



historians other than false or limited interpretations". Marxism, according to critics of poststructuralists like Young, is involved in violent repression of differences when confronted with others.

It should be taken both literally and figuratively. We can see in the latter violent way that the history of the non-West is neglected and necessary to sit within the clear boundaries of Marxist dialectics; In the act of colonization, we can see the former. The Marxist uncertainty as to what exactly the role of the West will play in the forthcoming world revolution can be seen in the theoretical hesitation with which Marx approached his controversial Asiatic mode of production, the project in which he was involved, the standard explanation given by Gayatri Spivak. , To answer the question, "Why is the standard logic of Capital not the same everywhere? .... Why isn't Europe the only self-identity? ". To understand why Marx sought the answers to these questions so hard, we must first understand that the effects of colonialism in the progressive Marxist dialectics, considered by the expansion of the capitalist world economy beyond Europe, were "by which capitalists can avoid. Socialist revolution at home." Because the bourgeois revolution is still taking place in the world. If colonialism does not fit into the Marxist dialectic, then the effectiveness of the Marxist prescriptive is in question. Marx's own ambitious project ... seems to establish his own identity through admission. For the self-determination that dispels the differences established by history. "Because of these problems of the creation and perception of history, Marx sought to define the Asian mode of production in order to explain the mode of production in large, state-based societies, such as China and India. That fact must be taken into account."

Once defined and clarified, the Asian mode of production can be reconciled with history: since it was a necessary precondition for the fulfillment of the socialist revolution, Marx was able to notice the difference by this classification. So, how to remove it? Considering capitalism as the "pharmakon" of Marxism or the "poison of medicine when deliberately administered", we can literally think of the violent force of Marxism ... which creates the possibility of the dialectical work of socialism. , But left to its own resources also blocks that work. "Thus capitalism, while despicable, at the same time, especially within the colonial framework, was very useful. Marx considered it a" moral and humanitarian argument against colonialism. " ... less important than its advantages in the end - the world historical movement towards socialism ". As far as the Asian mode of production is concerned, Marx felt that" the violent introduction of capitalist mode of production. ... shattered the ancient 'Barbarian' system of Oriental dictatorship, which only strengthened the brutality and degradation of human beings subject to external conditions."

The immediate illusion of Marxism is clear: its focus is on dialectical history in which all other experiences must be violently compressed in order to achieve the desired results, its position firmly underlined in Western thought. Its history at the time was also a product of Western thought, and so there was nothing universal about its dialectical nature; Instead, as we have seen, there will be a fierce confrontation with others who challenge the path of the Marxist prescription. Marcus's resolve, of course, was to derail the prescriptive lens he had ordered to the world once the difference was recognized. This led to some of Marx's more controversial statements, denying the possibility of any history of India before the advent of colonialism, and his insistence on the extreme desirability of modernity with the advent of capitalism outside Europe, through colonization. Will bring. Yet Marx's problem goes deeper: the "mere burial" of his problematic statements "will not take care of the problem ..." Spivak notes (79). Young people say that "Marxism, which has inherited the Hegelian dialectical system, is also involved in the link between the structure of knowledge and the forms of oppression of the last two hundred years: an event known as Eurocentrism". This is an important statement: it can be thought of as a "negative aspect of the history of European imperialism" rather than just a product of the state of Marxism in Western Europe. If, Young goes on to say, "deconstruction involves the decentralization and colonization of European thought - even if it is unable to respect the existence and meaning of others" and to that extent its philosophical tradition makes it a common cause of oppression and repression. The authoritarianism of the same 'om' then Marxism of the same reprehensible philosophical tradition suddenly takes on a more frightening air. On reflection this means: Marx

considered colonialism to be another "pharmakon" by which modernity could be taught to others as a result of the original "pharmakon," capitalism. How can this inspiration be realized in socialist utopia?

So, what are the consequences of the interaction between Marxist and post-colonial theory? How did one inform the other? To understand that relationship, we must first examine the relationship between Marxism and poststructuralism. Robert Young states that the resistance to poststructuralism, of which post-colonial theory is a part, was initially formed by Marxist thinkers such as Frank Lentricia and Terry Eagleton, who later "first claimed to represent the shadowist withdrawal from poststructuralism history" and, a year later, "It was a more deadly Holocaust-like liquidaion of history," says Perry Anderson, Young, "rejecting all poststructuralism on the grounds that it represents randomization of history. And so, there is no teleology "suggests that teleology, as it conveys Marxist theory, is a very problematic but essential element. It was not enough to stop the difference: "It quickly became clear that this was history There is a serious problematic concept, especially for Marxism.

It has never succeeded in achieving a solid "existence" outside of theory, where it can wait, ready to appeal against it". Was it the expected result of history that there was something wrong with Marx's concept? How can history create Stalinism? However, there are more fundamental differences between poststructuralism and Marxism that Young seeks to question. And acquires a single meaning by incorporating many such moral-political concepts, which then form the basis of the regulation and authorization of historical interpretation". Seeks to tear down this principle. The young people are of the opinion that the two things are inconsistent as it makes it impossible for Marxist history to reconcile with the separatist agenda.

Gayatri Spivak, on the other hand, does not find the Marxist theory to be impossibly wrong with the disintegration project, a task for which her new methods of analysis have been provocatively useful. However, it would be wrong to suggest that Spivak failed to acknowledge the falsity of Marxist theory, as she explicitly states that Marxism's "contradiction - the critique of the intended subject in each hypothesis and the talus based on the intended subject ... separates Marxism from within ..." Her confession of the relationship does not prevent her from using Marxism as a valuable tool in her disintegration projects. Spivak works in the field of Marxism and Feminism, as well as in other philosophical discourses, trying to use a strategic imperative by which she can implement her disruptive project. She warns that deconstruction is a challenge: the one who has gone through it must be careful not to "forgive", but to suspend the accusation in order to diligently examine whether there is a moment in the text's protocol that could lead to a new and new creation. Appropriate meaning ". In order to make a deconstructive reading of a philosophical element like Marcus, Spivak, from Derrida, "to maintain a grip on the former institution, which must be effectively replaced, we need to find a lever. New uses, as it were." This lever must be handled with care so as not to affect the tarnished or violent product: an effect that is involved in the actions it seeks to dismantle. When considering Marx, Spivak chooses to focus on the Asiatic mode of production as a lever. Here, she explains, "the concept-metaphor of AMP visualizes the site-specific limitations of production methods as an explanatory category". Certainly the Asian mode of production, in its violent production, denies the naturalness of the methods of production and the dialectical nature assumed by Marxism.

But Spivak warns that "we cannot forgive the dramatic change in Marx's paradigm from the violent consequences of the first wave of global Marxism ... on the other hand, it does not demand academic accusations against Marxism ... I am. Which involves attempting to access Marx's text protocol so that it can be rewritten for use. In order to do so, Spivak introduces three "easily available secondary texts." A careful reading of these texts in the context of examining the Asiatic mode of production, says Spivak, "describing the Asian mode as 'real' is not a problem in its explicitly appropriate place and time. The machinery of liberation transformation of Hegelianism is necessary as an important theoretical fiction to present itself as a general system. . . And, when it does, its ultimate appeal is its predetermination. These assumptions enable Spivak to draw provocative conclusions from the problematic consequences of the Asiatic production method and from the interpretation and planned actions based on its underlying flaws. On Marx's tainted theory, which calls into question the

development of capitalism in Europe: for example, he calls it a "bold rewrite"... Capitalism developed as a 'dangerous supplement' to the moment of weakness in European feudalism because the conquerors could not establish a flexible state. This does not mean that there is a 'correct' statement of history that is spivac. Now there is privilege; Rather, her project is to use Marxism as a tool to displace its own traditional statements of theory. Indeed, she demonstrates the effectiveness of such a project in her work.

Although Young acknowledges that Radial Transformation could have an impact on her disruptive work, she is skeptical of the broader value of her project. Respecting her ability to work in many subjects, Young questioned Spivak's ability to completely distance himself from the violent consequences of Marxist theory. When she speaks of the international division of labor, she is particularly troubled by her use of "the rest of elite Marxism is called upon to use its political influence from the outside, which it denies and clearly escapes the rigors established by the rest of its work ...". For example, he considers the young Spivak a slip she cannot avoid: her Marxism, he suggests, "works as a synchronous frame as a whole. It works ... as a great gesture to create closure. Spivak's complementary history must complement itself."

It should be clear that Spivak's project seeks to undertake a radical re-evaluation of Western thought and a legacy of Western knowledge creation. However, an integral part of her project is the manner in which her deconstruction projects must be constantly innovated. A single destructive reading, she maintains, will not reverse the power structures that have become localized in academic thought. Spivak therefore relies on a constant rearrangement of ideas arising from its disintegrating projects. Spivak may be said to be working outside the academy but she must also acknowledge her place in it. Young's advice against Spivak assumes that her projects do not suggest, less demand, further reevaluation; Moreover, he assumes that she failed for her own position at Spivak Academy and in the structures, she seeks to reconsider. Young also ignores the stated priority for her strategic urgency, arguing that her deconstruction enhances her ability to move forward. "Possible reading is a misreading," Spivak reported. Her point is that Marxism can be used in a variety of violent ways and that it directly interferes with its restructuring projects, but to unilaterally declare that it has no place in contemporary post structural discourse would be a violent denial of Marxism's own equality. Structural violence as related to others. There is no denying that Spivak's radical revision of Marxism has created an important understanding of the interaction between Western knowledge and others.

So, what should Young do with this disintegrating product because, in order to reach it, it is necessary to use the violent tools of Marxist discourse? Things that have already been created cannot be selectively ignored. Young's final review of Spivak insists that she has finally created an alternative glimpse of history, however, further complementarity is demanded. Spivak will probably agree. Her project, of course, insists on such volatile strategies that the production of her knowledge is a one-sided truth that would violate her sense of work. Spivak, indeed, accounts for. Her approach allows her a wide range of philosophical subjects from which she can choose the tools of her dissolution. To remove Marxism from that kit, even if it did remove her original problems from her project, would be counterproductive: the effectiveness of her work would be affected as a result. Indeed, Young's project, which is to expose the West as a valuable ideal, would benefit from borrowing from Spivak's conclusions and methods: destroying Marxism and then using it may seem paradoxical. But as Spivak has shown, it is a very powerful motivator in practice. The solution to the violence of the Western one-sided production of knowledge is not to suppress it in such a violent way but to use it destructively for re-reading and re-informing.

## CONCLUSION:

It is generally beyond dispute that Marxism suffers from a number of disabilities that consider its usefulness as a strategy for learning history. Where Marxist thought intersects post structural theory, a wide range of arguments is presented by the projects of Robert Young and Gayatri Spivak. Although she skillfully uses Marxism to carry forward her disintegrating project, her involvement in Spivak's impeccable discourse shows the most rewarding and provocative re-evaluation of Western

---

knowledge. Thus, it is her project, which is in the best position to fundamentally reconsider the issues presented by the provocative developing realm of post-colonial theory.

**REFERENCES:**

1. Chatterjee, Partha. 2013. "Subaltern Studies and Capital". *Economic and Political Weekly*. Lxviii(37): 69-75.
2. Nikita Dhawan, *Marxist Critique of Post-colonialism*, *Krisis Journal of Contemporary Philosophy*, Vol-2018, Issue-2, pp. 105-107.
3. Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999.
4. TariqueNiazi, *Postcolonial Theory in the 21st Century: Is the Past the Future or Is the Future the Past? Postcolonial Theory and Marxism: Culturalism vs. Materialism*, 2021
5. Vivek Chibber interviewed by Jason Farbman, *Marxism, postcolonial studies, and the tasks of radical theory*, *International Socialist Review*,
6. Young, Robert. *White Mythologies: Writing, History and the West*. London: Routledge, 1990.