



EXPLORING RESISTANCE IN LITERATURE: AN INTRODUCTION

1. Dr Hina Tahir, Assistant Professor, MANUU, ASCW Satellite Campus Srinagar

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the multifaceted landscape of resistance literature, tracing its origin, defining its parameters and delineating its various types. It draws on a diverse array of literary works spanning different historical periods and cultural contexts. The study delves into fundamental concept of resistance literature and its role in challenging oppressive regimes and advocating social justice. The paper provides a comprehensive examination of its historical background and theoretical framework. It categorizes resistance literature into distinct types and distinguishes 'resistance literature' from that of 'resistance in literature'. It offers a nuanced understanding of resistance literature as a dynamic and transformative force in shaping discourses of power, resistance and social change.

Key words

Resistance, Rebellion, Struggle, Power, Hegemony, Oppression, Injustice, Counter-Narratives, Disobedience and Liberation.

I. RESISTANCE: DEFINITION

The Oxford Dictionary of English defines the word ‘resistance’ as “the use of force or violence to oppose something” and “the refusal to accept or comply something” (Soanes and Stevenson 1499). It is also defined as a “secret organization resisting authority, especially in an occupied country” (1499). The word ‘resistance’ is derived from the root-word *resiste*’re which means ‘to stand against’. According to Usha Bande it denotes a slow enduring strategical potential to ‘dislodge’ if not ‘dismantle’ the dominant structure (1). In *Contesting Power: Resistance and Everyday Social Relations in South Asia*, Douglas Haynes and Gyan Prakash look at resistance from various angles of gender, production relations, culture and the state and conclude that resistance is conditioned by a given culture (1). Resistance according to them is “non-confrontational” and “contestatory” and “constantly present in the behaviours, traditions and consciousness of the subaltern” with a power to “tear through the fabric of hegemonic forms” (1). Haynes and Prakash point out that resistance has drawn attention of scholars from various fields like history, sociology, political science, anthropology, literature, etc. (22). Taking into account the socio-cultural nature of resistance, these scholars believe in the indispensable relation between domination and power. Domination according to them gives rise to resistance which in turn emerges as a consequence of power play that it seeks to challenge. As such, domination and resistance are dependent and power is central to both. Although revolutionary and rebellious events and deeds are not constituents of resistance, they are believed to have the capacity to build

what Kenneth Frampton in his essay, “Towards a Critical Regionalism: Six Points for an Architecture of Resistance” calls “identity giving culture” (Natoli 311).

The question of ‘power’ has always been close to theorists and their theories. They attempt to define various positions - political, economic, historical, cultural and that concerning gender. These theorists visualise that the change in the existing condition leads to intersection of these discourses. For example, post-structuralism is a critique of historicism with emphasis on the injustice towards the marginalised. Similarly, post-colonialism represents a change in the power relations between the imperial masters and the colonial subjects. Hence, resistance becomes visible by the very idea of change. In other words, the idea of change has its basis in the ‘resistance consciousnesses’. Resistance calls into question the systems of representation and ‘institutionalized’ power. Power, be it in relation to the colonized, or gender, or the subaltern is fundamental to the understanding of oppression and injustice. In *Writing Resistance*, Usha Bande writes:

Resistance involves re-interpretation so as to bring the
marginalized into the center, it also recognises the need
to “hear voices” and give consideration to the dispossessed (1).

The writers of resistance manifest what Michel Foucault calls “reverse discourse” (101). He uses the term to show how the dominated or the subjugated discourse deploys the same language that consigns or dismisses it to speak for itself. These writers critique the existing power structures and at the same time reshape and re-inscribe its concepts.

II. ORIGIN

The term resistance was first applied by Ghassan Kanafani (Palestinian writer and critic) in his description of Palestinian literature as Resistance Literature. In *Literature of Resistance in Occupied Palestine: 1948-1966*, Kanafani presents literature as an 'arena of struggle' and gives an important distinction between literature written 'under occupation' and 'exile'. According to him the occupying power not only exiles and subjugates people but also intervenes in the literary and cultural development of the people it has dispossessed and whose land it has occupied. Kanafani wrote his study in 1966 when the literature produced in occupied Palestine was largely unknown outside the borders of Israel. His concern lies in documenting the existence and material conditions of production of Palestinian literature under Israeli occupation or what he calls a 'cultural siege'. These political conditions play an equally important role for a writer writing in exile. Kanafani observes that in both the cases the researcher feels a scarcity of material. Therefore, he believes that for complete research on Palestinian literature it is important that "the researcher is located within the resistance movement itself inside the occupied land, taking his testimony from the place in which it is born, lives and is propagated: the lips of the people (12)". He rejects any pretence to academic objectivity and lays emphasis on critical opinions from various critics of Resistance Literature. In referring to Palestinian literature as Resistance Literature Kanafani is writing within a specific historical context - that which resembles the resistance movements of late 1960s on part of countries like Africa, Middle East and other occupied and colonized countries for national liberation.

III. THEORETICAL AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

A significant corpus of literary writing has been produced by the colonized peoples in those areas of the world over which Western Europe and North America have sought economic and cultural control over centuries. This literature emerged as part of the organized national liberation struggles and resistance movements in Latin America, Africa and the Middle East. It presents an analysis of the political, ideological and cultural parameters of the struggle. This literature “not only demands recognition of its independent status and existence as literary production, but also presents a serious challenge to the codes and canons of both the theory and the practice of literature and its criticism as these have been developed in the West” (Harlow, xvi). The assertion at the centre of Resistance Literature is that literature represents an ‘arena of struggle’ for those people who seek liberation through armed fighting and struggles from oppressive colonialism. Moreover, this battle for historical and cultural control is no less crucial than the armed struggles. Amilcar Cabral, a leader of Guinea-Bissau liberation movement as well as liberation theorist (of Africa) believes that the national liberation of a people lies in regaining their history (Bande 154). By deconstructing the imperial domination, they not only return to history but rewrite it too. As such, the power of Resistance Literature lies in displacing the western literary and cultural studies and bringing about the change. As resistance movements rely on political and guerrilla elements to force governmental and civil change, literary elements help in liberation from cultural hegemony and domination. Resistance has become a much-used word not only in post-colonial discourses but in all the discussion of the ‘Third World’ politics. Movements of resistance to Empire were seen

before the Second World War but post 1947, when India got freedom, represents a high period of decolonization. After 1947, nearly forty countries became independent, until 1987, when the United Nations numbered one hundred sixty autonomous member states. The dismantling of Soviet Union in 1989 resulted in the emergence of further member states. Therefore, the second half of the twentieth century saw the ‘freeing and splintering’ of political entities. The historical struggles against European colonialism resulted in the emergence of new political and cultural actors on the World stage. The Third World arose as a coherent expression after the Bandung Conference of 1955 sponsored by the then Indian Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru. In the conference the non-aligned nations of the world were organized as a political body. Nationalists took a confrontational approach ever than before which resulted in the demise of empires of Britain, France, etc. By the mid-1950s the decolonization movement, which had begun with demands of constitutional change before the war had gathered into an unstoppable force, an angry global wave in opposition to the colonial rule. There were outright violent oppositions. In decolonizing nations especially in African countries like Ghana, Kenya and in Algeria, the call was for freedom in the broadest sense. It meant nation-state independence in politics and control over productive resources in economics. The force behind this was an aggressive disobedience, opposition and struggle for liberation. The history of Third World as divided by La Gorce in three major periods summarizes these struggles. The first period extends from the Vietnamese victory against French in 1954 to Algerian independence in 1962, marked by events like ‘Suez Canal Crisis’ in 1956. The second period saw the success of many national liberation movements. This began with the Cuban Revolution in 1959 and

culminated with the fall of Saigon in 1975. African countries got independence in quick success. Ghana (1957), Nigeria (1960), Tanzania (1961), Algeria (1962), Kenya (1963), Zambia (1964), Trinidad, Jamaica and Tobago got independence in 1962, Barbados in 1966, Guinea-Bissau in 1974 and Mozambique and Angola in 1975. In the meantime, June War was fought between Israel and Egypt in 1967. The Arab-Israel October War of 1973 and the fall of Beirut to Israeli forces in 1982 frame the third period.

Resistance Literature plays an important role in these struggles. It is used for the genre of oppositional writing meant to protest the existing situation to allow empowerment. As such, Resistance Literature is currently imposing a review of what is understood by “literature” and “literary studies” (Harlow 4). This lead the historian of peasant wars, Eric Wolf to claim that the “European history must be re-written to include the people without history” (4). This history according to Jacques Berque will be the history of decolonization (2). According to Peter Worsley the ‘colonial relationship’ was a relationship between different societies who had their own cultural and social institutes with their internal differences. He believes that:

Histories of colonialism written by imperialists ignore one
of these terms: history is the story of what the White man did.
Nationalist historiography has developed a contrary myth: a
legend of “national” resistance which omits the uncomfortable
fact of collaboration (4).

For the writers and theorists of Resistance Literature and struggle, culture and cultural production plays an important role in activating what Edward Said (*Orientalism Reconsidered*) calls ‘repressed’ or ‘resistant history’ (1). Just as Kanafani makes distinction between literature written under ‘exile’ and ‘occupation’, Kenyan writer and critic Ngugi Wa Thiong’o presents a different set of categories. In his essay “Literature in Schools” in *Writers in Politics: A Re-engagement with Issues of Literature and Society*, he puts forth two “opposing aesthetics” in literature - “the aesthetics of oppression and exploitation and of acquiescence with imperialism and that of human struggle for total liberation” (38). The essay was written as part of the violent debate after the working committee that had been assigned the job to re-examine the syllabus for schools presented its report. Earlier Ngugi addressed four main issues that confront the Kenyan educational system. These issues were regarding the relevance and adequacy of educational system, decision makers, the staff and the approaches to literature. He contests the conventional division of literature into various genres like novel, sonnet, etc. as elaborated by Western critics. He proposes an organisation of literary categories which participates in the process of resistance to domination and subjugation.

These varied challenges depending on the needs of historical movement on part of writers like Kanafani, Ngugi and others show a collective opposition and resistance not only to cultural imperialism but also to economic and political domination that it accompanied. In *Resistance Literature* Harlow writes:

The writers and critics writing within the context of

organized resistance movements comprehend the role of

culture and cultural resistance as part of the larger struggle

for liberation (10).

Cabral believed that armed struggles for liberation put forth the essence of African culture. Frantz Fanon believed that the nationalistic struggle should aim not only on complete national autonomy but social and political transformations as well in order to produce a change. Fanon's characterization of resistance was more influential in African and Caribbean countries than in India. The Africans and Caribbeans took up the call to include literature as a moving spirit in their nationalistic struggles. Kanafani too felt the integral relationship between armed resistance and Resistance Literature. In his second study of literature of occupied Palestine he wrote:

If resistance springs from the barrel of a gun, the gun itself

issues from the desire for liberation and that desire for liberation

is nothing but the natural, logical and necessary product of

resistance in its broadest sense: as refusal and as a firm grasp

of roots and situations (13).

Kanafani believes that the cultural form of resistance is as important as armed resistance itself. Sandra Pouchet Paquet in "The Political Novelist and his Revolutionary Aesthetics" writes that George Lamming considers

that creative literature has a potential to liberate while Ngugi believes that the pen might do the work of a gun (qtd. in Boehmer 176).

Kanafani and Cabral were assassinated by the imperialistic government that they were opposing. They were both fighting from the barrel of pen for political and economic liberation of their people. Their deaths point out to the importance of cultural resistance as well as Resistance Literature. Ngugi was arrested and detained without a trial as his writings were considered aggressive and anti-government by the neo-colonial regime in Kenya. Therefore, Resistance Literature is a political activity. It gets involved in a struggle against dominant forms of 'ideological' and 'cultural' production. However, the resistance movements that deal with the oppression and subjugation of people from the policies of imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, under development, etc. sometimes fail to acknowledge the limitations of their own historical role. In his Introduction to *People Without Country: the Kurds and Kurdistan*, Maxime Rodinson points out the dangers of monolithic and uncritical view of the resistance movements and struggles. Although resistance movements represent a struggle against hegemonic dominance and oppression they are not without contradictions. However, these self-critical controversies (as pointed by Rodinson) play an important role in sustaining these movements and a struggle for cultural domination. In *Resistance Literature*, Harlow argues that it is important that the national liberation organizations and resistance movements assume their part in the process of decolonization. She believes that it is also required that such movements are not confined by First World imagination. Harlow thinks that; "The dynamics of debate in which the cultural politics of resistance are engaged

challenge both the monolithic historiographical practices of domination and the unidimensional responses of dogma to them” (30).

Harlow’s *Resistance Literature* (1987) is a foundational text in the field of post-colonial studies that calls for a more serious consideration of the previously ignored Third World texts. It demands that the Western literary critics abandon the mantle of neutrality and objectivity in favor of a methodology that takes into account the social, political and historical circumstances of these works. Harlow introduced to the West the political role of literature in armed struggle. Her study includes the body of literature from Africa, America and Asia - the countries that were engaged in armed struggles for liberation. She elaborates that these countries have fought against the socio-economic control and cultural domination of the West. Apart from this they have produced a significant corpus of literary writing, both narrative and poetic, as well as a broad spectrum of theoretical analysis of the political, ideological and cultural parameters of this struggle (Harlow xvi). She builds her argument by looking at works of many writers such as Roque Dalton, Julio Cortazar, Akhtar Baluch and others. Her discussions of resistance poetry, resistance narratives, prison memoirs and post-independence texts shows “the diversity and scope” of this body of work. In her discussion of resistance poetry Harlow shows those cultural and literary traditions that the Third World peoples have lost due to the military, economic and political intervention of the First World. She shows how this poetry acts as a force for mobilizing a collective response to occupation and domination and how it helps to reclaim the ‘historical personality’ of the

people. Resistance narratives according to her further analyse these power relations which sustain the system of domination and exploitation. Narratives are also able to present and analyse the role of past in present and this analysis is used to find new ways to resist “the present and the future” (82). She shows how the prison memoirs expose and challenge the social structures that underlie the prison system by recording the brutality that takes place within the walls of the prison. Prison memoirs of resistance writers show the desire of the government to silence resistance. Harlow then shows the failure of the utopian goals and visions that were expressed by the leaders of the resistance movements. She argues that Resistance Literature must critique and create workable strategies for achieving the utopian goals. Resistance Literature cannot be detached from the political reality of these struggles. These works are fully part of the historical situations within which they are forged and to read this literature otherwise is to offer an incomplete interpretation. Therefore, Harlow’s *Resistance Literature* problematizes the persistent continuation of liberation movements in which literature becomes an ‘arena of struggle’ against domination, hegemony and oppression.

IV. RESISTANCE LITERATURE AND RESISTANCE IN LITERATURE

Although there is a subtle difference between Resistance Literature and ‘Literary Resistance’, Harlow does not distinguish between the two. The distinction is clarified by Usha Bande in *Writing Resistance: A Comparative Study of the Selected Novels by Women Writers* as:

‘Resistance Literature’ stands for definitive texts, which examine the relationship between literature, and Third World Liberation movements, whereas ‘literary resistance’ is contestatory in nature and it is used for a genre of oppositional writing, a writing meant not only to protest but also to materially and conceptually change the existing situation to allow empowerment... literary resistance though marked by a profound struggle with power, is never a linear narrative of victimization (4-5).

Bande questions the compatibility of Barbara Harlow’s model of resistance literature to India. She says that Harlow has given a passing reference to India. The case of India has been discussed only twice. While discussing *A Passage to India* Harlow writes that the Indian character is seen as ‘peripheral’ by the Western critics. As such, these critics consider the natives as insignificant and push them to the back ground. She sees both ‘cultural imperialism’ of the British through the system of education as well as the resistance to it as a “critical part of geo-political strategy and confrontation” (Harlow 20). These instances, according to Bande, “do not approximate to the existence of resistance literature in India” (5). India’s struggle for independence generated intellectual inspiration for Indian writers. During the freedom struggle a body of literature - prose, poetry, fiction, songs, etc. emerged articulating resistance against the British imperialism. These writers felt a need to remake their histories and reclaim their voices in order to change the material and social reality and produce resistance. This literature was influenced by leaders like Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi who ad-

vocated passive resistance and revolutionaries like Bal Gangadhar Tilak who rejected Gandhi's means and believed in self-upliftment and self-empowerment. Ashis Nandy in *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self Under Colonialism* analyses the works of Gandhi, Rudyard Kipling, Sri Aurobindo and Rabindranath Tagore to illustrate with "ethical universalism and spiritualism" that the Indians not only coped with but also resisted the colonial oppression.

Bande believes that the later politico-historical events: the independence, partition, partition violence, 1984 riots after the assassination of Indira Gandhi, the Ayodha issue, communal tension, Gujarat problems, etc and such other problems have given rise to strong resentment and resistance. Her *Writing Resistance: A Comparative Study of the Selected Novels by Women Writers* bears no resemblance to Harlow's model of resistance. Bande examines nine contemporary novels by Indian women writers and through a close reading of these novels shows variegated pictures of resistance. She draws on the theories of feminist resistance, resistance operative during the anti-colonial struggle and subaltern resistance and traces the inter-connection between gender, cultural practices and the western influences on Indian social system. Recognition of resistance in these texts helps us locate the implicit urges of women to re-define their 'self' and to survive not in object passivity but with dignity.

By reading Harlow and Bande one can understand that both have a belief in literature's inherent capacity to 'resist'. Resistance in literature is essentially marked by the imperatives of saying 'No'. This literature insists on rethinking the past in order to eliminate the traditional hegemonic basis that 'obstruct' the identity of

subaltern groups, blacks, refugees, women, colonized people, etc. and gives impetus to resistance. Thus, there exists a resistance to hegemony. This is even overt and vocal but fundamental union between the armed struggles and culture as put forth by Harlow is not always perceptible. For example, there is anger, protest and frustration which are born out of the helplessness of situation in many works on peasants, working classes, etc. (like Gurdial Singh's *Marhi da Diva*) but these are not born out of any unified struggle for freedom or liberation. In *Kanthapura* Raja Rao raises questions of caste and untouchability in a convincing manner through Moorthy who exemplifies the Gandhian principles of Ahimsa. Although the text fights against the forces of oppression, class-caste bias, communalism etc., it is different from texts like Kanafani's *On Men and Gun* and Ngugi's *Petals of Blood* where gun serves as a means to analyse the social relations and structures of power and exploitation of society.

V. VIOLENT AND NON-VIOLENT MODES OF RESISTANCE IN LITERATURE

The practice of resistance has always been consciously divided into violent and non-violent strategies. Resistance can involve terrorism as well as social activism. In anti-colonial struggles itself this distinction is very well formulated in terms of violence or armed struggle versus what Daniel O'Connell called 'moral force', Gandhi Satyagraha and Kwame Nkrumah 'non-violent action' (Stegar 10-11). The contemporary tradition of civil disobedience or resistance that can be found in the civil rights movements, the anti-apartheid movement, the campaign for nuclear disarmament, the global anticapitalism movements, etc., "is for the most part the heir of the non-violent tradition of anti-colonial movements", which themselves drew on the examples

and practices of old transnational social movements such as the Anti-Slave Trade campaign and the Suffragette movement (Young 49). This tradition is mostly identified with the figure of Gandhi who was its most successful proponent and also the man who placed the question of ethics central to anti-colonial resistance.

Gandhi managed to re-establish non-violent resistance in the 20th century despite the success of Irish independence in 1916 and Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. His mode of resistance was not only well known but most effective form until the Cuban Revolution of 1959. Martin Luther King's role in the Civil Rights Movement in the late 1950s and early 1960s is well known. His philosophy of non-violence brought a new perspective to the Civil Rights Movement of the Afro-Americans. The Nobel Peace Prize in 1964 is a vindication of his faith and belief in non-violence. King was arguably Black America's and America's most outstanding leaders of this century. In *Stride Toward Freedom* (1958), he gives an expression to his philosophy of non-violence and how he came to the conclusion that non-violence is the only sensible and feasible course the African-American must take in achieving his civil rights. He describes his 'intellectual pilgrimage' to the philosophy of non-violence in one of the chapters, "Pilgrimage to Non-Violence". He writes of being fascinated by Henry David Thoreau's *Essay on Civil Disobedience* as well as Rauschenbusch's *Christianity and the Social Crisis* but in Gandhi he found a new way to confront social evils. Gandhi was to influence him like no other person did. He found in Gandhi and his philosophy what he could not find in Karl Marx, Friedrich Nietzsche, Henry David Rousseau, Vladimir Lenin, Jeremy Bentham, and Thomas Hobbes. He felt that the Gandhian philosophy of non-violence "was morally and practically sound method open to oppressed people in

their struggle for freedom” (ibid 97). He points out that non-violence is the only option that can lead the African-Americans to their cherished goals and turned all other ways to be “impractical and immoral” (ibid 213). *Why We Can't Wait* (1963) continues this commentary on non-violence and its implication as the best way of resistance. It is not only a book about the Civil Rights Movement in 1963 but also about King's part in Birmingham Campaign. The book contains the letters that he wrote in the Birmingham jail. He writes about the campaign and justifies his actions at Birmingham. He also writes about the timing of the campaign, the course of action adopted the justification of breaking the laws and the disenchantment over the role of the church, the espousing of the philosophy of non-violence and the need for resistance against the racist segregation in the United States. His non-violent way of protest and resistance is well known throughout the world today and its success evident in the Afro-Americans enjoying all rights at par with the whites in the United States. Barack Obama as the president of the United States is a living example of this success. King's belief in ending the injustice is clear in *Why We Can't Wait* where he writes:

I cannot sit idly... and not be concerned about what happens...

injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We

are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in

a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly,

affects all indirectly. Never again can we afford to live with

the narrow, provincial, 'outside agitator' idea. Anyone who

lives inside the United States can never be considered an outsider anywhere within its bounds (78-79).

King calls the year, 1963 as the year of Negro social revolution. His non-violent movement rocked the entire United States with protest marches, demonstrations and sit-ins; voter registration drives by various civil rights organizations across the South and the growing popularity of Islam and of Malcolm X which eventually led to the passing of the historic 1964 Civil Rights Act.

King is not the only proponent of the non-violent modes of resistance. The strength of the Gandhian method of non-violence and its influence can be seen in the agonised moment in which the African National Conference, which remained committed to Gandhian ways, announced in 1961 that it has changed its method of resistance from non-violent to violent means. The post-colonial South Africa owes much to the long tradition of commitment to ethical non-violent forms of politics, even in the face of unethical oppressive practices. Such tradition of protest was common in literature as well. For example, *The Man Died* by Wole Soyinka is a written record of protest and resistance as a spiritual and moral force. It deals with three hunger strikes that Soyinka took in prison to resist the inhuman behaviour given to him. Dennis Brutus, South African poet and activist, grew up in South Africa at a time when Gandhi's impact was much alive. In his *Letters to Martha and Other Poems from a South African Prison* Dennis Brutus himself acknowledges such an impact when he states:

I grew up engaged with the quest of social justice for the

exploited, which animates my activism in sport, poetry and
academia and motivates my mission against apartheid, racism
and injustice to help create a world where “pain will be quiet,
the prisoned free/ and wisdom sculpt justice from the world’s/
jagged mass” (20).

Brutus was determined to fight for a non-racial, democratic South Africa based on the principle of ‘one person one vote’. He fought against the injustices of apartheid in South Africa by adopting Gandhian method of non-violence. He founded South African Sports Association as a non-racial sports organization and ran a campaign for the exclusion of South Africa from the arena of international sports. His efforts bore fruit when South Africa and Southern Rhodesia were expelled from 1964 Olympic Games. He was arrested and imprisoned many a times for his actions and was sent to Robben Island where he broke stones with Nelson Mandela, Walter Sisulu and Ahmad Kathrada” (Narang 21). Although he was prohibited to write any publishable material in jail, he found a device of writing his poems in the form of letters to his sister-in-law which were published in 1968 as *Letters to Martha*. The purpose of these letters as Brutus writes in *Letters to Martha from a South African Prison* was:

Partly to wrench some ease for my own mind.

And partly that some world sometime may know (26).

His first book of poems *Sirens Knuckles Boots* was published prior to *Letters to Martha* in 1962. *Poems from Algiers* and *Thoughts from Abroad* represent the phase of his life when he was exiled from South Africa like those of Alex La Guma, Bessie Head, Arthur Nortje and many others in 1966. Brutus' spirit of protest and resistance is reflected not only in these works but almost in all his writings. For example in his poem, "At a Funeral" which was composed after Valencia Majombozi died shortly after qualifying as a doctor, Brutus writes:

Oh all you frustrate ones, powers tombed in dirt,

Aborted, not by Death but carrion books of birth

Arise! The brassy shout of Freedom stirs our earth;...

Better that we should die, than that we should lie

down (Narang 25).

In opposition to the Gandhian method, the other tradition of anti-colonial struggle usually associated with Frantz Fanon is that of violence. In "Concerning Violence" Fanon argued that just as colonialism was established by violence, so must de-colonization always be a violent phenomenon. He also makes a subtle argument that in a situation of oppression it is ethically justified to employ violence as a mode of resistance. The strength of Gandhian tradition of non-violence had disempowered the Leninist view in Fanon's time. In *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction* Robert J.C Young writes that:

Fanon was...responsible for turning the tide and shifting the

primacy of the anti-colonial tradition and political practice from

the Gandhian one to violent one of the FLN in Africa” (54).

This mode of resistance has been adapted over the years from its origin in Algeria to the centres of struggle in the East particularly Palestine and Egypt as well as in struggle of Polisario Front and Sahrawi, people against the forces of the king of Morocco. Resistance writers continue to draw from both Gandhi and Fanon to articulate the resistance movements of their people be it violent or non-violent.

VI. CONCLUSION

The writers make the unequal power relation visible with the goal of ending it. They not only interrogate the past but the ongoing legacies of European domination in order to undo them. As the Western intellectual enterprise is fundamentally dependent on Europe's conquest and exploitation of the colonial world, the post-colonial resistance would be pointless as a mere intellectual enterprise. The resistance writers question the violence of colonialism accompanied with cultural interaction and attempt to frame explanations of it as well as provide alternative models of accommodation. Definitions of identity and belonging, inclusion and exclusion, rights and entitlements are posited for specific situational reasons. Resistance writers examine these reasons empirically and theoretically as well as recognise the fact that world ensembles both historical and regional processes and that particular times and places cannot be separated to seek to bring the change. Literature is a tool in the contest against the European domination. Resistance in literature demands to expose the

power domination that condoned the world to crisis. The relationship between literature and political struggles is much more specific, direct and functional. Selwyn R. Cudjoe believes that:

In literature, caught up in the struggle, words must be like
bullets, sharp, straight and to mark. To miss is literally to
lose one's life in the process(64).

Therefore, the writer's role is to reinterpret the world and accompany the broader programme of political resistance. Resistance in literature, as such, has transformative capacities.

References:

Bande, Usha. *Writing Resistance: A Comparative Study of the Selected Novels by*

Women Writers. Shimla: IAS, 2006. Print.

Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors*. 2nd ed.

New York Oxford UP, 2005. Print.

Brutus, Dennis. "At a Funeral". *Mightier than Machete*. Ed. Harish Narang. New

Delhi: Indian Council for Cultural Relation, 1995. Print.

---. *Letters to Martha and Other Poems from a South African Prison*. London:

Heinemann, 1981. Print.

---. "Today in Prison". *Poets to the People: South African Freedom Poems*. London:

Allen, 1980. Print.

Cudjoe, Selwyn R., *Resistance and Caribbean Literature*. Athens: Ohio University

Press, 1980. Print.

Harlow, Barbara. *Resistance Literature*. New York: Methuen, 1987. Print.

---. Interview with Betsy Esch and Nancy Coffin. *On Literature and Resistance*.

<<http://www.solidarity-us.org/site/node/1835>>. Retrieved on 22 Nov 2012.

Haynes, Douglas, and Gyan Prakash. *Contesting Power: Resistance and Everyday*

Social Relations in South Asia. Delhi: Oxford, 1991. Print.

Kanafani, Ghassan. *Literature of Resistance in Occupied Palestine: 1948-1966*.

(1966).Trans. Barbara Harlow. Beirut: Institute for Arab Research, 1982, Print.

---. *Palestinian Resistance Literature Under Occupation: 1948-1968*. Trans. Barbara

Harlow. Beirut: Institute for Arab Research, 1981. Print.

King, Martin Luther. *Stride Toward Freedom* (1958). San Francisco: Harper, 1986.

Print.

---. *Why We Can't Wait*. San Francisco: Harper, 1964. Print.

Nandy, Ashis. *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self Under Colonialism*.

New Delhi: Oxford, 1983. Print.

Stegar, Manfred B. *Gandhi's Dilemma: Nonviolent Principles and Nationalist*

Power. New York: St. Martin, 2000. Print.

Young, Robert. J.C. *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. Oxford:

Blackwell, 2001. Print.