

Deviation from Traditionalism for the sake of being Liberal: The Historical conceptual framework of Baloch Society

Muhammad Amin¹

Abstract

The paper covers that the modernity on de-ontological ethics hits the foundation of traditionalism, so the de-ontologically conceived a-teleological ground pushes the traditionalism towards a fundamentalism. The paper argues that traditionalism neither remains a-teleological nor it prevails de-ontological. The paper discusses the assumption that the politically engaged Baloch individual entertains traditionalism as a synonym of fundamentalism. The paper suggests that the traditionalism is the conscious survival of Baloch society. The research embraces that the assumed notion of de-ontological modernity and a-teleological progressiveness does not lead only the Baloch society towards the liberalism, but it formulates the conversion of traditionalism into fundamentalism. The research analyses teleological ground of traditionalism, Baloch tradition and fundamentalism, and concludes that tradition shouldn't need to be eventual, but evolutionary and teleological

Key words: Baloch, Fundamentalism, Liberalism, Traditionalism, Modernity, A-teleology, De-ontology.

Introduction

Modern de-ontological rationality makes discourse talk about ethics on the account to gauge the man as rational. De-ontological ethic(s) does not need any sort of a, or a few super-natural beings or entities to make an account of measure that judge man's deeds or actions. Thus de-ontological ethics makes the man self-sufficient in ethical plane to balance rationality. Because rationality always has capacities of constructions and it does not

¹- He is known as Amin Zaamin Baloch, the author of five Balochi books on Philosophy and edits a series book series in Balochi on Social Science, he can be reached at mazbaloch@hotmail.com

go with destruction; therefore, the rational man is in-itself the measure of all things. Modernistic definition of rationality is not determined in limitations, but actually it is determined to make everyone free (Suri, 2016). Basically, modernity makes rationality an on-going agenda and fixes to anything that man thinks. The ground of modernity makes path towards mutual freedom that makes maximization of opportunities possible. However, this opportunity is conditional that is to be rational.

A-teleological ground of de-ontology presumes that the modern progress is immanence and removes all particularities of rationality and transcends the individual from evolutionary steps. It assumes the experience as a unit which is not evolutionarily associated with other phenomenal occurrences, but the man can rationally make a causal connection between two different or novel occurrences.

In a traditional social set-up, when man moves toward competition eventually, he finds obstacles. He conceives obstacles as a frame of freedom, which limits the freedom. Historically, he seeks tradition as a major obstacle. He forms intention to hit the foundations of tradition through the availability of modern rationality, but he lives actually in a traditionally installed society making rational possibilities of tradition for the sake of identity on the bases of de-ontological de-facto. In petty capitalistic state, we face two situations, which are as following:

- 1- We cannot survive without identity, and
- 2- We cannot compete without modernity.

The first condition makes our social life possible, but it does not create a single corner of individual liberty. The second situation makes man capable to construct individual liberty possible, but it transcends us from open and participatory surrounding. Finally, we are going to make identity rational, because, we get interdisciplinary position of survival. Subsequently, we have intention to make a rational tradition which could be span in modern perspective, without knowing the foundations of modern rationality. So, how do we get this presupposed modern rationality? This remains a question to be answered.

Let it be assumed for the sustenance of this argument. Historically, first we got progressive mode to make our life comfortable in order to strengthen our traditional identity. Consequently, in 19th and 20th centuries, the Baloch society moved towards liberal order of collective accumulation

of wealth, however assuming the a-teleological surface too. This political journey made definition of progressiveness as an agenda on the basis of evolutionary movement of nature. However, in traditional Baloch structure, the economic system does not remain foundational because individuality is not authoritative, but the political system is authoritative- because our living structure is authoritative per se. Our authoritative structure, before coming to meet with a structure of a state, remained a form of unification between its actions and manifestation. When it was maladjusted with state's form, then it changed its active way, but it made its manifestation sustained for the sake of controlling the public. Ultimately, concealed politics remained practical. When public got an understanding of concerned political attitude, then public just put-on the mask to respect the authority. Authority remained a power that was only apt power structure to fulfill individual's opportunities. If authority really comes to join the traditional flow, then it really will be persuasive. The morale is that our political structure should accept its defeat, because they don't have any option except to lose its active dimension of manifesto which had been corrupted because of its adopted political themes. In this sequence, whatever nature the state assumes, but it probably remains clear and its clarity leads it towards traditionalism.

As a result, the practice of traditional progressiveness was converted into liberal progressiveness. When we (Baloch community) felt the downfall of socialism then we easily kept liberal order of individualistic accumulation of wealth, (Dr. Abdul Wahab Suri (2006) named it Capitalism), as an alternative mode of liberalism that sustains liberty and keeps us secure to resist reversion of past. Past is the door of traditionalism. We assumed that traditionalism would not fill the blanks of our progressive thinking with its rigid framework. We measured traditional freedom or progress with the rational historiographical mode that shows the un-reversing of history which is being constructive in nature. It also reveals that the reverse of history is impossible because dialectical move is natural. Propositional attitudes² are kept intact and it is assumed that the reverse of history is only possible to get manifestation in the theory of cycle.

²- Propositional attitude shows, if a man affirms a thing it means he negates a thing, but he does not manifest negation at all.

This was our first phase of political survival. Now, we move to second phase. In second phase we completely fell into liberal capitalistic order, because we do not find any other progressive option. In liberal capitalistic order, we assume motion of development as a real natural phenomenon. This attitude results the emergence of Baloch salariate. The Salariate is a class and it is a sine qua non for a person, and he is ready to instrumentalize his pen to them, if they would be the source of his permanent salary, he remains always instrumental for them. This person is called salariate, and being an instrumental makes him auxiliary. In this context, the salariate always abides to be an auxiliary, and the auxiliary is gone to be a salariate.... the salariate class emerged in Balochistan as soon before the first general election in Balochistan. (Baloch, 2020a).

Moreover, the salariat class turns the Baloch society individualistic primarily on two grounds. First, the salariate goes to attack on social codes for the sake of freedom. Socially and politically, the promotion of individuality occurs in our society, because only the individuality remains sustained, often, when individual wants to get freedom from every social, and available political system. Thus, the nourishment of individuality would be possible because it comes from a notion where he gets rid of freedom from all institutions that elevate the collection (Baloch, 2020b).

Liberal capitalistic order assumes progressiveness as an entry-pass of liberal world order. This order supposes peace is only possibility of world which is installed to secure individual freedom. In contemporary time, we conceive progressiveness as a real constructive attitude. If we are progressive and in chain with airtight compartment of progressiveness, which determines us to be free; thus, we can't oppose modernity as the sake of development and progressiveness. Basically, we do not go against the modernity rather don't demonstrate the affirmation of modernity. Therefore, second layer intelligentsia of liberal system takes our 'non-against' position as affirmation. Not only we cannot go against modernity, but also we do not reject the slogan of gender equality and violation. Thus, we have been considered as peaceful, bolster of gender-equality, modernism and progressive. Finally, we do not find all above celebrations in traditionalism and even we make synonyms meaning of traditionalism and fundamentalism.

Demarcation of Fundamentalism and Traditionalism

Now, we move to make a line of demarcation between traditionalism and fundamentalism.

1. According to Chris Harman (2008), modernity is not binary opposite of fundamentalism, however, the traditionalism is the enemy of fundamentalism, because fundamentalism wants to back toward the foundation and in this process first it has to eradicate the developed forms and actualizations that got growth from traditionalism (p.7) because traditionalism is a synthesized phenomenon which makes journey towards peace and harmony. Fundamentalism presents regeneration as a catastrophe that supposes that its micro change can vandalize the foundations of humanity. The foundation of humanity means to live in accordance with what fundamentalism provides, but this passion is completely subjective. Fundamentalism considers regeneration as a catastrophe and that's why it counts regeneration as a wrong attitude or evilness. Because it always measures the accounts of regeneration in a determination or a fixation, rather regeneration might be the cause of good and goodness (p. 08). Fundamentalism presents social regeneration in religious frame, but the social regeneration might be the foundation that makes challenges to state exploitations (p. 08). However, fundamentalists make force the state to succumb where it has controlled. Thus, they promulgate a particular culture in existing territory, (p. 27) but many times, the war industry makes a pressure wall for the maximization of profit where the particular culture is going to be practical. It tries to sustain marginalized culture in surrounding of existing territorial boundaries, because this position creates foundation of the restoration of fundamental idol. On the other hand, traditionalism always forges awareness about its boundaries and it always makes lines on boundaries for the sake of making it pure probably. If a system or an organization takes traditionalism's culture and evacuates it from the boundaries, that traditionalism determined the traditionalism to keep this position vulnerable on the bases of others misusages of its culture, because traditionalism is alive state therefore, it does not want its culture to fall into crisis. Contrarily, if we analyze fundamentalism then we

conclude that fundamentalism does not have dread of any misusages of the culture that lead it to vulnerability. Fundamentalism invites to use its culture on the condition of assuming its meta-narrative good. Basically fundamentalism does not engage with the protection of identity rather survival. Thus, in first phase, fundamentalism demands notion of survival and then moves to reformation.

Fundamentalists run toward battlefield when they find only a single way of maximization of opportunity to make their meta-narrative, whatever meta-narrative that might be. Thus, it means that the way of identity is flexible on the basis of maximization of opportunity. Unfortunately, capitalism remains the only way of maximization of opportunity. It has probabilities to harmonize any sort of order with single option.

The roots of fundamentalism basically arise from traditionalism, but the emergence of fundamentalism gets possible when it comes to divert traditionalism. When traditionalism opens doors for others falling into the vulnerability of maximization of opportunity. When it seems that its roots are going to be misused then it moves toward reformation. When it comes to reform then it deals with the problem of survival. For making survival possible, it keeps eye on restoration of foundations.

2. On many occasions fundamentalism has been assumed as an institution. It has been decorated with fixed reasoning that makes achievement of power historically rational. Thus it gets agreement on using of power but it does not consider the normative usage of powers. The sustainability of concerning institutions is possible when they change their foundations with the passage of time. These institutions change their educational foundations for the sake of harmonization with situations. They get hermeneutical assist to make adjust their educational foundation. This is a trace-system that man observes same foundations on new hermeneutical interpretations. In this situation their education gets propositional shape or attitude.

Man, with intention to live a cultural-life, crosses the limitations of tradition then he faces identity crisis. Traditional identity is the symbol of his aliveness and his conscious survival. Besides, the

man gets this position evolutionary on the back to back process of generations. In this case no one becomes an entity of a fixed and particular tradition suddenly. In tradition man gets a peculiar conception of good, each conception of good obtains objective form in its time of evolution, but the structure of tradition remains sustained. Basically, identity has fixation with the structure. When man revolts against tradition, he feels threatened of losing his identity. We can trace the dread of harmonization in history. We find religion as challenging the traditional identity and trying to repel what man has lost. Religion makes way of conceiving man to give it a universal identity and transcends man from the artificial identities which are designed by a man (This meta-narrative is a fundamentalist view). Modernism repels man's traditional identity which he has lost with fashion and consuming power. Thus, modernity makes man free to construct his own conception of good, measures himself and makes identity for one's own self. Although, post-modernism rived the discourse of identity on the basis of irrelevant concerns because identity deals with meta-narrative, contrary, meta-narratives are not real and every meta-narrative discourse is alive in an iron-cage of determination; basically this determination is artificial, howbeit the life remains in little-narratives.

Aside from this, in our condition, we do not believe in post-modernism's last perspective. We have agnostic view of tradition, and we believe that tradition is possible to remain sustained in meta-narrative and little-narrative. This position keeps varying from limitation to limitation. We do not take interest to make path of tradition on mechanical materialism where it goes to reach a final and single determined destination. If we seek objectivism in micro level then we find that little-narratives also have consistency in this situation, and we find the same consistency in tradition on the bases of teleology.

We observe traditionalism in the post-modernism paradigm. If we observe it in meta-narrative, then we can judge it in romanticism. We feel traditionalism or tradition on the romance or empathy of a man. Romantic empathy makes it possible for man to empathize

others feelings. In this pattern, one gets other expressions. This position, probably, makes meaningfulness for each other on the basis of empathy, which produces the meaning of oneness. According to empathetic position, there emerges a peacefulness dimension of traditionalism, thus there are two dimensions of traditionalism; one is progressiveness and the other is peacefulness. If, in the name of traditionalism where is no harmony, people have declined collective life and are shedding blood. Remember obviously they have crossed the limitations of tradition, but we illogically or non-romantically conceive it as traditional; because of misunderstanding to call it as a cause. Basically, cause does not rely on thing in-itself, it always relies beyond the concerning thing.

3. There are two methods of producing institutionalization in society.

1- Determined Institution

2- Valued Institution

Fundamentalism has one institution. Determined institution means state is a perfect totality. It determinately promulgates all those action or things that make its mean fulfill. Thus, it makes social stratification on the bases of determination. On the other hand, valued determination means that state protects values of society and it obtains the position of value carrier. Further, it creates selective way of getting value. In this manner, it develops value nature as a selective. It provides paths of value to individual and in this path, man harmonizes himself with values and he makes a positive propaganda. Besides this, he always needs a total value, because on the ground of total value one makes no clash with others' values. This path leads us toward liberal destination and rationality gets value to totality.

There is another available form of value that makes protection of social values possible, but in this case the nature of value is not selective rather aesthetical. The collective awareness is consist of aesthetical awareness; vis-à-vis, collective awareness is the measure of actions. This collective and aesthetical condition sustains peace and harmony in society. No sequence phenomenally occurs in society because of non-subjective clashes. This path leads us to

traditionalism and aesthetics has totality or minority (in its paradigm).

Conclusion

In above discourse, we would conclusively obtain following points:

- 1- It is an assumption about traditionalism it is equal to fundamentalism. Thus, fundamentalism has a way of destruction rather than the single version of construction.
- 2- In this sense, we have moved to liberalism.
- 3- Liberal propositional attitudes lead us toward the selective nature of value.
- 4- When Baloch society has assumed selective nature of value or modernity, it makes environment of competition and it has used traditionalism as a taste to live or survive. It has not considered value's aesthetical in actual plane. That's why we have produced a day for celebration of the Baloch Culture Day. In as much as, when you celebrate a day, it means this day is dead.
- 5- On evolutionary ground, Baloch society has rational duties to make an objective adjustment between the flow of requisites and tradition, because the action of adjustment is ultimate survival. The Baloch society survives unless the tradition prevails. This makes two objectively essential and particular tasks possible: firstly, society can underpin or support itself and conceive the requirement of reproduction. Secondly, on the bases of first principle, society can get possibilities of its conscious existence. Thus the tradition is the practical reference points between individuals of society that fabricates a social isomorph. These conditions incite the bonhomous Baloch individual to accept the tradition as a conscious object of his or her life. In the fullness of time the notion of 'to be traditional' remains a conscious guarantee of the survival of Baloch society. The Baloch society produces resources as the resources are required imperatively and indispensably, but it needs to make the conscious survival persisted.

References:

Baloch, A. Z. (Aug. 13, 2020a). The Salariate, Alienation and Struggle: A pattern study of Struggle. from, http://balochstudentsactioncommittee.org/2020/08/13/the-salariate-alienation-and-struggle-a-pattern-study-of-struggle-by-amin-zaamin-baloch/?fbclid=IwAR3wvaFX_38S-6IvX1omozV0BXPtsTFgEN2wf3HAbwKFAKIh4FiQ-qMQwbk

Baloch, A. Z. (Jan. 07, 2020b). The Probable Source of Individualization. From, <http://nodarbar.com/2020/01/07/the-probable-sources-of-the-social-individualization-in-baloch-society-amin-zamin-baloch/>

Suri, A. W. (2016 June). Foundations of Liberal Capitalistic Revolution. (A. Z. Baloch. Ed.), Raajmaan (2)

1- ہارمن، ک۔ (اپریل 2008)۔ اسلامی تحریکیں اور مزدور طبقہ۔ کراچی: انٹرنیشنل سوشلسٹ پبلیکیشنز