The governments of both the countries force their subjects to play the organs of state violence against the citizens of the other country. Therefore, the political forces of both the nations use Kashmir as a battleground for their vested interests. Individual agency of all the state subjects involved gets compromised for the political interests of the greater forces of state authorities.

The violence inflicted upon him by the Indian military makes him recognize violence as an important component of his identity. His brutal assassination of the Indian military men indicates the internalization of violence as a victim of social, economic and political violence throughout his life. Furthermore, he does not regret exercising violence as a means of resistance in Kashmir. On the contrary, he fits right in with the violence that encapsulates the area. In fact, violence prevalent in Kashmir resonates with the violence that he has internalized as an oppressed state subject. The following lines explain his satisfaction with being present in a place violence and destruction:

He found that he revels in the chaos of conflict He has also discovered that it is not the call of God that motivates him to violence In a strange way, he even understands the violence that is being done to him. After all, if the roles were reversed, this probably what he would do to them. (221)

Ausi's fascination with violence and his desire to use it on others reflect the problematic nature of anarchist violence as a means of resistance. In a way, he internalizes violence as a defence mechanism to assert his agency as well as authority over others when he gets a chance to. His ability to 'understand' the violence inflicted upon him demonstrates violence as a part of his very identity and which in turn results into converting him into one of the "purveyors of violence" (Amster 44) himself. Due to being "invaded and violated" he "subconsciously revenge[s]" himself by "invading and violating others" over whom he may have authority (Berkman, Goldman 180). Hamid portrays individuals' lives as consumed by a "sea of violence" (Amster 44) where sometimes they are the victims of state violence, and sometimes become its perpetrators themselves. In this way, Hamid's text points out how Ausi gradually transforms from being a powerless prey to the authoritarian violence to being a terrorist that enjoys using violence to create chaos in society.

Moreover, his humiliation heightens when the Indian military men read him a letter by Eddy while sodomizing him. In the letter Eddy reveals his love for Sana and the revelation, once again, highlights the huge contrast between his and friends' lives. Eddy's confession of having feelings for Sana, in fact, indicates his wish to possess Ausi's object of desire. The confession may be taken as a metaphor for the bourgeoisie class's attempt to usurp the economic and political rights of the proletariat. The difference between his life in "a grimy Indian prison cell" and his friend's privileged one makes "anger rise within him. No, not anger, hate. From somewhere deep within him. An all-consuming hatred for everything and everyone in his life" (222). Hence the abuse borne at the hands of the Indian military and his experiences of social and political injustices jointly contribute towards his choice for utilizing violence against "everything and everyone" that come his way (222). He chooses to channel his anger by deciding that "he will destroy the world" when he gets out of "this hell" (223). Consequently violence perpetrated by the state gets mixed with his

earlier socio-economic experiences to prompt him to use violence as way to challenge oppressive authoritative structures in society.

Book three, also the last part of the novel, presents a narrowing of focus vis-a-vis target of violent destruction. Ausi focus on using violence to eradicate “corruption” that “permeates” in the Pakistani society in particular. After having “wandered all over the country” (228) he becomes “convinced” that the “nation is diseased and needs to be cleansed If the core is corrupt, the seed it spreads will never be wholesome” (228). According to ideals of anarchism, the relocation of focus on the state institutions reaffirms the role state as the chief perpetrator of corruption in society.

5.8 State: The Real Target of Violence

Ausi’s return from the Indian prison consolidates his position as a symbol of resistance within the terrorist groups in Pakistan. These radical organizations attempt to use his incarceration by the Indian army to perpetuate their political agenda. These organizations recast him “as a heroic figure, an icon, the unbreakable iron man of the movement” (228). However, this time Ausi does not play an organ for their political interests. Instead, he uses these organizations as a platform for the perpetuation of his own revolutionary ideas. *TST* portrays how religious authority may easily be misused in order to cause destruction in society. Moreover, Ausi makes use of his ability to convince to steer his followers towards terrorism. He “discovers” that he has the “gift for speech-making, for motivating and spellbinding audiences with his words. The funniest thing is, he never believes any of what he says, but he has the ability to make others believe. And that makes him powerful” (*TST* 228). He uses this particular ‘gift’ to convince the manpower invested in jihadi interests for his own anarchist agenda.

Ausi’s newly “exalted status” also brings him “limitless resources” to aid him on various fronts when it comes to recruiting and organizing “followers” for his cause. “Overnight, his new organization acquires a 150 acre site to build a ‘spiritual headquarters’ Crates of AK-47s and grenades are delivered to his headquarters in the blink of an eye” (228). The elevation of status results in the increased ease with which he is able to instigate a mass uprising. He acquires “zealots in the truest sense, wanting to refashion the world in the image of his own vision. His rhetoric has grown more virulent in response to

their demands” (228). He develops a symbiotic relationship with an already violent group of individuals in society and uses them to further his own agenda. Both the parties, in this case, feed off of each other’s tendency to use violence, and continue to grow fiercer with the passage of time. Malatesta points out that “anarchist violence is the only violence that can be justified” (61). However, he is of the opinion that the nature of violence as revolutionary tactics becomes problematic when it begins to replace the oppression that it initially sought to defy. He argues that if violence becomes a “controlling force,” then it will ultimately “translate into a new tyranny” (63). In this case, Ausi realizes that inciting sectarian violence may never be justifiable but he incites it all the same as he considers it to be legitimate for his anarchist cause.

Moreover, Ausi justifies sectarian violence sectarian hatred as he considers it to be a manifestation of the frustrations of the oppressed majority in the hierarchical society. He thinks that the oppressed people use violence against other sects as an outlet to their suppressed emotions. Ausi comments on Eddy’s inability to comprehend his logic of sectarian violence in the following lines:

Eddy doesn’t understand why one group wants to kill another group of people over things that happened 1500 years ago. But Ausi understands that this is a basic instinct, and people need symbols to justify doing the things they could never do otherwise [I]f the world has to change its ways, it demands blood, and Shi’a blood is convenient. (229)

In his opinion, the murder of Shi’as seems justifiable to gain his political agenda. This shows how his violence is, to a certain extent, inevitably driven by his personal and religion interests. In this manner, Hamid presents the flaw with the use of destruction to end injustice in society as it ultimately becomes a tool of oppression for others in itself. Ausi aims to the “basic instinct” possessed by the religious organization in order to garner as many agents of violence as he possibly can in order “to change” the world (*TST* 231). He wants to disrupt the “corrupt” order of the society that “power” may be seized away from the currently dominant body and be delivered to its rightful owners i.e. the “people” (231). The narrative depicts that his motive to use violence is to gain power because “money does not interest him. Power interests him. And people. Having the power to get

people to set the world on fire” (*TST* 231). Acquiring manpower becomes the most important step in strategizing mass violence against the existing power structure in the society. In this manner, in opposing the hierarchical relations in society, Ausi himself becomes an authoritarian figure.

Ausi considers the “Saudi’s quixotic attack on the Twin Towers” to be highly misplaced (*TST* 234). He believes Osama bin Laden to be a “fool” for not being able to strategize violence towards the “real problem” at hand i.e. the state. Ausi’s feels disgust towards Osama for carrying out a failed plan to challenge the hegemony of America and for failing to identify the state, “the internal enemy,” as the most important one to be “defeated” (234). From Ausi’s point of view, the state hierarchy i.e. ‘the internal enemy’ serves as an organ for the West to consolidate the authority of America over this part of the world. In order to annihilate their hegemonic domination, one must target their “agents of corruption” functioning here at home (234). Ausi believes Osama’s plan to be a failed one because it leads to have the completely opposite effect for the revolutionary cause and gives America a renewed reason to consolidate its control over the territories of Pakistan and Afghanistan. He suspects Osama to be “an American agent provocateur” because his plan seems to have worked in favour of America instead of weakening its control as an international hegemonic power (234). The absence of strategy leads to have negative effects on the future aspects for bringing about an anti-state revolution.

The incident of 9/11 proves to be disastrous for Ausi’s revolutionary cause as because of it the Taliban come to be identified as the enemy of the west. As a result, both the US and Pakistani governments persecute the Taliban for being agents of terror and chaos. In this way, Osama bin Laden’s lack of strategy leads to the loss of manpower in Ausi’s resistance against the state institutions. Ausi reflects that “when push came to shove, the agencies betrayed them all. The same individuals who had been hailed as heroes in Kashmir, were now arrested and kept under surveillance” (235). The text shows that the change in change in government policies results in the persecution of those political elements in society who were previously accepted by the state to perpetuate its agenda. These politics in fact come to be recast as the major threat to state security as an aftermath of 9/11 and are hunted down as a result.

The text depicts how Ausi uses the brutal murder of Rachel Boyd, an international journalist, to gain media attention as the “prominence given by the West and the media to the Arabs and Al-Qaeda irks him” (264). This indicates that with the progression of plot, he gradually turns into a narcissistic maniac who indiscriminately uses violence as a tactic to garner people’s attention to his cause. It also demonstrates how his primarily revolutionary violence becomes a tool of tyranny for ordinary civilians. This violent incident problematizes violence as a legitimate means to reconstruct society along anarchist ideals. Ausi’s decision to do something drastically violent, nonetheless, seems to be significant as it successfully manages to divert focus from Al-Qaeda to his cause. He believes that his followers’ fear of state surveillance and persecution may only be overcome by an act of even greater destruction that renews the revolutionary consciousness once again. The following lines explain Ausi’s sentiments regarding inflicting destruction upon the world in order to reform it for the better:

He doesn’t care about the consequences. He wants the world to turn red with blood . . . he has found that people will follow you even after you commit the vilest act, as long as they are convinced of the strength of your willTo change the world, you must violate it first. (265)

The fact that Ausi unconcerns for the life of an innocent human being as well as for the consequences of his terrorist actions shows his non-humanist attitude towards human life in general. Moreover, he takes a dictatorial position while ending the journalist’s life. After “heartlessly slaughtering [the] pregnant woman,” he claims to have had set her “free” (266). This demonstrates how he turns the woman into a slave of his will and assumes complete authority over her life and that of her unborn child. In this manner, Ausi evinces “a real passion for destruction” in order to destabilize the existing hierarchy so that “new worlds” may be reorganized (Bakunin 2005: 28). However, his violence also turns him into a dictatorial beast that claims illegitimate authority over unwilling individuals.

Ausi also believes that his “terrible act of violence” (241) is demonstrative of “what he can be capable of” (266). Hence, from Bakunin’s perspective the act in itself is not a “glorious” one in itself but, it may be considered vital in order to achieve the revolutionary cause (266). The beheading of the Englishwoman proves to be the last step in the journey to

set himself “free” from the constraints of the state domination (266). Moreover, this act prepares him to finally launch an attack against the head of the state himself. Thus, Hamid also shows how unchecked acts of violence inevitably lead to more instances of terrorism in the society.

The beheading of Rachel Boyd sets the stage for Ausi’s final encounter with the state authority. It enables him to register himself as a noticeable threat for the state and leaves “the president, embarrassed and humiliated in front of the world” (*TST* 281). The prominence allows him to gather more followers to be deployed later on for “wide and passionate destruction” (Bakunin 2005: 28). Due to his murder of the Englishwoman, Ausi becomes “a symbol of defiance against this puppet government and it’s puffed up president” (*TST* 281). The violent act serves as a means to recast him as symbol of anti-state resistance. He may not agree with the ideology of religious fanatics, yet his violence is successful in mobilizing them for his revolutionary cause. Although his plan to assassinate the president fails miserably, yet he is successful in winning an audience and that is what his revolutionary cause requires. His final attack on the president, the most important symbol of the state authority, is a meticulously organized one and consolidates his images as a strategist. The “pawn” that he uses for “the cause” is “a third year physics student” who is “a far more potent weapon than an illiterate Mehsud tribesman” (*TST* 282). He considers the whole operation to be a game of chess and believes that “a good chess player is always willing to sacrifice a pawn in order to kill the king” (282). Here, too, Ausi evidently considers himself hierarchically superior to the young student he exploits for the assassination. The inclination to use violence to ‘sacrifice a pawn’ imposes lower social status upon the militant youth in comparison to the king’. Therefore, while seeking to demolition of the current order of society, Ausi, in fact, seems to consolidate the hierarchical positioning of the state authority and the state subjects.

At the end of the novel, Omar Abassi comes to a somewhat partial understanding of the mechanisms of Ausi’s schematic mind. However, he is unable to fully grasp the trap that Ausi has set for him strategically, from the very beginning, to once again evade the police force. In the following lines, Ausi comments on the police’s inability to understand the motive that drives him towards destruction:

You ascribe all those motives to me, as if I was some kind of a common criminal, because as policewallahs, your minds cannot comprehend ideals that are beyond your limited intellect. You think people break the law because they are motivated by the money, desire or some other base emotion. I am no common criminal Superintendent. Your laws mean nothing to me. I am driven by a higher calling. (TST 294)

Ausi mocks the police institution's attempt to rationalize his violent resistance as "base" (TST 294) "criminality" (Gordon 83). His struggle is, in fact, an anarchist one that is "resistant to institutionalized organization (Gordon 83). The complete disregard of the legal state apparatus is one of the manifestations of his anarchist rebellion against authority. Furthermore, Ausi's violence against the state may be categorized as "structural violence" against the violence perpetuated by the state. Iadicola and Shupe define structural violence as harm caused "in the context of establishing, maintaining, extending or reducing the hierarchical ordering of categories of people in society" (qtd. in Gordon 90). From Ausi's view point, he commits the series of acts of structural violence to challenge uniform state authority. Ausi's escape from the prison after decapitating Abassi is significant to his violent struggle on two levels. Firstly, it illustrates his successful attempt to defy state authority by targeting a representative of 'RSA'. Secondly, it may be representative of his freedom from the "centuries-old prison called the state" (Bakunin 2005: 161). The prison, in this instance, may be taken as a symbol of the state itself. Thus, his final encounter with the state proves to be a successful one in the series of violent conflict against the state. Therefore, an anarchist interpretation of the instance reveals that Abassi's death may signify the eventual collapse of state domination in the face of continuous strategic violence.

On the contrary, the epilogue of the novel hints at the vicious cycle of violence Ausi intends to engage himself in. He plans a suicide bombing to kill the CID in-charge, Shahab, using Juman, his prison guard. He wishes to kill Shahab's entire family along with him for "much better publicity value" (299). Although he hopes to do it in order to teach the policemen a lesson for persecuting him, yet his violence, again, indiscriminately targets their families as well. This shows how his acts of violence have become a way to terrorize others rather than to fight state domination. Moreover, his desire to attain media attention

points out that he now uses violence primarily for the sake spreading terror in society. Malatesta points out that “terror, like war, . . . brings the worst elements of the people to the fore. Rather than help to defend the revolution it helps to discredit it” (63). In Ausi’s case, too, terror intended for revolutionary purpose seemingly discredits his violent tactics.

Furthermore, violence also seems to have a maddening effect on his psychology as it is revealed at the end of the novel that he actually killed his friend Eddy some years ago and pretended to write letters to himself. Although from an anarchist point of view, writing letters may be considered as a strategic move to escape police authority, yet killing his best friend seems to be a completely irrational act of violence. Consequently, Ausi’s use of violence seems to be an effective tool to challenge state authority but on the other hand, it also proves to have detrimental effects on himself as well as on the targeted society.

5.9 Conclusion

As my analysis shows, *The Spinner’s Tale* depicts the use of terrorist violence by anti-state individuals to limit state authority. More specifically, the text focuses on the social and economic injustices that force people to take up arms against the state. The novel illustrates how non-state actors strategize violence as a revolutionary tactic to obliterate centralized state authority in order to reorganize society along non-hierarchical structures. On the other hand, the text depicts the problematic nature of violence as a way to resist state authority as it consistently endangers innocent civilian life. Moreover, the use of violence to reconstruct society also seems to impose the revolutionary ideology of the anti-state elements on unwilling and non-consenting state subjects. As a result, violence by so-called revolutionaries oppresses the people they claim to liberate in the first place. In the next chapter, I conclude my discussion argument and discuss my findings.

Notes

¹. See Mikhail Bakunin, *God and the State*, (New York: Dover Publications, 1970). *God and the State*, Bakunin refers to Satan as “the first free thinker and emancipator of the world” (10) as it was he who taught Adam and Eve to challenge the authority of God. This, according to him, makes Satan the first anarchist in the world.

². See Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer*, (California: Stanford University Press, 1998).

³. Later in the novel, Hamid uses Ausi’s sodomy by a military man as a metaphor to show his political exploitation.

⁴. See Soeren Keil, *Multinational Federalism in Bosnia and Herzegovina*, (Routledge, 2016). Keil describes how the Vidovdan constitution formed a highly centralized state which would ensure Serb domination in the state and “discriminated against other nations in the first Yugoslav state” (64). For further reading on state violence against the Bosnian Muslims see pages 64 and 65.

⁵. Line of Control (LoC) refers to the military controlled border between the Indian and the Pakistani occupied parts of Jammu and Kashmir.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

I embarked upon this study with the basic premise that Omar Shahid Hamid's selected novels depict violence by anti-state elements in Pakistani society to have the potential to disrupt centralized state authority. I have sought to investigate the instances of subjective violence perpetrated by non-state actors claiming reconstruct society along non-hierarchical structures depicted in the selected novels. Moreover, this study has been concerned with highlighting the violence and repression that the state exercises through its repressive apparatuses in order to overcome the terrorist threats posed by the radicalized elements. While analyzing the novels, my thesis has also attempted to draw attention to the detrimental effects of the use of violence as a tool of resistance against the state since it greatly damages the fundamental structures of the society it claims to reorganize. Furthermore, I have discussed the profound repercussions of the use of anti-state violence on the economy as well as general stability of a country. More importantly, my main concern has been to explore how violence may also endanger the lives and freedom of the common people of the state depicted in fictional narratives of Omar Shahid Hamid.

While carrying out an analysis on the selected works, I have attempted to seek answers to my research questions with which I began this research in the first place. The questions have helped me direct my analysis more systematically, and have also kept the focus of the study in place. Firstly, I have been concerned with finding out how the selected texts highlight the increase of violence in Pakistani society after 9/11. Secondly, I have been interested to explore the multiple ways his characters carry out their resistance against the state apparatus. Thirdly, I have sought to investigate how different forms of authority corroborate with each other in the texts and to what effect. Keeping the research questions in mind, I have conducted the analysis on the selected texts from an anarchist perspective.

I have used Mikhail Bakunin's anarchist perspective as my theoretical lens to analyze the selected works. I find Bakunin's ideas about the use of violence and destruction as potent tools for social uprising against state authority to be useful to analyze the dynamics of violence in Hamid's text. His anarchist theory declares the role of government as a centralized, authoritative organization in society. It further highlights the violence perpetrated by the state itself to control and, subsequently, exploit its citizens perpetuate its own agenda. Bakunin considers the state to be an organization of oppression that actively promotes hierarchy and class division within society in order to ensure its own stability and hegemony. Therefore, he considers the abolition of state and its institutions through revolution essential to achieve freedom for its citizens. Most importantly, he advocates this revolution to be merciless and sanguinary in nature in order to be successful. Since I have been concerned to investigate the depiction of violence in Hamid's works, I have chosen Bakunin's theory of violent revolution to analyze my primary texts.

In the analysis of *The Prisoner*, I have been primarily concerned with the depiction of the 'RSA', a term used by Louis Althusser, in the novel to investigate the role of state institutions in dealing with the threats of political violence in Pakistani society. An anarchist reading of the text reveals how the repressive state apparatuses employ violence in order to maintain uniform state control over its subjects. I dedicate a major portion of my analysis to highlight the role of policemen as state's violent gendarmes, in perpetuating state's agenda. On the other hand, an anarchist perspective on the text also serves to highlight how Hamid's characters, including the state-employed citizens, rebel against the state authority using violence as a strategic tool. A detailed analysis of the novel also highlights the constant challenges posed to uniform state authority over its territory. It reveals that state hegemony gets continuously disrupted by dissident political entities with the acts of violence and terrorism. However, the nature of these violent challenges to state authority remains questionable as they prove to be destructive to the society in which they occur. The analysis also reveals that major victim of anti-state violence usually happen to be the proletariat as the ruling class largely remains unaffected by it. In other words, strategic use of violence may prove useful in restricting state domination, yet it may not be considered as an ideal tool to reconstruct society along a more classless structure.

My anarchist analysis of Hamid's second work *The Spinner's Tale* lets allows us to investigate the nature of terrorist violence in a much more elaborate fashion. Taking a departure from Hamid's first novel, this one lets the reader view violence as a strategy from the point of view of a terrorist, the central character of the novel. The text portrays how social and economic exploitation in a highly stratified society may contribute in propelling an individual on to the path of violence against the state. The protagonist of the text involves in a series of violent activities in attempts to challenge authority in all its forms. A detailed reading of the text illustrates that his aggression does not remain exclusive to the Pakistani state; On the contrary, he takes part in various acts of political terrorism to defy international power structures as well. However, the ultimate target of his violence remains the state at home as he believes it to be the root of all oppression in society. Moreover, the text draws attention to the role of state in instigating violence in society by promoting unequal power relations. An anarchist analysis of the text highlights how individual agency seems to be in constant opposition to repressive state authority. It also points out how the protagonist strategizes terrorist violence to oppose state authority and the exploitation it entails. In this thesis, I analyze how events of terrorist violence may prove to be a form of resistance against state domination. Nevertheless, they may not be considered ideal as they also prove to be harmful for the society in which they take place. I have already summarized the major points of my analysis of the selected texts, but I am now going to discuss each one of the findings under the following heading to make it more systematic for the readers of this study.

6.1 Findings

Since this study is exploratory and interpretive in nature, I have employed qualitative research methodology in it. Hence, the findings of this research are likely to be ungeneralizable. Keeping the research questions in mind, it may be noted that the primary texts display the dynamics of violence in Pakistani society while representing the state as one of the major perpetrators of political, economic and social exploitation. The selected work highlights the possibility of nexus between state exploitation and the rise in political violence in Pakistan. In other words, the selected novels illustrate how Pakistani state employs legalized violence and repression as effective tools to maintain unchallenged authority over its citizen, and this repression gives rise to violence by radicalized subjects

against the state. The two texts also show that the centralization of power in Pakistani society allows the state apparatus to carry out capitalist exploitation of the unprivileged governed majority on behalf of the ruling elite. Therefore, outbreaks of violence seem to occur as a reaction to unchallenged state authority.

Another important finding that I have reached at, and that is very much related to the first one, is that Hamid's selected fiction demonstrates a link between Pakistani state's support for the USA's military operations in Afghanistan as well as on its own territory, and the rise of terrorist violence. Pakistan, being an ally to the USA, appears to consolidate the USA's hegemonic control over the region by giving it access to the Pakistani territory to carry its operations specifically for its so-called 'war on terror'. The use of force through state institutions against its own subjects seems to instigate individuals to take up arms against their own state as a reaction. In this manner, in Hamid's novels terrorist activities seem to exert a restrictive-corrective influence on the state authority by employing violence as a tool of resistance. His works, then, present a peripheral counter-narrative to the USA's rhetoric of the 'war on terror' by mapping out anti-state violence by certain state subjects. On the contrary, after an anarchist analysis of anti-state violence in Hamid's novel, we find out the negative impact of the use of violence as a tool of resistance against the government. *The Prisoner* and *The Spinner's Tale* show that, in most cases, violence carried out by non-state actors primarily targets ordinary people and their private property instead of the ruling elite. In the way, the common citizens of society serve as scapegoats for the violent political entities for the demonstration of their power against the government. Therefore, political violence does not always serve to liberate people from state domination but rather subjugate them even more by subjecting them to violence and terrorism.

Moreover, while investigating the repercussions of the so-called reactionary violence, I have found out that the selected texts demonstrate how anti-state political parties employ violence as a way to secure economic interests in society. The use of force and coercion allows these political entities to control various sites of business. In this manner, they successfully extort monetary benefits from these businesses with the help of violent political influence. Therefore, economic exploitation of the powerless state subjects may be at work under the disguise of unchecked political violence by the dissident political elements in society.

Another significant finding of the foregoing analysis is that the use of terrorist violence by an individual seems to impose their will over all the other non-consenting citizens of the state. Hence, individual terrorism against the state appears to be highly dictatorial and goes against the anarchist ideals of human freedom as is apparent in the example of Ausi, the protagonist of *The Spinner's Tale*. Moreover, it may also be referred to as non-humanist as it gives superiority to the violent ideology of one human being over the lives and wills of other individuals. Keeping the third research question in mind, it may be noted that the character of Ausi also demonstrates how terrorist non-state elements in society use religio-political authority to achieve their personal goals. Donning the façade of religious zeal, such individuals incite hatred and violence against those citizens of state who disagree with their violent ideology. Therefore, Hamid's selected texts let us investigate how religious authority is misused by non-state actors to destabilize state authority.

In addition to the above-mentioned findings, the textual analysis of the two texts helps reveal how terroristic violence may prove to be regressive for society in general. Terrorism proves harmful for country in all walks of life namely, social, political, educational etc. It results not only in the loss of human life but also the destruction of infrastructure of a country. For a third-world country like Pakistan, it becomes particularly challenging to recover from the damages brought about by instances of terrorism given its limited resources. So instead of bringing revolution to the country, violence often seems to push it further into poverty and ignorance. Consequently, violence by non-state actors appears to cause more harm than good especially in the context of Pakistani society. Keeping the thesis statement of my study in mind, it may be noted that violence on the part of anti-state elements may indicate rebellion against unchallenged state domination. However, the use of violence and terrorism as a strategy to achieve a non-hierarchical society may not be considered beneficial as it destroys the very fabric of society it aims to reconstruct. An anarchist interpretation of Hamid's works opens up new discourse on violence perpetrated by individuals in comparison to the dominant Western discourse on the 'war on terror'. The current study is significant in nature because it generates discussion on dynamics of violence and terror with special reference to Pakistani fiction in English.

In view of the above-mentioned findings, I want to neatly sum up the strategies of violence used both by the state and the non-state players. Those strategies are as follow: The state and the anti-state agents use violence as a strategy for pandering to the capitalist machine. Moreover, non-state actors make use of violence as a strategy for dismantling the status quo. The state, on the other hand, employs the strategy of violence to iron out dissent. Both the state and the anti-state elements use violence as camouflage for ideology. Lastly, the non-state elements employ violence as a strategy to negate the dominant Western rhetoric of the ‘war on terror’. In view of my textual analysis and findings thereof, I am in a position to suggest recommendations to the upcoming researchers on Pakistani Anglophone literature.

6.2 Recommendations for further research

This study has enabled me to recommend to future researchers to explore Pakistani Anglophone literature from multiple perspectives. Just like his first two works, Hamid’s third novel, *The Party Worker*¹, also evinces anarchist tendencies and, therefore, researchers may be interested in carrying out an anarchist reading of the text. Moreover, in view of the Textual Analysis of *The Spinner’s Tale*, I am able to suggest an anarcho-feminist reading of the text (which I haven’t focused in my thesis) that explores the female representation as well as the protagonist’s relationship with women in the text. Furthermore, since Hamid’s work portrays economic relations and class struggle in Pakistani society, it would be useful to look at it from the Marxist perspective.

*The Wandering Falcon*² by Jameel Ahmad presents an insightful read as far as the relationship between periphery and the center (and the violence that it ensues in Pakistani society) is concerned. Hence, an anarchist reading of the novel may be in order. Similarly, Mohammed Hanif’s *A Case of Exploding Mangoes*³ deals with the accidental violent death of General Zia, former president of Pakistan. The novel also depicts the conflict between state repression and anti-state violent elements in Pakistani society. Therefore, I would recommend future scholars to investigate anarchist themes in this work.

Rafia Zakaria’s memoir, *The Upstairs Wife: An Intimate History of Pakistan*⁴, seems to shed light upon the role of dictatorship and the rise of violence in Pakistani society, especially Karachi. Hence, it would be interesting for researchers to explore

anarchist themes and tendencies in the author's work. Just as Zakaria foregrounds violence in Karachi in her work to highlight the relationship between state repression and terrorism, Bilal Tanweer's novel, *The Scatter Here Is Too Great*⁵, seems to present the dystopic image of Karachi and explore the nexus between violence and political agenda. Not only does the work represent events of terrorist violence that entangle the city but also makes an excellent example of city literature on Karachi. Thus, I would suggest to potential researchers to study the novel from an anarchist perspective in order to explore the relationship between state, violence and urban life in Pakistani society.

I hope that my thesis paves the way for other scholars on Pakistani Anglophone literature to explore anarchism in the works of Pakistani writers. Moreover, I expect more researchers to investigate Omar Shahid Hamid's novels from multiple perspectives in order to bring intricacies of his work to the fore. I am also hopeful that my recommendations prove to be useful in opening up new avenues of research on Pakistani literature in English.

Notes

-
- ¹. See Omar Shahid Hamid, *The Party Worker*, (New Delhi: Pan Macmillan India, 2017).
 - ². Jameel Ahmad, *The Wandering Falcon*, (Haryana: Penguin Books, 2011).
 - ³. Mohammed Hanif, *A Case Of Exploding Mangoes*, (New Delhi: Random House India, 2008).
 - ⁴. See Rafia Zakaria, *The Upstairs Wife: An Intimate History of Pakistan*, (New Delhi: Beacon Press Books, 2015).
 - ⁵. See Bilal Tanweer, *The Scatter Here Is Too Great*, (Noida: Random House India, 2013).

Works Cited

- Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer*. Stanford University Press, 1998.
- Amster, Randall. *Anarchism Today*. ABC-CLIO, 2012.
- Aras, Ramazan. *The Formation of Kurdishness in Turkey: Political Violence, Fear and Pain*. Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2013.
- Bakunin, Michael. *God and the State*. Dover Publications, 1970.
- Bakunin, Michael. "Letters to a Frenchman on the Present Crisis." In Sam Dolgoff, ed. 1971.183-224.
- Bakunin, Michael. *Statism and Anarchy*. Edited and Translated by Marshal S. Shatz, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Bell, Kathleen. "Ethel Mannin's Fiction and the Influence of Emma Goldman." In H. Gustav Klaus and Stephen Knight, eds. 2005.82-96.
- Belsey, Kathleen. "Textual Analysis as a Research Method." In Gabriele Griffin, ed. 2005. 157-74.
- Benton, Graham. "Riding the Interface: An Anarchist Reading of Gravity's Rainbow." *Pynchon Notes*, vol. 0, issue no. 42-3, 1998, pp. 152-166.
- Berkman, Alexander, and Emma Goldman. *The ABC of Anarchism*. Courier Corporation, 2005.
- Chomsky, Noam. *On Anarchism*. London: Penguin Books, 2014.
- Diken, Bulent. "From Exception to Rule: From 9/11 to the Comedy of (T)errors." *Irish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 15, issue no. 1, 2006, pp. 81-98.
- Dolgoff, Sam, ed. *Bakunin on Anarchy*. Vintage Books, 1971.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Blackwell Publishing, 1996.
- Escriba-Folch, Abel. "Repression, Political Threats, and Survival under Autocracy." *International Political Science Review*, vol. 34, issue no. 35, 2013, pp. 543-560.
- Farr, Roger. "Poetic Licence: Hugo Ball, The Anarchist Avant-Garde, and Us." In Jeff Shantz, ed. 2010. 15-28.
- Ferrell, Jeff. "Against the Law: Anarchist Criminology." *Thinking Critically About Crime*, edited by Brain Maclean, Collective Press, 1997.146-54.

- Geifman, Anna. "Statism and Anarchy: Mikhail Bakunin." *History of Political Ideas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. 453-4.
- Georgoulas, Stratos. *Critical Criminology of Leisure: Theory, Methodology and a Case Study*. London: LIT Verlag Munster, 2009.
- Goldman, Emma. *Anarchism and Other Essays*. Courier Corporation, 2012.
- Goldman, Emma. "Prisons: A Social Crime and Failure." *Anarchism and Other Essays*. Courier Corporation, 2012. 82-95.
- Goldman, Emma. "The Psychology of Political Violence." *Anarchism and Other Essays*. Courier Corporation, 2012. 60-81.
- Goodway, David. *Anarchist Seeds Beneath the Snow: Left-Libertarian Thought and British Writers From William Morris to Collin Ward*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2006.
- Gordon, Uri. *Anarchy Alive!: Anti-Authoritarian Politics from Practice to Theory*. London: Pluto Press, 2008.
- Griffin, Gabriele, ed. *Research Methods for English Studies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005.
- Guerin, Daniel. *Anarchism: From Theory to Practice*. Translated by Mary Klopper, NYU Press, 1970.
- Hamid, Omar Shahid. *The Prisoner*. New Delhi: Pan Macmillan India, 2013.
- Hamid, Omar Shahid. *The Spinner's Tale*. New Delhi: Pan Macmillan India, 2015.
- Hester, Diarmuid. "Queer Cryptograms, Anarchist Cyphers: Decoding Dennis Cooper's *The Marbled Swarm: A Novel*." *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, vol. 45, issue no. 2, 2012, pp. 95-112.
- Jackson, Elizabeth. "Choosing a Methodology: Philosophical Underpinning," *Practitioner Research in Higher Education Journal*, vol. 7, issue no. 1, 2013, pp. 49-62.
- Kanwal, Aroosa. *Rethinking Identities in Contemporary Pakistani Fiction: Beyond 9/11*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Keil, Soeren. *Multinational Federalism in Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Routledge, 2016.
- Khan, Sibghatullah. "Between Homes and Hosts: Life Narratives of South and

- Southeast Asian Diasporic Academic Women in America.” Dissertation, National University of Modern Languages, 2012.
- Kilroy, Richard James, ed. *Wiley Pathways Threats to Homeland Security: An All-Hazards Perspective*. John Wiley & Sons, 2007.
- Klaus, H. Gustav, and Stephen Knight, eds. *‘To Hell with Culture’: Anarchism and Twentieth-Century British Literature*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2005.
- Laclau, Ernesto. Foreword. *From Bakunin to Lacan: Anti-authoritarianism and the Dislocation of Power*, by Saul Newman, Rowan & Littlefield Publishers, 2001, vii.
- Lieberman, Max. “The Failure of Civilization from an Anarcho-Premitivist Perspective.” In Jeff Shantz, ed. 2010.31-60.
- Lenin Vladimir Il’ich, and Todd Chretien. *State and Revolution*. Haymarket Books, 2015.
- Makhno, Nestor Ivanovich, and Mike Jones. *The Anarchist Revolution*. Sydney: Jura Books, 1995.
- Malatesta, Errico. *The Anarchist Revolution: Polemical Articles 1924-1931*. London: Freedom Press, 1995.
- Mason, David T. *Caught in the Crossfire: Revolution, Repression, and the Rational Peasant*. Rowan & Littlefield Publishers, 2004.
- Marshall, Peter. *Demanding the Impossible: A History of Anarchism*. London: Harper Perennial, 2008.
- Mckee, Alan. “What is Textual Analysis?.” *Textual Analysis: A Beginner’s Guide*. SAGE, 2003, pp. 1-33.
- McLaughlin, Paul. *Anarchism and Authority: A Philosophical Introduction to Classical Anarchism*. Hamshire: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.
- McLaughlin, Paul. *Mikhail Bakunin: The Philosophical Basis of His Anarchism*. Algora Publishing, 2002.
- Misra, Kalpana. *From Post-Maoism to Post-Marxism: The Erosion of Official Ideology in Deng’s China*. London: Psychology Press, 1998.
- Nesson, Liam. “Anarchic Resistance and Bureaucratic Appeal: Edward Abbey, Wallace Stegner, and Literary Approaches to Environmental Defence.” In Jeff Shantz, ed. 2010.64-85.

- Newman, Saul. "Anarchism, Marxism and the Bonapartist State." *Anarchist Studies*, vol. 12, issue no. 1, 2004, pp. 36-59.
- Newman, Saul. *From Bakunin to Lacan: Anti-authoritarianism and the Dislocation of Power*. Rowan & Littlefield Publishers, 2001.
- Pound, Roscoe. *Interpretations of Legal History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Prakash, Gyan, ed. *Noir Urbanism: Dystopic Images of the Modern City*. Princeton University Press, 2010.
- Proudhon, Pierre-Joseph. *What is Property?*. Edited and Translated by Donal R. Kelly and Bonnie G. Smith, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Rignall, John. "Conrad and Anarchism: Irony, Solidarity and Betrayal." In H. Gustav Klaus and Stephen Knight, eds. 2005.11-20.
- Riley, Thomas Auraldo. *Germany's Poet-Anarchist John Henry Mackay: A Contribution to the History of German Literature at the Turn of the Century, 1880-1920*. Revisionist Press, 1972.
- Room, Donald, *What is Anarchism?: An Introduction*. PM Press, 2016.
- Sartwell, Crispin. *Against the State: An Introduction to Anarchist Political Theory*. SUNY Press, 2008.
- Shantz, Jeff, ed. *A Creative Passion: Anarchism and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010.
- Shantz, Jeff, ed. *Specters of Anarchy: Literature and the Anarchist Imagination*. Algora Publishing, 2015.
- Stanley, Elizabeth, and Jude McCulloch, eds. *State Crime and Resistance*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2012.
- Tambling, Jeremy, ed. *The Palgrave Handbook of Literature and the City*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Thompson, Debra. *The Schematic State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Ward, Collin. *Anarchy in Action*. London: Freedom Press, 1996.
- Worthington, Heather. "Identifying Anarchy in G. K. Chesterton's *The Man Who Was Thursday*." In H. Gustav Klaus and Stephen Knight, eds. 2005.21-34.
- Wardlaw, Grant. *Political Terrorism: Theory, Tactics and Counter-Measures*.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Yoder, John Howard. *When War is Unjust: Being Honest in Just-War Thinking*.

Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2001.

Zizek, Slavoj. *Violence: Six Sideways Reflections*. Picador, 2008.

