JOURNAL FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE STUDIES
An International Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal

ISSN (Online): 3006-2071 | ISSN (Print): 3006-2063
Volume 4 • Issue 2 • June 2026

FROM SUBALTERN SILENCE TO NATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS: RE-READING FANON AND SPIVAK IN POSTCOLONIAL NATION-BUILDING

Wardah Ahmad[1], Turs Mohi Ud Din[*2], Shahan Pervez[3]

[*1]*Lecturer at CASTECH, University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan.*
[2]*Lecturer at Department of English and Literary Studies, University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan.*
[3]*Lecturer at Department of English, Forman Christian College (A Chartered University), Lahore, Pakistan.*

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22916277

Keywords
Frantz Fanon, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, national consciousness, subalternity, postcolonial nation-building, representation.

Article History
Received: 01 April 2026
Accepted: 17 June 2026
Published: 30 June 2026

Copyright @Author

Corresponding Author: *
Turs Mohi Ud Din

Abstract

The relationship between postcolonial nation-building and the representation of marginalized voices remains a significant concern in postcolonial studies. While Frantz Fanon views national consciousness as a product of psychological decolonization and collective resistance, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak questions the inclusivity of nationalist projects by exposing the persistent silencing of subaltern voices. Although scholars have extensively examined Fanon's theories of race and liberation and Spivak's concept of subalternity, limited attention has been given to the intersection of these frameworks in discussions of nation-building. This study undertakes a comparative textual analysis of Fanon's Black Skin, White Masks (1952) and Spivak's "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (1988) to explore the tensions between national consciousness and subaltern agency. It argues that while Fanon emphasizes collective empowerment through psychological decolonization, Spivak reveals the exclusions embedded within nationalist discourse. The study contends that postcolonial nation-building involves not only the recovery of collective identity but also the negotiation of representation, voice, and inclusion. By placing Fanon and Spivak in dialogue, this article offers a nuanced understanding of the possibilities and limitations of postcolonial nation-building.

INTRODUCTION

The twentieth century witnessed the political dismantling of European colonial empires across Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean; however, the end of formal colonial rule did not signify the end of colonial domination. Rather, colonialism left behind enduring political, cultural, and psychological structures that continued to shape the realities of formerly colonized societies. Consequently, the question of decolonization became more complex than the mere attainment of national independence. Postcolonial theorists increasingly argued that the liberation of colonized nations required not only political sovereignty but also the recovery of indigenous identities, histories, cultures, and modes of representation. Within this context, postcolonial literature and theory emerged as crucial sites for examining the relationship

JOURNAL FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE STUDIES
An International Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN (Online): 3006-2071 | ISSN (Print): 3006-2063
Volume 4 • Issue 2 • June 2026

between colonial oppression and the formation of national consciousness.

The concept of national consciousness occupies a central position in postcolonial discourse because it addresses the process through which colonized populations transform themselves from fragmented subjects into self-aware political communities. National consciousness functions as a collective realization of shared historical experiences, cultural identities, and political aspirations. For many anti-colonial thinkers, the development of such consciousness represented an essential step toward dismantling colonial power structures and constructing independent nations. Literature, therefore, became more than a medium of artistic expression; it evolved into a political and intellectual instrument through which colonized peoples could challenge imperial narratives and reclaim their collective identities. As Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin observe, postcolonial writing seeks to contest colonial representations by recovering voices, histories, and cultural experiences that had been marginalized within imperial discourse (Ashcroft, 2002). Among the most influential theorists of decolonization, Frantz Fanon remains a foundational figure whose writings continue to shape contemporary understandings of colonialism, race, and national liberation. In *Black Skin, White Masks* (1952), Fanon investigates the psychological consequences of colonial domination and argues that colonialism operates not only through political and economic control but also through the internalization of racial inferiority. According to Fanon, the colonized subject is compelled to perceive himself through the gaze of the colonizer, resulting in a fractured identity characterized by alienation, self-negation, and cultural displacement (Fanon 82–90). The colonial encounter produces a condition in which indigenous cultures are systematically devalued while European values become universal standards of civilization, rationality, and progress. Consequently, Fanon views psychological decolonization as a necessary prerequisite for genuine liberation. The colonized must first reject the internalized assumptions of colonial discourse before they can develop a collective consciousness capable of sustaining nationhood.

While Fanon's work is often associated with revolutionary nationalism and anti-colonial resistance, his understanding of national consciousness is fundamentally rooted in the recovery of agency among colonized peoples. For Fanon, colonialism succeeds by convincing the oppressed of their own inferiority; therefore, the process of nation-building begins with the rejection of colonial categories of knowledge and identity. National consciousness emerges when formerly colonized individuals recognize themselves as active participants in history rather than passive objects of imperial representation. As Fanon later argues in *The Wretched of the Earth*, decolonization is ultimately a process of creating "new men" capable of transforming both themselves and their societies (36). Although scholars frequently discuss this notion in relation to Fanon's later political writings, its psychological foundations are already present in *Black Skin, White Masks*.

In contrast to Fanon's emphasis on collective agency and liberation, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak introduces a more critical and skeptical perspective regarding the possibility of representation within postcolonial discourse. In her influential essay "*Can the Subaltern Speak?*" (1988), Spivak interrogates the structures through which knowledge about marginalized populations is produced and circulated. She argues that the subaltern, those individuals occupying the most marginalized positions within social and political hierarchies, remains largely excluded from systems of representation. Even when intellectuals attempt to recover subaltern voices, they often reproduce the very structures of power they seek to challenge because they continue speaking on behalf of the marginalized rather than enabling them to speak for themselves (Spivak, 1988). Consequently, Spivak complicates optimistic narratives of national liberation by drawing attention to the exclusions embedded within projects of collective identity.

Spivak's intervention raises important questions regarding the assumptions underlying

JOURNAL FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE STUDIES
An International Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN (Online): 3006-2071 | ISSN (Print): 3006-2063
Volume 4 • Issue 2 • June 2026

nationalist discourse. If national consciousness requires the construction of a collective identity, who determines the boundaries of that identity? Whose voices are included within the nation, and whose experiences remain marginalized? While Fanon envisions national consciousness as a liberatory force capable of overcoming colonial fragmentation, Spivak warns that such projects may inadvertently silence the very groups they claim to represent. Women, indigenous communities, lower-class populations, and other marginalized subjects often remain absent from dominant narratives of nationhood despite their participation in anti-colonial struggles. Thus, the transition from colonial oppression to national consciousness is neither straightforward nor universally inclusive.

The tension between Fanon's optimism regarding collective liberation and Spivak's skepticism concerning representation reveals a significant theoretical debate within postcolonial studies. Existing scholarship has extensively examined Fanon's theories of psychological decolonization and Spivak's concept of subalternity as separate intellectual projects. Fanon has frequently been studied in relation to race, violence, identity formation, and anti-colonial nationalism, whereas Spivak's work has primarily been analyzed through questions of discourse, representation, gender, and epistemic violence. However, comparatively little attention has been devoted to examining how these theoretical frameworks intersect in discussions of postcolonial nation-building. In particular, there remains a need to investigate whether Fanon's model of national consciousness adequately addresses the concerns raised by Spivak regarding the silencing of subaltern voices.

This article seeks to address that gap by placing Fanon and Spivak in direct theoretical dialogue. Rather than viewing their perspectives as mutually exclusive, the study argues that both thinkers illuminate different dimensions of the postcolonial condition. Fanon's work demonstrates the necessity of psychological decolonization for the development of collective agency, whereas Spivak exposes the limitations and exclusions that may emerge within nationalist projects. Together, their theories reveal that postcolonial nation-building is simultaneously a process of empowerment and contestation, involving both the recovery of collective identity and the continual negotiation of marginalized voices.

By re-reading Fanon through Spivak and Spivak through Fanon, this study contends that national consciousness cannot be understood solely as a unified expression of anti-colonial resistance. Instead, it must be examined as a complex and contested process shaped by questions of representation, agency, voice, and power. Such an approach contributes to contemporary postcolonial scholarship by demonstrating that the movement from subaltern silence to national consciousness remains one of the most significant and unresolved challenges within postcolonial nation-building.

Research Objectives

The primary objective of this study is to examine the relationship between subaltern agency and national consciousness through a comparative analysis of Frantz Fanon and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak.

The specific objectives are:

1. To analyze Fanon's concept of psychological decolonization and its role in the formation of national consciousness.
2. To examine Spivak's theory of subalternity and her critique of representation within postcolonial discourse.
3. To investigate the similarities and differences between Fanon's and Spivak's approaches to agency, voice, and liberation.
4. To evaluate the extent to which Fanon's model of national consciousness addresses the concerns raised by Spivak regarding subaltern exclusion.
5. To demonstrate how the dialogue between Fanon and Spivak contributes to a more nuanced understanding of postcolonial nation-building.

JOURNAL FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE STUDIES
An International Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN (Online): 3006-2071 | ISSN (Print): 3006-2063
Volume 4 • Issue 2 • June 2026

Research Questions

1. How does Frantz Fanon conceptualize psychological decolonization as a prerequisite for national consciousness?
2. How does Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's notion of subalternity challenge dominant narratives of national identity and representation?
3. What points of convergence and divergence exist between Fanon's theory of national consciousness and Spivak's theory of subaltern agency?
4. To what extent can Fanon's vision of collective liberation accommodate Spivak's concerns regarding the silencing of marginalized voices?
5. How does a comparative reading of Fanon and Spivak contribute to contemporary understandings of postcolonial nation-building?

Literature Review

The concepts of national consciousness, representation, and subaltern agency have occupied a central position within postcolonial studies since the latter half of the twentieth century. As former colonies struggled to define their political and cultural identities after independence, postcolonial theorists sought to understand the continuing effects of colonial domination and the possibilities of resistance. Among the most influential contributions to this intellectual tradition are the works of Frantz Fanon and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. While Fanon emphasizes psychological decolonization and collective agency as foundations for national liberation, Spivak interrogates the politics of representation and questions whether marginalized populations can genuinely participate in dominant discourses. Although both theorists address the legacies of colonialism, they offer significantly different perspectives on the relationship between voice, agency, and nation-building.

Frantz Fanon's scholarship has been primarily concerned with understanding the psychological dimensions of colonial domination. In *Black Skin, White Masks* (Fanon F. , 1952), Fanon argues that colonialism functions not merely through military occupation or economic exploitation but also through the internalization of racial hierarchies. According to Fanon, the colonized subject develops a fractured identity because he is compelled to view himself through the perspective of the colonizer. Colonial discourse establishes whiteness as the standard of civilization, rationality, and humanity, while blackness is associated with inferiority and cultural backwardness. As a result, the colonized subject experiences psychological alienation and attempts to gain recognition by adopting the language and values of the colonizer. Fanon's famous assertion that "to speak a language is to take on a world, a culture" demonstrates the intimate relationship between language and power within colonial societies (Fanon)

Scholars have extensively examined Fanon's analysis of racial identity and psychological alienation. David Macey argues that Fanon's originality lies in connecting individual psychological experiences to larger structures of colonial domination. Rather than treating racism as an isolated social prejudice, Fanon demonstrates how racial hierarchies become embedded within institutions, cultural practices, and systems of knowledge. Similarly, Lewis Gordon interprets Fanon's work as an exploration of the ontological exclusion experienced by black subjects within colonial societies. According to Gordon, Fanon reveals how racism denies black individuals' full participation in the category of the human, forcing them into a position of perpetual otherness. This interpretation has contributed significantly to contemporary discussions of race, identity, and recognition.

Another important dimension of Fanon scholarship concerns the relationship between psychological liberation and national consciousness. Although *The Wretched of the Earth* (Fanon F. , 1961) contains Fanon's most explicit discussion of national consciousness, scholars increasingly recognize that its foundations are established in *Black Skin, White Masks*. Fanon contends that colonialism succeeds because it persuades the colonized to internalize feelings of inferiority and dependency. Consequently, political liberation cannot be achieved without psychological decolonization. Jane Anna Gordon argues that

JOURNAL FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE STUDIES
An International Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN (Online): 3006-2071 | ISSN (Print): 3006-2063
Volume 4 • Issue 2 • June 2026

Fanon's concept of national consciousness should not be interpreted as narrow nationalism but as a transformative process through which colonized populations become capable of identifying the causes of their oppression and collectively pursuing liberation. National consciousness therefore functions as a form of political and cultural awakening that enables colonized peoples to reclaim agency and participate actively in history.

Homi K. Bhabha further develops Fanon's insights by emphasizing the ambivalent nature of colonial identity. In *The Location of Culture* (Bhabha, 1994), Bhabha argues that colonial authority depends upon the simultaneous production of difference and imitation. Colonial subjects are encouraged to mimic the language and behavior of the colonizer but are never fully accepted as equals. This process produces what Bhabha describes as a hybrid identity characterized by contradiction and instability. Fanon's discussion of linguistic assimilation and racial alienation anticipates many of these concerns, demonstrating how colonial subjects remain trapped between cultural worlds. Bhabha's interpretation has contributed to a broader understanding of the complexities of postcolonial identity formation.

While Fanon focuses on psychological liberation and collective agency, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak shifts attention toward questions of representation and epistemic exclusion. Her influential essay "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (Spivak, 1988) emerged as a critique of both colonial discourse and certain strands of Western intellectual thought. Spivak challenges the assumption that marginalized populations can easily articulate their experiences within dominant systems of knowledge. According to her, the subaltern occupies a position of structural silence because existing political, academic, and cultural institutions are incapable of adequately representing subaltern experiences. Consequently, attempts to speak for the marginalized frequently reproduce the very structures of domination they seek to challenge.

Spivak's concept of subalternity has generated extensive scholarly debate. Early interpretations emphasized her argument that the subaltern cannot speak because dominant discourses inevitably mediate and distort subaltern voices. However, more recent scholarship has sought to complicate this understanding. Piermarco Piu argues that Spivak's theory of subalternity should not be viewed solely as an epistemological critique but also as a sociological framework for understanding exclusion, agency, and resistance. According to Piu, Spivak's later work demonstrates that subalternity possesses both theoretical and practical relevance for analyzing contemporary forms of inequality under globalization and neoliberal capitalism. Her conception of subalternity therefore extends beyond colonial contexts and remains applicable to modern structures of marginalization (Piu, 2024).

Similarly, Sara de Jong and Jamila Mascat contend that subalternity should not be reduced to a generalized condition of oppression. Instead, they argue that Spivak's formulation highlights specific forms of exclusion from systems of representation and social mobility. Their work emphasizes the continuing relevance of subalternity as an analytical category capable of illuminating the intersections of race, class, gender, and colonial history. By relocating the concept within contemporary debates, they demonstrate how Spivak's critique continues to challenge assumptions regarding agency and political participation (Mascat, 2016).

Another significant aspect of Spivak scholarship concerns the relationship between subalternity and literature. Scholars have noted that literature frequently functions as a space in which marginalized voices become visible even when they remain excluded from political discourse. Isabella D'Angelo argues that Spivak's readings of postcolonial literature suggest that literary texts can create possibilities for representing subaltern experiences through narrative strategies that resist dominant forms of knowledge. Although Spivak remains skeptical regarding direct representation, literature provides an important medium through which questions of voice, marginality, and agency can be explored (D'Angelo, 2021).

JOURNAL FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE STUDIES
An International Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN (Online): 3006-2071 | ISSN (Print): 3006-2063
Volume 4 • Issue 2 • June 2026

Despite their different intellectual trajectories, Fanon and Spivak share several concerns. Both theorists recognize that colonial domination extends beyond political control and shapes systems of knowledge, identity, and representation. Both challenge Eurocentric assumptions regarding civilization and progress, and both seek to recover forms of agency that colonial discourse attempts to suppress. Furthermore, both theorists emphasize the importance of understanding colonialism as a process that continues to influence postcolonial societies long after formal independence (Fanon F. , 1952) (Spivak, 1988).

However, significant differences emerge regarding the possibilities of collective identity and liberation. Fanon remains fundamentally optimistic about the capacity of colonized peoples to overcome psychological alienation and develop a unified national consciousness. His work assumes that collective political agency can emerge through processes of decolonization and resistance. National consciousness functions as a unifying force capable of transforming fragmented colonial subjects into active participants in nation-building.

Spivak, by contrast, remains skeptical of claims to collective representation. Her critique suggests that nationalist discourse may reproduce exclusions by privileging certain voices while marginalizing others. The construction of national identity often depends upon the creation of dominant narratives that fail to account for internal differences related to gender, class, ethnicity, and social status. Consequently, Spivak challenges the assumption that national consciousness can fully represent all members of the nation.

Although comparative studies of Fanon and Spivak exist, they generally focus on broad questions of colonial discourse, identity formation, and resistance. Many scholars examine Fanon's theory of psychological liberation independently from Spivak's critique of representation, treating them as separate intellectual traditions within postcolonial theory. As a result, relatively little attention has been devoted to examining how these perspectives interact within discussions of postcolonial nation-building. Existing scholarship tends either to celebrate Fanon's vision of collective agency or to emphasize Spivak's critique of subaltern exclusion without exploring the productive tension between these positions.

This gap is particularly significant because nation-building remains one of the most pressing concerns in postcolonial societies. While Fanon's framework explains how psychological decolonization contributes to the formation of national consciousness, Spivak's critique reveals the limitations of nationalist projects that fail to account for marginalized voices. A comparative analysis of these theorists therefore provides an opportunity to rethink postcolonial nation-building as a process that involves both the recovery of collective agency and the continual negotiation of representation.

The present study addresses this gap by placing Fanon and Spivak in direct theoretical dialogue. It argues that Fanon's concept of national consciousness and Spivak's theory of subalternity should not be understood as opposing frameworks but as complementary perspectives that illuminate different dimensions of postcolonial experience. While Fanon demonstrates the necessity of psychological decolonization for collective liberation, Spivak exposes the exclusions that may emerge within projects of national identity. By examining the movement from subaltern silence to national consciousness, this study seeks to contribute to contemporary postcolonial scholarship and offer a more nuanced understanding of the possibilities and limitations of postcolonial nation-building.

Theoretical Framework

This study is situated within the broader field of postcolonial theory and employs the theoretical perspectives of Frantz Fanon and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak to examine the relationship between national consciousness, representation, and subaltern agency in postcolonial nation-building. While both theorists address the enduring consequences of colonial domination, they approach the question of liberation from distinct yet complementary perspectives. Fanon

JOURNAL FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE STUDIES
An International Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN (Online): 3006-2071 | ISSN (Print): 3006-2063
Volume 4 • Issue 2 • June 2026

primarily focuses on the psychological effects of colonialism and the necessity of collective consciousness for national liberation, whereas Spivak interrogates the politics of representation and the structural silencing of marginalized voices within both colonial and postcolonial discourses. Bringing these perspectives into dialogue enables a critical examination of the possibilities and limitations of postcolonial nation-building.

Frantz Fanon's theoretical contribution emerges from his analysis of colonialism as a system that extends beyond political and economic domination to encompass psychological control. In *Black Skin, White Masks* (1952), Fanon argues that colonialism produces a fractured subjectivity by compelling the colonized individual to internalize the values, language, and worldview of the colonizer. The colonial encounter is therefore not merely a confrontation between two political entities but a process through which the colonized subject becomes alienated from his own culture and identity. Fanon contends that the colonized individual learns to perceive himself through what he describes as the "white gaze," resulting in feelings of inferiority, self-negation, and cultural displacement (Fanon 82–90). Consequently, psychological decolonization becomes a necessary condition for political liberation.

Central to Fanon's theory is the concept of national consciousness. Although his most explicit discussion of national consciousness appears in *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961), its foundations are already present in *Black Skin, White Masks*. Fanon argues that colonial domination fragment's collective identity by imposing racial hierarchies that position European culture as the universal standard of civilization. The recovery of national consciousness therefore requires the rejection of these imposed hierarchies and the reconstruction of a collective identity rooted in indigenous histories, cultures, and experiences. National consciousness, in Fanon's formulation, is not simply a political ideology but a transformative process through which colonized peoples reclaim agency and become active participants in their own historical development.

The significance of Fanon's theory for this study lies in its emphasis on collective agency. Fanon assumes that colonized subjects can ultimately overcome psychological alienation and unite around a shared national identity capable of resisting colonial domination. Such a position provides an optimistic vision of postcolonial liberation in which collective consciousness serves as the foundation for nation-building. However, this assumption also raises important questions regarding the inclusivity of national identity. If national consciousness is presented as a collective project, whose experiences become representative of the nation, and whose voices remain excluded from its narrative?

It is precisely at this point that Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's intervention becomes crucial. In her influential essay "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (1988), Spivak challenges the assumption that marginalized populations can easily gain access to structures of representation. Drawing upon poststructuralist and postcolonial perspectives, she argues that the subaltern occupies a position of structural silence within dominant systems of knowledge. The term "subaltern" refers not merely to the oppressed but to those groups whose voices are systematically excluded from institutional, political, and intellectual frameworks. According to Spivak, even well-intentioned efforts to represent the marginalized often reproduce existing relations of power because intellectuals continue speaking on behalf of the subaltern rather than creating conditions in which the subaltern can speak for themselves (Spivak 284–308).

Spivak's critique is particularly relevant to discussions of nation-building because nationalist discourse frequently relies upon claims of collective identity and shared experience. While such narratives may challenge colonial domination, they also risk erasing internal differences within the nation. Women, indigenous populations, lower-class communities, and other marginalized groups may find themselves excluded from dominant narratives of national consciousness despite

JOURNAL FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE STUDIES
An International Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN (Online): 3006-2071 | ISSN (Print): 3006-2063
Volume 4 • Issue 2 • June 2026

their participation in anti-colonial struggles. Spivak therefore complicates the notion of a unified national identity by demonstrating that representation itself is a contested and politically charged process.

The tension between Fanon and Spivak forms the central theoretical foundation of this study. Fanon conceptualizes liberation as the recovery of collective agency through psychological decolonization, whereas Spivak questions whether collective identities can ever fully accommodate marginalized voices. Fanon's framework emphasizes the necessity of unity in the struggle against colonial oppression, while Spivak draws attention to the exclusions that may emerge within projects of unity. Rather than treating these perspectives as contradictory, this study views them as complementary approaches that illuminate different dimensions of the postcolonial condition.

The comparative dialogue between Fanon and Spivak enables a more nuanced understanding of postcolonial nation-building. Fanon's theory provides a framework for analyzing how colonialism undermines cultural identity and how psychological liberation contributes to the formation of national consciousness. Spivak's theory, in contrast, provides a framework for examining the limitations of nationalist discourse and the persistent marginalization of subaltern voices. Together, these theories reveal that nation-building is neither a straightforward nor a universally inclusive process. Instead, it involves continuous negotiations between collective identity and individual difference, representation and exclusion, empowerment and marginalization.

Within the analytical chapters of this study, Fanon's concept of psychological decolonization will be employed to examine how colonial discourse produces racial alienation and how the recovery of agency contributes to the development of national consciousness. Particular attention will be given to his discussions of language, identity, race, and cultural inferiority in *Black Skin, White Masks*. These concepts will be used to demonstrate how Fanon imagines the transformation of colonized subjects into active participants in the construction of national identity.

Simultaneously, Spivak's concept of subalternity will serve as a critical lens through which the assumptions of nationalist discourse will be interrogated. Her critique of representation will be used to evaluate whether Fanon's model of national consciousness sufficiently addresses the experiences of those who occupy marginalized positions within the nation. The analysis will investigate the extent to which collective liberation can coexist with the recognition of diverse and often silenced voices.

Ultimately, the theoretical framework of this study rests upon the argument that postcolonial nation-building must be understood through the intersection of Fanon's theory of psychological liberation and Spivak's critique of representation. While Fanon demonstrates the necessity of collective consciousness for overcoming colonial domination, Spivak reminds us that such consciousness remains incomplete if it fails to account for the voices of the subaltern. The dialogue between these theorists therefore provides a productive framework for examining both the emancipatory potential and the inherent limitations of postcolonial nation-building.

Analysis and Discussion

From Psychological Colonization to National Consciousness: Fanon's Vision of Collective Agency

Frantz Fanon's understanding of colonialism extends beyond political occupation and economic exploitation. For Fanon, colonialism is fundamentally a psychological project that reshapes the consciousness of the colonized and compels them to internalize colonial hierarchies. In *Black Skin, White Masks*, Fanon demonstrates how colonial power operates through language, culture, education, and representation to produce feelings of inferiority among colonized populations. The colonized subject gradually comes to view himself through the standards established by the colonizer and, consequently, becomes alienated from his own culture and identity.

JOURNAL FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE STUDIES
An International Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN (Online): 3006-2071 | ISSN (Print): 3006-2063
Volume 4 • Issue 2 • June 2026

One of Fanon's most significant contributions to postcolonial theory is his analysis of language as a mechanism of colonial domination. He famously states that "to speak a language is to take on a world, a culture" (Fanon 25). This observation suggests that language functions not merely as a means of communication but also as a vehicle through which cultural values and power relations are transmitted. Within colonial societies, mastery of the colonizer's language often becomes associated with education, prestige, and social mobility. As a result, indigenous languages are devalued and perceived as signs of backwardness.

The implications of this linguistic hierarchy are profound. The colonized individual attempts to achieve recognition by adopting the language and cultural practices of the colonizer. However, such imitation never leads to complete acceptance because racial difference continues to function as a marker of exclusion. Fanon's analysis reveals that colonialism creates a paradoxical condition in which the colonized subject is encouraged to assimilate while simultaneously being denied equality. Consequently, psychological alienation becomes a defining feature of colonial existence.

This alienation is particularly evident in Fanon's discussion of racial identity. He argues that the black subject exists within a social structure that continually reinforces notions of racial inferiority. The colonized individual is not perceived as an autonomous human being but as a racialized object whose identity is defined through colonial stereotypes. Fanon's assertion that "the black man has no ontological resistance in the eyes of the white man" (90) captures the extent to which colonial discourse denies black subjects' independent existence. Rather than being recognized as individuals, they are reduced to representations constructed by colonial ideology.

The significance of Fanon's analysis lies in his insistence that liberation must begin with the rejection of these imposed identities. Political independence alone cannot eliminate the psychological effects of colonialism because the structures of thought that sustain colonial domination remain intact. Psychological decolonization therefore becomes a prerequisite for genuine freedom. The colonized must reject the values imposed by colonial discourse and recover a sense of cultural dignity and self-worth. This process of psychological liberation forms the basis of Fanon's concept of national consciousness. Although *Black Skin, White Masks* does not provide a systematic theory of nation-building, it establishes the conditions necessary for collective political agency. Fanon understands national consciousness as the transformation of isolated and fragmented individuals into a community capable of recognizing shared experiences of oppression and collective aspirations for liberation. Through this transformation, colonized peoples become active participants in history rather than passive objects of colonial rule.

For Fanon, nation-building is therefore inseparable from the recovery of agency. Colonialism fragments society by creating divisions based on race, culture, and social status. National consciousness overcomes these divisions by providing a common framework through which colonized populations can understand their historical condition. The nation emerges not merely as a political entity but as a collective expression of resistance against colonial domination.

Spivak and the Problem of Representation

While Fanon's analysis emphasizes the possibility of collective liberation, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak introduces a critical perspective that complicates nationalist narratives. In "Can the Subaltern Speak?" Spivak challenges the assumption that marginalized groups can easily participate in dominant systems of representation. Her theory of subalternity directs attention toward those individuals who occupy positions of extreme marginalization and whose voices remain excluded from institutional structures.

Spivak's intervention is particularly significant because it exposes the limitations of representation. According to her, even attempts to recover subaltern voices often reproduce relations of power because intellectuals continue speaking on behalf of the marginalized. The

JOURNAL FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE STUDIES
An International Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN (Online): 3006-2071 | ISSN (Print): 3006-2063
Volume 4 • Issue 2 • June 2026

subaltern is not merely oppressed; rather, the subaltern occupies a position from which meaningful participation within dominant discourses becomes structurally impossible.

This critique has important implications for postcolonial nation-building. Nationalist movements frequently claim to represent the interests of all members of the nation. However, Spivak argues that such claims often conceal significant inequalities within postcolonial societies. Certain groups are privileged as representatives of the nation, while others remain marginalized and invisible.

Women occupy a particularly important position within Spivak's analysis. She argues that colonial and nationalist discourses frequently construct women as symbolic figures rather than political agents. Consequently, women become objects of representation rather than participants in processes of representation. Their experiences are mediated through male-dominated structures that claim to speak on their behalf.

Spivak's critique therefore challenges the assumption that national consciousness necessarily produces inclusivity. Even after the end of colonial rule, structures of exclusion may persist within the nation itself. The transition from colonial domination to national independence does not automatically guarantee the participation of marginalized groups in political and cultural life.

Fanon and Spivak in Dialogue

When Fanon and Spivak are placed in conversation, a productive tension emerges regarding the nature of postcolonial liberation. Fanon emphasizes the necessity of collective consciousness for overcoming colonial domination, whereas Spivak highlights the dangers of assuming that collective identities can fully represent diverse experiences. Together, their theories illuminate both the strengths and limitations of postcolonial nation-building.

A central point of divergence concerns the question of agency. Fanon remains optimistic about the capacity of colonized peoples to recover agency through psychological decolonization. He views collective consciousness as a transformative force capable of uniting fragmented populations around shared goals. National consciousness therefore functions as a mechanism through which formerly colonized societies can reclaim historical agency and construct independent futures.

Spivak, however, remains skeptical of such optimism. She argues that claims to collective identity often obscure internal hierarchies and exclusions. The nation may present itself as unified while continuing to marginalize certain groups. Consequently, the recovery of agency cannot be understood solely in collective terms because different members of the nation experience power in different ways.

Despite these differences, Fanon and Spivak share a common concern with the effects of colonial discourse. Both theorists recognize that colonialism shapes systems of knowledge and representation that continue to influence postcolonial societies. Fanon focuses on the psychological consequences of these structures, whereas Spivak examines their epistemological dimensions. Together, they reveal the multifaceted nature of colonial power and the challenges involved in resisting it.

The dialogue between Fanon and Spivak also highlights the relationship between voice and identity. Fanon assumes that psychological liberation enables colonized subjects to reclaim their voices and participate in the construction of national identity. Spivak questions whether such participation is equally available to all members of society. Her critique suggests that the recovery of voice remains uneven and contested.

This tension does not invalidate Fanon's theory but rather expands its analytical scope. Fanon's emphasis on collective liberation remains essential for understanding anti-colonial struggles, yet Spivak's critique reminds us that liberation must be accompanied by continual attention to questions of inclusion and representation. Nation-building cannot be reduced to the creation of a unified identity because such identities often conceal differences within the nation itself.

JOURNAL FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE STUDIES
An International Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN (Online): 3006-2071 | ISSN (Print): 3006-2063
Volume 4 • Issue 2 • June 2026

Re-reading Postcolonial Nation-Building

A comparative reading of Fanon and Spivak suggests that postcolonial nation-building should be understood as a dynamic and contested process. Fanon's theory explains why psychological decolonization is necessary for overcoming colonial domination, while Spivak demonstrates that liberation remains incomplete when certain voices continue to be excluded.

National consciousness therefore emerges as both a possibility and a challenge. It offers a framework for collective resistance against colonial oppression, yet it also raises questions regarding who is included within the nation and who remains marginalized. The process of nation-building involves continuous negotiation between unity and diversity, collective identity and individual difference.

By bringing Fanon and Spivak into dialogue, it becomes possible to move beyond simplistic understandings of postcolonial liberation. Their theories reveal that nation-building is neither a linear nor a universally inclusive process. Rather, it involves ongoing struggles over representation, agency, and belonging. These struggles continue to shape postcolonial societies long after the end of formal colonial rule.

Conclusion

The relationship between national consciousness and subaltern agency remains one of the most significant debates within postcolonial studies. Through a comparative examination of Frantz Fanon and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, this study has demonstrated that postcolonial nation-building cannot be understood solely as a political process of achieving independence. Instead, it must be recognized as a complex cultural and psychological project involving questions of identity, representation, agency, and power.

Fanon's analysis of psychological colonization provides an essential framework for understanding the conditions under which national consciousness emerges. By exposing the internalized racism, linguistic alienation, and cultural inferiority produced by colonialism, Fanon reveals that liberation begins with psychological decolonization. His work emphasizes the importance of collective agency and demonstrates how national consciousness can transform fragmented colonial subjects into active participants in the construction of a shared future. In this sense, Fanon's vision remains a powerful affirmation of the possibility of postcolonial liberation.

However, Spivak's theory of subalternity complicates this optimistic narrative by drawing attention to the exclusions that often accompany projects of national identity. Her critique of representation reveals that nationalist discourse may reproduce structures of marginalization even while challenging colonial domination. The nation frequently claims to speak for all its members, yet many voices remain absent from dominant narratives of nationhood. Consequently, Spivak reminds us that liberation is incomplete if it fails to address the experiences of those who continue to occupy marginalized positions within society.

The comparative dialogue between Fanon and Spivak demonstrates that national consciousness and subaltern agency should not be viewed as mutually exclusive concepts. Rather, they represent complementary perspectives that illuminate different dimensions of postcolonial experience. Fanon explains the necessity of collective consciousness for resisting colonial domination, while Spivak highlights the importance of continually questioning who is included within that collective consciousness. Together, they provide a more comprehensive framework for understanding postcolonial nation-building.

Ultimately, this study argues that the movement from subaltern silence to national consciousness is neither linear nor complete. Nation-building remains an ongoing process characterized by negotiations between unity and difference, empowerment and exclusion, voice and representation. By placing Fanon and Spivak in critical dialogue, this article contributes to contemporary postcolonial scholarship and demonstrates that the challenge of creating inclusive forms of national consciousness continues to shape postcolonial societies in the twenty-first century.

JOURNAL FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE STUDIES
An International Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal

ISSN (Online): 3006-2071 | ISSN (Print): 3006-2063
Volume 4 • Issue 2 • June 2026

REFRENCES

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures. 2nd ed., Routledge, 2002.

Bhabha, Homi K. The Location of Culture. Routledge, 1994.

D'Angelo, Isabella. "Reading the Subaltern: Representation and Voice in Spivak's Postcolonial Theory." Junctions: Graduate Journal of the Humanities, vol. 6, no. 1, 2021, pp. 1–15.

Fanon, Frantz. Black Skin, White Masks. Translated by Richard Philcox, Grove Press, 2008.

Fanon, Frantz. The Wretched of the Earth. Translated by Richard Philcox, Grove Press, 2004.

Gibson, Nigel C. Fanonian Practices in South Africa: From Steve Biko to Abahlali baseMjondolo. University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2011.

Gordon, Jane Anna. Creolizing Political Theory: Reading Rousseau through Fanon. Fordham UP, 2014.

Gordon, Lewis R. What Fanon Said: A Philosophical Introduction to His Life and Thought. Fordham UP, 2015.

de Jong, Sara, and Jamila Mascat. "Relocating Subalternity: Scattered Speculations on the Conundrum of a Concept." Cultural Studies, vol. 30, no. 5, 2016, pp. 717–29.

Lazarus, Neil. The Postcolonial Unconscious. Cambridge UP, 2011.

Macey, David. Frantz Fanon: A Biography. Granta Books, 2000.

Piu, Piermarco. "Subalternity and Agency: Revisiting Spivak's Legacy." The Sociological Review, vol. 72, no. 1, 2024, pp. 1–18.

Said, Edward W. Orientalism. Vintage Books, 1978.

Sekyi-Otu, Ato. Fanon's Dialectic of Experience. Harvard UP, 1996.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, University of Illinois Press, 1988, pp. 271–313.

Young, Robert J. C. Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction. Blackwell Publishing, 2001.