

- Fradinger, Moria. *Binding Violence. Literary Visions of Political Origins* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010.
- Hamilton, Paul. *Historicism*. London, New York: Routledge,1996
- Horowitz, Louis Irving(Ed). *Power, Politics, and People: The Collected Essays of C. Wright Mills*. New York: Ballantine,1963.
- Kegan, Paul. *Gramsci and Marxist Theory*. London: Routledge,1979.
- Kolbas, E.Dean. *Critical Theory and the Literary Canon*. Colorado: Westview Press, 2001.
- Mc Culloch, Jack. *Colonial Psychiatry and the African Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Mouffe, Chantal. Laclau, Ernesto (1985). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*. London New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Nancy, Jean Luc (1988).*The Experience of Freedom*. Trans, B. Mc Donald Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993.
- Norman, Richard. *On Humanism. Thinking in Action*. London, NewYork: Routledge,2004.
- Paine, Thomas. *The Rights of Man*. Easyread Edition. Kent: Wordsworth Edition Ltd, 1996.
- Solomons, John.Back, Les (Eds) *Theories of Race and Racism. A Reader*. London, New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Said, Edward. *Representations of the Intellectual*. New York: Vintage Books,1996.

reconcile but to articulate: why and how one must call for both popular sovereignty and freedom of the individual; the universality and diversity of mankind; the absolute or relative character of value judgment, free or determined action, each of these questions. Paine and Fanon encourage the reader not to choose one term to the detriment of the other, but consider both simultaneously. There are not choices to be made but discrepancies that define the thought of man and his societies. Every epoch had its prophets and its men of inspiration, but each one spoke the life of his times as it seems clear in the case of Paine and Fanon for whom revolutionary wars are considered as the most dramatic and important events in their political life. But questions of the two intellectuals' contribution to the construction of a better and peaceful world, their humanism, and their global visions of man let them bypass their revolutionary claims. The study of Paine and Fanon together is one of the areas where critics are most seriously lacking at and, therefore, today more than ever, that the question be posed that is rarely being invoked.

Bibliography

- Browitt, Jeff. Milner, Andrew. *Contemporary Cultural Theory*. Sidney: Allen& Unwin, 2002.
- Bulhan, Hussein Abdilahi. *Frantz Fanon and the Psychology of Oppression*. New York and London: Plenum Press, 1985.
- Camus, Albert (1957), Dec, 10th. From *Nobel Lectures, Literature 1901-1967*, Ed. H. Frenz. Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing Company, 1969.
- Caute, David, *Frantz Fanon*. London: Fontana Collins, 1970.
- Ekers, Michael. Hart, Gillian. Stephan Kipfer. Alex. Loftus. *Gramsci Space, Nature, and Politics*. London: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.
- Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. (trans. Markmann). New York: Grove Press, 1967.
- Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. London: Penguin Books, 1990

radical movement for decolonization; a struggle to produce a meaningful life. The utopian elements that is constitutive of Paine and Fanon's imagination of freedom. Creative engagement, intellectual commitment, and freedom of expression in the *Right of Man* (1791) and *Black Skin White Masks* (1952) is what the works focus on. Freedom insists on being claimed as a general value to be championed and imposed no matter the means. Paine and Fanon variously entail, promote and defend the form of active physical resistance to oppression with all the ethical quandaries and dilemmas connected to the use of violence. Their liberating way of thinking fits, therefore Albert Camus's vision of the intellectual (writer). In his speech at the Nobel Banquet in Stockholm on December, 1957, Camus pays homage to the intellectuals could not put themselves in the service of those who make history; they are at the service of those who suffer it. None of us, reiterates Camus, is great enough for such a task. But "all circumstances of life, in obscurity of temporary frame, cast in the irons of tyranny or for a time free to express himself. The writer (intellectual) can win the heart of a living community that will justify him, on the one condition that he will accept to the limit of his abilities. The two tasks that constitute the greatness of his craft: The service of truth and the service of liberty. Whatever our personal weaknesses may be the nobility of our craft will always be rooted in two commitments, difficult to maintain: the refusal to lie about one knows and the resistance to oppression (Camus.1957).

Camus's words apply so well to Paine and Fanon as they lived in a permanent interest to different subaltern and oppressed groups, not as instrumental additions, but as co-constitutive and transformative of these groups. For both thinkers internationalism was more than the sum total of national party or institution strategies. It involved the production of translocal transnational forms of solidarity. Paine and Fanon never adhere to a single dogma, but that they begin by recognizing two forces, two requirements, and two contrary needs which they seek not to

advance. Both were intensely active as journalists with the publication of numerous newspaper articles and pamphlets. Both put themselves in the service of those “who suffer history” and those who to resist all forms of falsehood and subjugation seen to be a grand self-renovating project. Resistance underpins Paine and Fanon’s passionate reflection in all his essays and articles. Likewise, resistance runs through Paine and Fanon’s discussion of *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961), it surfaces in the screaming voices of slaves and colonized people. His intoxicating insurrection against race subjection and abjection; the right to resist and live a descent life still holds, and it circulates in the many routes that men, women, and children follow in the hope to achieve freedom. Because of unequal global distribution of wealth and of the quality of life regulated by power, freedom is not granted to everyone and it is still an unaffordable dream for millions of people.

Utopia also coexists with Paine and Fanon’s desire for a home that may composite the devastating effects of imperial history and colonialism. A world that allows each of its citizens to find a place that may contain their future. Their present was “seldom” free and because there is of necessity a utopian element in freedom, a moment of deferral in its experience which calls for belief and hope. *The Rights of Man* and *Black Skin and White Masks* radiate a “spirit of utopia” that does recall in spite of the different contexts, refer to Paine and Fanon’s writing about the future. In the American history when all was death and destruction, Paine saw hope in the future as strictly related to the darkness of the present. Similarly, Fanon’s work has been written exactly at a crucial juncture between memory and prophecy, where darkness may be dispelled and unfreedom overcome by searching for alternative truths in the past and hoping for a free future. Both afford themselves the right to believe in alternative ethical, sociopolitical models that might lead to freedom. Alongside the apparent exhaustion of the utopias of liberation that supported some of the most powerful

define themselves as that of humanists, neither individualists defending liberty against all its enemies. How Paine and Fanon's engagement in public illustrate their principles?

Both are not contented with elaborating doctrines, on several occasions in their lives, they become men of action, politically active. They were reproached with having been advocates of violence but behind the declaration of the noble principles dissimulated the defense of oppressed people. Paine and Fanon's choice of revolution to end the colonial terror, to establish a popular sovereignty that does not override personal freedoms can be defined by two negatives: the rejection of those who are against revolution, and the rejection of those who want to push it to the point of terror. Their centrist positions make them fight the two extremes which do not put them in contradictory position. They are not party men: not because they are saints or unable to take their interests into account, but because they extend their loyalty to the ideas in which they believe, not to the apparatuses: to defend what is right and just, not to serve specific interests. They are faithful not to individuals, but to principles. They do not believe in an immutable identity of the person that would remain insensitive to circumstances, they always proclaim the same ideals. People change, principles stay. Both choose ideals rather than parties, devoted themselves with zeal and perseverance to the defense of any individual whom they saw oppressed. In the midst of political tempest, they lend all the support of their action and courage to persecuted people. This kind of position professed by Paine and Fanon is more valuable as a political philosophy than as a political action. It makes it possible to fight the extremes, to escape sectarianism and remain faithful to an ideal rather than a party. One thus grants to Paine and Fanon that they remained in practice, faithful to their own theories.

During their careers, both know that printing is the essential tool of democracy, but for this tool to be accessible to all requires a pluralist press and publications not controlled in

reformulate them over the rest of their lives. This is the point to which they return most often and it is what they consider the leitmotiv of their political philosophies. For both, “to be happy” men need only to be allowed perfect independence, regarding everything that touches on their occupation, their sphere of activity, and their imagination. Freedom, a utopian word, is all that is required for the happiness of modern man whose part Paine and Fanon resolutely take. The plots of tragedies, as imagined by Paine and Fanon, all lean in the same direction. Whether the black slave fighting for his release; his adversary is “the iron-clad institutions, the regime of blood, the hanging judges, the pitiless masters, and all that arsenal of a police force crushing a single unfortunate person because his color is different are the back bone on which their works rest and will be the domains inside which Paine and Fanon will exert their critical and constructive spirit. The political, social world of public action, the realm of diversity, intimate life of affection and love, such will be the intellectual and militant plan that will animate Paine and Fanon in all their activities. Their attitude is not dogmatic but dialogical because they do not seek to close the debate with simple and definite answer, but to shake off initial certainty and lead toward more enlightened convictions.

Equality is another universal value that dominates the public space and provides the foundation for justice to be exercised. Throughout their lives, Paine and Fanon would grant considerable weight to this driving force in human action. Their political choice is defined by a double contrast, hidden in the dual meaning of the word “liberty” the anti-thesis of traditional authority, at the same time, of the materialist Western causality. Both remain uncompromisingly partisans of each one’s right to choose his own life, rejecting blind subservience to any arbitrary tradition. They are resolutely opposed to ambicionado determinism which resulted from the materialism of Enlightenment. They found support in the triumphant scientific spirit. By rejecting both these points, Paine and Fanon’s position

themselves nor of what is called glory. They are not politicians who left the reader a reflective work exposing the lessons of their experiences. They are rather thinkers, philosophers and writers who cannot remain indifferent to the fate of the world and who decided to accept their responsibility. Their engagement was crowned with success, even if, since the time of their death many critics have forgotten Paine and Fanon's many merits. Democracy for all is the direct heir of the ideal that they defended. While the interest of critics is on the aspect of violence, it is by no means the only driving force, aspiration to justice, equality, and liberty must also be considered. Paine and Fanon suggest an answer to this question in their *Rights of Man* (1791) and *Black Skin and White Masks* (1952), two texts that contrast the idea of reducing the two thinkers' ideologies of merely advocating violence. Paine and Fanon's thoughts on revolution cannot be limited to the well known theories of advocating violence, theories that are quite old and are certainly present in their texts. While using the language and arguments of these theories, Paine and Fanon give their readers their own social thoughts which incarnate an ideal of justice and generosity. Both adhere to a sophisticated religion which submits to any interest other than that of the oppressed. Paine and Fanon were able to sacrifice themselves, to find values higher than their own life. The "force of sacrifice" is the mother of all virtue for these two dedicated thinkers who have given up seeking glory and content themselves with the enthusiasm, the power, and convictions of ideals they defended and the reader should not be deluded on this point. What interests Paine and Fanon above all is the suffering of others, or more precisely, the dominated, the exploited, and the oppressed. Adopting this line of behavior for the whole central period of their life, Paine and Fanon have the noble faculty of living through and for others. They shared their burning desire for independence, a great impatience with bounds by which they were surrounded. Their ideas on freedom were fixed since their first writings; both would only revisit them and

institutions. For him: “the independent intellectuals are among the few remaining personalities equipped to resist and to fight the stereotyping and consequent death of genuinely living things. Fresh perception now involves the capacity to continually unmask and to smash the stereotypes of vision and intellect with which modern communications swamp us. These worlds of mass-art and mass-thought are increasingly geared to the demands of politics. That’s why it is politics that intellect solidarity and effort must be centered. If the thinker does not relate himself to the value of truth in political struggle, he cannot responsibly cope with the whole of live experience (Mills.1963:299).

To observe the dangers that Paine and Fanon describe and to examine the remedies that they propose, it is useful to return to what they themselves judge to be the focal point of their analyses, the liberty, equality, and justice in the sense that they use them. Both start with a plea for liberty, the supreme value and believed in a universal humanity, founded in liberty but, at the same time, to take into account the development of various societies and the forces of social pressures. Their common utopian vision of man and their utopian world where freedom equality and justice reign; the same world continues to be “waved” as a banner by endless parties and movements across the political spectrum. The utopian project of Paine and Fanon resembles the proposal of Jean-Luc Nancy’s *Experience of Freedom* (1988) where the author closely links the right in free futures with thinking of freedom which means: freeing freedom from manipulations, including, first of all, those of thinking. Such a way of thinking requires something on the order of revolution, and also a revolution in thinking (Nancy.1988:102).

The utopian project of Paine and Fanon is to build a world devoid of a common language of exploitation and warfare, the projection of a dream of universal and substantive democracy which ends with the deep crisis of freedom as a universally accepted human value. Both Paine and Fanon neither think about

and persons. Accordingly, there is an inestimable value to what Paine and Fanon did to ensure the community's survival during periods of extreme national emergency, loyalty to the group's fight for survival. They are often looked to by members of their nationality to represent, to speak out for, and testify to the sufferings of that nationality. They are in symbolic relationship with their time: in the public consciousness, they represent achievement, fame, and reputation which can be mobilized on the behalf of ongoing struggle or embattled community. Inversely, they are very often made to bear the burns of their community's opprobrium, either when factions within it associate the intellectual with the wrong side.

Gramsci and Said's visions of the intellectual accord to the way Paine and Fanon whose task is explicitly to universalize the crisis, to give greater human scope to what a particular nation suffered, to associate that experience with the suffering of others. Both start out as potential legal scholars, critics, historians essayists, philosophers and social theorists with public welfare as their goals. Though they are issued from different societies, but they do serve the same purpose, which is something, panoramic realistic of their periods, of showing intellectuals in action, beset with numerous difficulties and temptations. Their representations, their articulations of a cause or idea to society, are not meant primarily to fortify ego or celebrate status. Nor are they principally intended for service within powerful bureaucracies and with generous employers. Their representations are activity itself, dependent on a kind of consciousness that is skeptical, engaged, unremittingly devoted to rational investigation and moral judgment. They stand therefore, for what the American sociologist C.Wright Mills calls a fiercely independent intellectual with an impassionate social vision and a remarkable capacity for communicating his ideas in a straightforward and compelling way. They were faced either with a kind of despondent sense of powerlessness at their marginality, or with the choice of joining the ranks of

deliberate or inadvertent violation of these standards need to be testified and fought against courageously (Ibid.12).

Real intellectuals for Edward Said, constitute a clerisy, very rare creatures indeed, since what they uphold are eternal standards of truth and justice that are precisely not of this world. They are never more themselves than when, moved by metaphysical passion and disinterested principle of justice and truth, they denounce corruption, defend the weak, defy imperfect or oppressive authority. They conceded their moral authority to what, in a prescient phase “the organization of collective passions”. Real intellectuals risk being burned at the stake ostracized or crucified. They are symbolic personages marked by their unyielding distance from practical concerns in a state of permanent opposition to the status quo: their blinding insights into eternal principles might, like those of Don Quixote, be little more than private fantasies. They are able to speak the truth to power, a crusty, eloquent, fantastically courageous and angry individuals for whom no worldly power is too big and imposing to be uncriticized and pointedly taken to task (Ibid.5).

With reference to Fanon, Said reiterates that: “It is inadequate only to affirm that a people was dispossessed, oppressed or slaughtered, denied its rights and its political existence, without at the same time doing what Fanon did during the Algerian war affiliating those horrors with the similar afflictions of other people. This does not at all mean a loss in historical specificity but rather its guards against the possibility that a lesson learned about oppression in one place will be forgotten or violated in another place or time. Said’s notion of the “intellectual” who exists in a kind of universal space, bound neither by national boundaries nor ethnic identity accords with Paine and Fanon as they are individuals whose capacity for thought and judgment make them suitable for representing the best thought as they are not allied with the stability of the victors and rulers. Both Paine and Fanon took the difficult path of taking account of the experience of subordination, the memory of the forgotten voices

good sense that workers share with one another, namely “practical transformation of the world”. As they are actively involved in society; they constantly struggle to change minds. Organic intellectuals, reiterates Gramsci, are able to carry needs from the private into the social, or extend the political functions of the social into the private. On the contrast, there are traditional intellectuals who domesticate needs by forcing them back into private sphere or administering them as experts (Ekers.Hart.Kipfer. Loftus.2013:35).

Subsequent to Gramsci’s vision of the intellectual, Edward Said insists that there has been no major revolution in modern history without intellectuals; conversely, there has been no major counterrevolutionary movement without intellectuals. They have been the fathers and mothers of movements. One task of the intellectual is the effort to break down the stereotypes and reductive categories that are limiting to human thought and communication. They are those figures whose public performances can neither be predicted nor compelled into some slogan, orthodoxy, party line, or fixed dogma. They are the ones who question patriotic nationalism, corporate thinking, and a sense of class racial privilege (Said.1996:11).

The intellectual, adds Said, is an individual endowed with a faculty for representing, embodying, articulating a message, a view, an attitude, philosophy or opinion to as well as for, a public. And this role has an edge to it, and cannot be played without a sense of being someone whose place it is publicly to raise decisive, confront orthodoxy and dogma rather than producing them. To be an intellectual is to be someone who cannot easily be co-opted by governments or corporations, and whose “raison d’être” is to represent all those people and issues that are routinely forgotten or swept under the rug. He does so on the basis of universal principles: that all human beings are entitled to expect decent standards of behavior concerning freedom and justice from worldly powers and nations, and that

historical convulsions and revolutions to put new questions, their avant-garde, works stood in opposition to the dominant “Bourgeois culture” as an essentially “adversarial” force, in the words of Andrew Milner and Jeff Browitt, aspiring to a positively “redemptive” social function (2002:148).

Following on Gramsci’s pioneering vision and his social analysis of the intellectual who fulfills a particular set of functions in the society, his vision of the function of the intellectual will be applied to Paine and Fanon, the organizers of the working-class movement, and as journalists and the most consciously reflective of the social analysts, whose purpose was to build not just a social movement but an entire cultural formation associated with the movement. As an organic intellectual himself, Gramsci was put on trial for treason in 1926 and was condemned to twenty years imprisonment. He would die in prison in 1937 but not before writing his celebrated *Prison Notebooks* (1926-1937) that immortalized him as the towering figure of the Western thought. Among the great Marxist theorists of the twentieth century, Gramsci is unique in the attention he pays to the role of intellectuals in elaborating popular consciousness, and connecting it to vistas of national and global history. In his prison diaries, he wrote: “All men are intellectuals, one could therefore say: but not all men have in society the function of intellectuals”. He divides the intellectuals into two categories: teachers, administrators, priests, and clerks that he calls “traditional intellectual” as they continue to do the same thing from one generation to another. In the second category, Gramsci puts what he considers “organic intellectuals” who are directly connected to organize interests, gain more power; get more control as they would liberate “good sense” from what is known as “common sense”. Organic intellectuals are able to fight a worker’s “common sense” inherited from past and uncritically absorbed that leads to what is “moral and political passivity”. At the same time, they are elements in the struggle for hegemony because they can elaborate the kernel of

More significantly, in order to show how convergent was their thinking and, at the same time, how their affinities make complementary contributions to their historicism which articulates both space and time in order to weave analyses of the multiple rhythms of history and revolutionary strategy, both reached beyond the polemical battles of their times, which make them superficially different. That requires exploring the political and ideological context that gave meaning to their parallel projects. For the two figures their engagements with historical forces is inseparable from their theoretical developments. If the overarching logic of colonial discourse was to “construe” the colonized as people of degenerate types, the hegemony of such discourse needs counter-hegemonic practices, which according to the Italian revolutionary theorist, Antonio Gramsci (1891-1937) are produced as an alternative by the practices of conscious agents. For him, the intellectuals are the dominant group’s “deputies” exercising the subaltern functions of social hegemony and political government. There are, however, two kinds of intellectuals: what he calls “organic intellectuals”, by which he means the type of intellectual that each major social class creates for itself so as to give it homogeneity and an awareness of its own function. The “traditional intellectuals” already in existence which seem to represent historical community including the clergy, administrators, theorists, and philosophers who affect a kind of autonomy from the dominant social classes, but their autonomy is illusory. The problem for him was the creation of a layer of organic working-class intellectuals capable of leading their class in battle for counter-hegemony. The concept of “organic intellectual” will be applied to the way Paine and Fanon mount a stunning indictment of colonialism and invest their hopes in the possibility for the oppressed to gain their freedom. The role of the intellectual, in this regard, is understood as that of cultural leader, moving ahead of the wider society, much like the revolutionary vanguard in the Leninist view of politics. As individuals who are led by such

It may be important to note that from its beginning with its precursors, Nietzsche, Marx, Hegel, and Freud to its modern form with its promoters such as Michel Foucault, Stephen Greenblatt, Jack Lacan among many others, pursue especially the reflexive implications of this skepticism as they distrust not only tradition that denies that all writing end up conniving at the political power that permits it but also any interpretation which does not acknowledge that its history of the past is relativised by also being also a history of the present. The theorists featuring in the historicist-materialist fashion are also as keen to consider and define human beings as primarily historical creatures. They insist, in their different ways, on the primacy of the material circumstances of humans' lives and ideas as well as in their elucidations of the ways of understanding the world. The stress on the specificity of human historical context, Milner, Browitt observe, echoes the more generally romantic preoccupation with human individuality. These contexts were often seen as distinctively "national". So that historicism often seemed readily compatible with cultural nationalism (Milner.Browitt.2002:22).

To address and interpret Paine and Fanon's works as pointing towards an emancipator politics, despite their appraisal of the possibilities for radical social change, and make their accounts of rational and irrational individual behavior in their studies of oppressive and repressive domination, the present paper revolve around three key concepts: that of the "intellectual" and his role as a consciousness awakener; that of "hegemony and counter hegemony", and that of "utopia". All of them will be set out to outline the similarities that emerge from hitherto unexamined and unexpected convergence in the writings of Paine and Fanon. Before proceeding to their works, however, it seems useful to consider the more obviously theorization of these cognate concepts, which might be applied to the selected works of Paine and Fanon, two longstanding opponents of colonialism with their ambivalent operations of colonial stereotyping.

personal, professional experiences and also an integration of the principles of humanistic philosophy with its highlights as they connect with the philosophy of global peace. Paine and Fanon are certainly intellectuals with a humanist attitude, which makes the reader aware that all human beings are equal and their lives are sacred. As humanists, their interests are very broad as they seek ways to assist oppressed people and to add to their personal growth by their interest in history and philosophy.

It is the desire for freedom of colonized people to live with dignity and self respect that animated Paine and Fanon's lives; that transformed frightened young men into bold ones; that drove two journalists and writers to become revolutionaries; and that turned family dedicated husbands into men without home and even country. Their universality means taking a risk in order to go beyond the easy certainties provided by a specific background, language, nationality, which so often, shield from the reality of others. It also means looking for and trying to uphold a single standard for human behavior when it comes to such matters as foreign and social policy; and that made these life-loving and more independently minded intellectual and history makers. The challenge of Paine and Fanon's lives is to be found in dissent against the status quo at a time when struggle on the behalf of the unrepresented and disadvantaged groups is unfairly weighted against them.

These larger dilemmas will be the real subject of inquiry which takes its theoretical bearings from Historical materialism that examines relation between the texts and their political cultural, and historical environments. Its point of departure begins with Historicism that is related to the view that historical events can properly be understood only in the immediate context of their occurrence, rather than as instances of some kind of universal abstract theory, such as that propounded by the Enlightenment. As a critical movement, historicism insists on the prime importance of historical context to the interpretation of texts of all kinds (Hamilton.1996:02).

political thought and all elements of their thoughts which represented a break with the humanist and utopian visions were ignored. So, unwilling to merely accept the views of others about these authors, emphasis will be put on what can set them apart from previous analyses; a way to go beyond to release their creativity from the idea of merely being advocates of violence. It will be suggested, however, that there are also other significant aspects in their respective analyses concerning “the utopian impulse” or the future to which Paine and Fanon’s revolution point. Specifically, there has been a widespread failure to appreciate the similarities between Paine and Fanon beyond their revolutionary claims. The “utopian promise” of a society without repression, domination, and misery, which is the other half of revolution, has been almost completely ignored in the existing literature on both thinkers.

The present paper attempts to clarify the affinities between the two intellectuals by demonstrating that important shifts in their thinking call into question advocating violence for the sake of violence. Without regard to both aspects, means emptying Paine and Fanon works of their essential content and meaning. It rather suggests the necessity for reinterpreting Paine and Fanon’s ideas from a new perspective and the matters at issue are to devolve into two main analytically distinct questions: the implications that Paine and Fanon worked for, hoped for, fought for, which it seems, have been swept aside by many of their reviewers. The key question for Paine and Fanon was how in the face of colonialism and imperialism, as humanistic as any intellectual awakener in the history of mankind, to create and strengthen the institutions of political, economic, and cultural democracy, which is still today’s crucial problem. To answer this call, I suggest interpreting the two authors’ works in terms of what can be called a “synthifunction”, by which I mean an approach as well as a discourse by which to analyse Paine and Fanon’s ideas beyond the limits of advocating violence. I propose to focus mainly on a synthesis of the two men’s

worth looking, by way of comparison, at the works of two intellectuals striving toward perfect equality and the subversive demanding that political conflicts, social injustices, and inequalities be addressed. As leaders inflamed by passion for a larger cause, they have mobilized people into the struggle against domination in supporting nationalist movements. From their pens rushed eloquent pieces that spoke for liberatory goals designed to nurture an embryonic working class-culture. They are namely, Thomas Paine (1737-1809) and Frantz Fanon (1925-1961) who, forced by history to confront the question of revolution, reflected on politics in order to decide how to step or sidestep the conflict, and whose writings illustrate how particular lines of thoughts open up a particular line of action. Issued from distinct social worlds, different periods and following divergent traditions, Paine and Fanon converged on a similar critique of colonialism and elaborated theoretical positions in advocating the necessity of violence to free people from the tyranny of colonialism. Both published their ideas in pamphlets, articles and books as thinkers whose ideas and commitment earned them worldwide respect and admiration and left public marks on the world. If an adamant self-certainty enables Paine to charge the monarchy with hypocrisy and self-delusion to fight at every turn the same credence allows Fanon to declare violence strategically necessary to overthrow the rule by violence, and psychologically useful to release the native from the somatic reflexes of subordination that are the outcome of the same rule.

While some critics have confined the study of Paine and Fanon's works in relation to their biographies or mainly their revolutionary aspects, others have overlooked the two authors' sensibilities as well as their humanist values. It is undeniable that there are certainly some significant points of agreement between Paine and Fanon concerning the necessity for the oppressed to renounce all compromise with their oppressors and to organize themselves to get rid of colonial injustice and repression through revolution. But both were thereby reduced to chapters in modern

Thomas Paine and Frantz Fanon Beyond Their Revolutionary Claims

**GADA Said
Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-ouzou, Algeria.**

Abstract

The present paper may provide something of interest for everyone interested in Thomas Paine and Frantz Fanon, not only the history makers and political figures, but also human beings with all their strengths and weaknesses. Both dreamed of freedom, justice, love, and peace; they struggled most of their lives to transform their dreams into realities and tried their best to make the world a better place. In spite of their high ideals they shared the vulnerabilities of their fellow human beings. Both rose above the dark side of their personalities to leave a positive legacy for our “global village” as their struggles transformed their personalities into powerful beacons guiding their communities in particular and humanity in general. As creative visionaries who chose to become involved in social and political movements, their life stories of revolutionaries who dared to challenge oppressive and exploitative traditions and systems in hope of creating peaceful and just societies have become a source of inspiration for future generations.

Key Words: Revolution, Utopia, Commitment, Humanist Values.

Nowadays, we live in a world of global rivalries, the impact of imperialism, mass struggles and revolution are very much at issue. The same world is experiencing a profound political social, and ideological breakdown where human beings individually and collectively are losing control and becoming violent because of grave miscarriages of justice and governments’ manifestly oppression. In sum, it is a world that is permanently threatened by self-destruction. In this context, it is