



Sklar, R., 1963, *Nigerian Political Parties: Power in an Emergent African Nation*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Smith, A., 1987, *A Little New Light: Selected Historical Writings of Abdullahi Smith*, Za-

ria: The Abdullahi Smith Centre for Historical Research.

Whitfield, L., 2005, 'Trustees of Development from Conditionality to Governance: Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers in

Ghana', *Journal of Modern African Studies* 43 (4): 641-64.

Williams, G., ed., 1976, *Nigeria: Economy and Society*, London: Rex Collings.

---

## Colonisation from a World History Perspective\*

---

'Until lions have their own historians, tales of the hunt will always glorify the hunter' (African proverb).

Colonisation is certainly one of the events that have had a considerable and lasting impact on history. In 1760, European colonial empires covered 18 per cent of the earth's surface area and accounted for three per cent of its population. In 1914, when they were at their zenith, they sprawled over more than 39 per cent of the planet and were host to 31 per cent of the world's population.

Even though colonisation appears to have ended, apart from a few isolated cases, its impact on former colonies and international relations is still very strong. Colonisation is still the subject of political debate within former colonies and their colonial metropolis countries as well as between former colonies and the latter. The French law of 23 February 2005 amply illustrates this.

In the past, colonisation was the subject of research and numerous publications. After a brief lull, interest in the subject was rekindled, resulting in a multiplicity of theses, colloquiums, books and articles that raised new questions, defined new objectives and tried out new approaches.

This renewed interest has not had a significant impact on the teaching of colonial history everywhere. How should the history of colonisation be taught in our countries? What type of curricula and textbooks should be adopted and how should teachers be trained?

A look at North African and French syllabi and textbooks clearly shows that colonisation is being taught from a strictly national perspective. A world history approach would bring out the complexities of the subject more clearly. The pedagogic spin-off would include improved chronology, concepts, terminology, content and more suitable documents that can be used

**Tayeb Chenntouf**  
University of Oran,  
Algeria

in class. It would then be possible to design courses.

### Teaching the history of colonisation: National perspectives

Since its institution in the late nineteenth century, the teaching of history has had almost the same overriding objective: to promote nation building and strengthen nationalism. More than a century later, this is still the main objective of official directives and curricula in North African countries. The situation is the same in France, as can be seen in the role played by E. Lavisse.

In France, the virtues of colonisation and the empire were extolled while decolonisation and the Algerian War were ignored. A number of studies in France itself decried the shortcomings of programmes and textbooks. The didactic realities are less well known.

Following the 1865 circular by V. Duruy, colonisation was incorporated into the Upper Sixth curriculum, in the section dealing with the history of the Second Empire. The subject was partially taught in the Lower Sixth form and from 1902, in Form Four. It disappeared from the secondary school curriculum from 1923 to 1946 and 1957 to 1962 (Lantheaume 2000). Today, it is taught in Form Three and the Lower Sixth. The subject is taught following the model adopted in the school of the Third Republic. The model is based on a purely national approach to the

events that link some one hundred years of history to colonisation. Even though the history of colonisation and of the 'Overseas Territories' is marginalised in the university and in research, it is taught in secondary schools. It mainly focuses on the idea of the empire, the civilising mission of colonisation and the greatness of the nation. This was reiterated in official programmes when teachers were asked in 1938 to 'pay the necessary attention to French Overseas Territories, which may up till now not have occupied the place they are entitled to in school programmes' (Lefeuve 1993).

A close look at textbooks reveals numerous shortcomings. The history of colonisation is reduced to the barest minimum, without even an attempt at evaluating colonisation. The scant and often indirect information presented indicates that French colonisation was beneficial to the colonised countries and to a lesser extent to the colonial power (Lantheaume 2000). Teachers have also criticised the discontinuous manner in which the history of colonisation is taught: the subject appears only in the syllabi of Forms Three and Lower Sixth. They have also decried the silence of textbooks over the colonial methods of conquest (war and various forms of brutality) and the colonial system itself (inequality as well as administrative and political oppression) (*Les Manuels scolaires* 2002: 180).

In 2001, M. T. Maschino conducted a survey to find out the opinion of teachers on the teaching of the history of colonisation. 'There is little or no emphasis on the negative aspects of colonisation,' one teacher admitted. In Form Four, 'nothing is said to students about the methods used to partition the world (extortion and looting). The colonial system and the re-

sistance to it are not mentioned.' One female teacher admitted that there is a huge gap 'between the putting in place of the imperialist system and the resistance to it'.

Decolonisation was added to the Upper Sixth curriculum, which was applied from 1962. It called for the study of modern history, dividing it into contemporary history (1914 to the present date) and the birth of contemporary civilisations, including Moslem civilisation. It was introduced in colleges in 1971 and from the 1980s it was taught in Forms Three, Four, Five, and Upper Sixth. In the Upper Sixth, the decolonisation of Algeria was divided into three chapters: decolonisation and international relations, the Fourth Republic and the Fifth Republic. It dwelt on internal French history, treating decolonisation as a mere appendage of the history of France.

The Algerian War<sup>1</sup> could, in principle, be taught in high schools from 1960, even before it ended. It was added to the section on the birth of modern history (1914 to the present) and to the one on international relations from 1962. Today, all secondary school students are taught about the Algerian war in Form Four and in the Lower Sixth under the chapters dealing with decolonisation and the history of France from 1945. The expression 'Algerian War' first appeared in textbooks in 1971 and it was only as of 1983 that the war was studied systematically, in the same manner as the other colonial wars.

Even today, the Algerian war is still the subject of heated debate within France and Algeria and between the French and Algerians. The teaching of the subject in France posed problems of chronology, terminology and unresolved dispersion.<sup>2</sup> A survey of French students aged between 17 and 30 years shows how they learnt about it. This study was conducted by the University of Paris and published with commentaries in the French newspaper *Le Monde* under the title: 'The Algerian War: The appeased memory'.<sup>3</sup> Sixty-nine per cent of the youths surveyed declared that they had learnt of the Algerian War for the first time on television before hearing of it from their teachers. Eighty and a half per cent of them were of the opinion that they had not been sufficiently taught about the Algerian War in school.<sup>4</sup>

From early independence, history was also taught in North African countries from a national perspective. The aim was to

forge a national identity and strengthen national unity and social harmony. Recent reforms have not made any significant changes to these objectives.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, they have instead laid greater emphasis on building a national identity. The new curricula and textbooks dwell lengthily on resistance to colonial occupation and struggles for independence. Unlike its two neighbouring countries, the War of Independence is given pride of place in Algerian textbooks.

In keeping with this new approach, two textbooks for Grades Eight and Nine were published in Morocco in 2003 by Maison d'Édition Marocaine. The first is divided into two parts. Part one, which deals with Europe from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries, examines economic changes (the Industrial Revolution), the American and French Revolutions and finally European imperialism in the nineteenth century. Part two (comprising sixteen lessons), examines the reaction of the Moslem world to the European invasions of the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries: the Ottoman Empire (two lessons), Algeria, Tunisia and Libya (1 lesson each), Africa before and after colonisation (two lessons). The rest (nine lessons) is devoted to the history of Morocco from the birth of the Alaouite dynasty through European invasions and penetration in the nineteenth century to the French Protectorate.

The textbook for Form Eight is also divided into two parts. Part one deals with world events: the First World War, the Russian Revolution, the Great Depression and the Second World War. The second is devoted entirely to the study of liberation movements in the world: in the Middle East (three lessons), North Africa (nine lessons, six of them on Morocco), Africa (one lesson) and Asia (one lesson). The textbook ends with two questions relating to the global changes that took place after 1945: changes in international relations as well as scientific and technological development and its consequences.

In Tunisia, reforms focused mostly on contemporary history, substantially modifying the former approach to nationalism, the manner of presenting key players and H. Bourguiba's role. The reforms also changed the manner of portraying local reactions to French occupation. Unlike in the past when textbooks glossed over resistance, the new ones laid emphasis on the reaction of Tunisians to colonial

occupation. These reactions were included for the first time in school curricula. The textbook for Form Six described the role of resistance fighters like Hassan b Abd Aziz al Sid. The textbook for Form Seven states that: 'French colonisers had imagined that it would not take them long to occupy the country. Unfortunately for them, the inhabitants put up very stiff resistance, though with limited means. It took the colonisers many years to subdue Tunisia' (Abbassi 2002).

The contents of curricula and textbooks in Algeria are very much the same, save for the fact that they dwell more lengthily on the War of Independence (1945 to 1962). In primary schools, history subjects focus entirely on resistance to colonisation and on the War of Independence. School programmes clearly outline objectives. In Forms Five and Six, the aim is to provide pupils with the basic skills they need to consult archives, classify and analyse events and draw logical conclusions from them. Again, the aim is to show them the importance of history and encourage them to carry out research on Algerian history: this is done using documents that glorify the Algerian people and their resistance to colonisation. Finally, the objective is to form generations that would defend their ancestors and who believe in the objectives of the Algerian revolution that was meant to build a new society.

Specific objectives for each year are even more significant. At the end of the course, Form Five pupils are expected to have acquired a very good knowledge of the National Liberation Front, the National Liberation Army and their grassroots organs and a good opinion of the Algerian Revolution and of the struggles of the Algerian people. They are also expected to develop respect for the 'chouhadas' (martyrs of the War of Independence) and to view them as models. Finally, the subject is expected to strengthen patriotism and highlight the achievements of the Algerian people. Grade Six pupils are expected to understand the condition of the Algerian people, the place of Algeria in the world, the colonial policy and the oppressive practices of colonisation, and to have a good opinion of the resistance by Algerians and to know the heroes of the Algerian Revolution.

The contents of textbooks are designed to meet these objectives. The Algerian pupil is first introduced to history in Grade

5. After three introductory chapters that focus on the notions of time, documents and historical events, the rest of the textbook dwells on the War of Independence. Throughout the year, pupils in Grade 6 are taught the history of colonisation and the resistance to it. The new textbook presents Algeria as it was before colonisation, the causes and methods of colonial conquests, resistance to occupation (battle of Constantine, Emir Abd al-Kader), methods of colonialism (settling of people, exploitation of resources and physical abuses), resistance to French colonisation (uprisings up until 1881 and political struggles that lasted till the start of the November 1954 Revolution). Primary and secondary school curricula and textbooks also treat colonisation and the War of Independence extensively under headings that are almost the same as those in Grades Five and Six textbooks. Unlike in Tunisia and Morocco where programmes and textbooks pay scant attention to the armed struggle, the struggle for independence is the basis for the Algerian national identity (Tayeb 2005).

### Colonisation from a world history perspective

The post-colonial crises of the 1980s decade, globalisation and the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States have again given rise to a debate on colonisation and, more broadly, on relations between the West and the East. The French law of 23 February 2005 opened heated controversy in France and Algeria. The effects of colonisation were once more at the centre of debate. Politicians, the media and historians attempted to reassess it, while remaining silent on the lasting and far-reaching consequences that colonisation had on colonised people and on their development.

Indeed, the advantages and disadvantages of colonisation have been debated since the late eighteenth century. Liberals in England and later on in France were against it. The triumph of colonisation in the nineteenth century pushed debate on the subject to the background. It was revived after the Second World War.

Up until 2005, the public at large did not participate in this debate. The series of documents published by R Cartier in *Paris Match* (August–September 1956) were raised to a doctrine: cartierism. It favoured the French rather than the African point of view. According to J. P. Chevènement, the positive aspects of colonisation

should be taken into consideration, 'primarily, the school that provided colonised people with the arms of the Republic, giving them the intellectual tools needed for their liberation' (*Le Nouvel Observateur*). J. P. Cot declared in 1984: 'I do not believe that colonisation was bad' :

A. Adler showed he was a keen advocate of colonisation when he wrote: 'it would be but normal and just to also bear in mind the grandeur of this undertaking (...) these are all things that the Anglo-Saxon world cannot understand (...). In Africa, people loved France for the good things it had to offer: the White Fathers (...) officers of the colonial army (...), doctors who invented humanitarian action a hundred years ago,' (Bancel, Blanchard, Vergés 2003).

*The Encyclopaedia of North Africa*, which has a website, summarises the benefits of colonisation: schools, healthcare, roads, railways, port infrastructure.

Colonisation, according to some, was costly and of little or no benefit to the colonial powers. Consequently, these countries should not be held responsible for the underdevelopment of colonised countries. P. Bairoch, in his assessment of colonisation (Bairoch 1963), holds that trade with the colonies contributed little to the economic growth and development of Europe. In France, J. Marseille declared that according to some financial experts, business leaders and senior government officials, the need to modernise the French economy was incompatible with the cost of maintaining a colonial empire and that it would have been better to send back the available resources to metropolitan France (Marseille 1984). D. Lefevre also held a similar point of view with regard to Algeria (Lefevre 1997).

The law adopted by the French parliament on 23 February 2005 clearly took a stand in the debate pointing out that colonisation was beneficial. It immediately provoked heated reactions in France and, shortly afterwards, in Algeria.

The so-called Fillon Law urged 'the nation to be grateful to the men and women who participated in France's enterprise' (section 1) and that 'university research programmes shall restore the history of French Overseas ... to its rightful place' and that 'school programmes should especially acknowledge the positive role played by the French overseas presence' (section 4).<sup>6</sup>

Although the law did not provoke any particular political debate, French historians vigorously protested against it, mostly through the media and the numerous internet websites that were set up. An association was set up to remind people of the methods and results of colonisation. It reaffirmed the principle of freedom in research and teaching of history.<sup>7</sup>

In Algeria, the media at first considered the controversy triggered by the law as a purely internal French problem and adopted a neutral stance in discussing the debate. It was only later that it became aware of the official reaction of the Algerian government. During the 50th anniversary celebration of the events of 8 May 1945, the Algerian president compared the lime kilns in which many Algerians had been burnt near Guelma to Nazi ovens. One month later, on 7 June, the National Liberation Front also 'very vigorously' condemned the law, because it was silent about 'colonial savagery, glossing over its most heinous acts'. Parliamentarians also reacted by voting a resolution calling on the French parliament to repeal the law. In Tlemcen, A. Bouteflika once more criticised the 'negationism and the revisionism' of the law and described colonisation as 'a crime against humanity' and an undertaking that 'de-civilised' colonised peoples.<sup>8</sup>

Apart from the methods and assessment of colonisation, the debate also examined the outcome of colonisation. What is its impact on the history of colonised countries and on their relations with Europe? From the perspective of world history, it fits into the three main periods of globalisation. It is the only path to modernisation that countries under colonial domination must take, whether they like it or not.

The first period was in the sixteenth century, following the 'voyages of discovery' and European maritime expansion. For the first time, navigation and trade linked Europe, Asia, Africa, and America under the aegis of Europe. It was characterised by a triangular Atlantic trade in which the slave trade played a major role.

The second period lasted from 1870 to 1914. According to S. Berger, it was during this period that we first experienced globalisation (Berger 2003). According to Marxist works, the partitioning of the world among European powers was an act of imperialism. This second globalisation is symbolised by the 1885

Berlin Conference. It expanded colonial possessions and increased contacts as well as regional and world trade. It was prolonged after the First World War through the mandates given to France and England by the League of Nations, especially in the Middle East.

The 'colonial situation' defined by G. Balandier and I. Wallerstein includes colonisers and colonised peoples, contacts and trade between them and the tensions and conflicts that gave rise to nationalism in the various countries. The notion of acculturation and social change (Wallerstein 1966) were meant to explain these changes in the 1950 to 1960s.

In fact, the history of the colonised became the history of the colonisers and the history of the colonisers became the history of the colonised. This history of North Africa has become the history of France, and the history of France that of North Africa. Colonisation is part and parcel of the history of France. The building of the State, the Republic and the Nation is inextricably linked to colonisation. On the whole, colonisation played a significant role in the modernisation of the West. The history of Europe can never be complete without the history of colonisation. Only an ethnocentric person would deny this.

The Moroccan historian, A. Laroui, has rightly pointed out that in the colonies, particularly in his country, the French protectorate and General Lyautey succeeded in implementing the reforms that the sultan had tried in vain to apply towards the end of the nineteenth century and at the beginning of the twentieth century (Laroui 1986). K. Marx, in describing the British colonisation of India, underscored its ambivalent nature. His approach was criticised or at best ignored subsequently. It presented colonisation as a formidable agent of change and transformation in India.

Nevertheless, the reverse side of colonisation is the traditionalisation of colonised societies and the perversion of their relations with modernity. Colonisation readily presented itself as the progress of civilisation against barbarism. It is far from achieving this programme. The limitations of colonisation are geographical, social, cultural and political. Colonisation is quick to demarcate a useful geographical area which it separates from the rest of the territory. This includes maritime regions, agricultural plains and regions rich in raw materials. In the Maghreb, for instance, the Sahara acquired interest only

from 1955 to 1956 with the exploitation of hydrocarbons. The limitations of the economic and social transformations are clearly reflected in studies on under-development in the 1950–1960 period. The survey carried out by P. Bourdieu (1960) at the end of the colonial era gives a clear idea of living conditions and difficulties in drawing up projects for the future.

Traditionalisation was also strong in the political domain. The British colonial system leant on a small military corps, a small team of administrators and the traditional chieftaincies, which were part and parcel of the administration of the territories. India is the classic case. In Morocco, the traditionalisation policy was instituted by General Lyautey. His administration of the protectorate sought to preserve the traditional framework by maintaining the 'natural hierarchies', the Cherif landscape, while turning the country into a 'French California'. This policy was pursued up to the Second World War. It is mostly in the areas of culture and thought – difficult to quantify – that colonisation has the most profound and lasting effects. It resulted in the perversion of relations between colonised peoples and modernity. The illegitimacy of colonisation – due to its foreign nature – seriously discredited its modernity for large portions of the elite and the population. Testimonies are legion. The reforms initiated by the Moroccan sultans, Sidi Mohammed and Moulay abd al Raham, were considered as misbegotten innovations (*bidaa*) repugnant to the spirit of Islam. The columnist, al Naciri captures this general feeling. In the Istiqla, he considers that the adoption of foreign ways serves no useful purpose; on the contrary, the only solution to strengthen the kingdom in the face of foreign intervention lies in tradition and isolation. In Algeria, education and colonial medicine met with stiff resistance up to the end of the nineteenth century (Chenntouf 2003). In the twentieth century, the works of F. Fanon (1961) and A. Memmi (1954), contemporaries of colonisation and decolonisation, are replete with precise, concrete and focused data on the scope of the damage caused to the psyche and behaviour of the Maghreb people. In Algeria, M. Lacheraf, through his numerous studies, keeps highlighting the role of colonisation in the shortcomings of the anti-colonial struggle and nationalism (Lacheraf 1962). Even today, culture and political thought have not yet cut the Gordian knot of modernity: reason, free-

dom, future. Modernity is challenged for the reasons that it is considered akin to colonisation and foreign ways. Thought dissociates modernity by separating its most visible technical and material aspects from its philosophical underpinnings, namely worldview and action on the world. The essence of the colonial experience is certainly the fact that it deprived the colonised peoples of the right to chart their own history.

### Lessons from the colonial experience

What can we learn? How do we teach colonial facts 'and events'? How do we include these in school curricula and teach them to young children and teenagers? Within the context of world history, teaching colonisation raises at least four problems.

The first concerns chronology, which remains problematic both for the major historical upheavals and for the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Equally noteworthy is the gap between research and official syllabi. Many works and colloquiums have dwelt on colonisation and colonies. Some go as far back as Greece and Rome. The medieval period is also considered the period of colonisation. M. Ferro, who coordinated a project on the history of colonisations (Ferro 2001) situates this period from the thirteenth to the nineteenth centuries. But there is more consensus among historians to the effect that colonisation started in the sixteenth century.

The second work of M. Ferro entitled *Le livre noir du colonialisme* has the subtitle: *16e-21e siècles: de l'extermination à la repentance*.<sup>34</sup>

The curricula and books focus exclusively on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The teaching of history in the Maghreb adopts – albeit while questioning it – the general chronology of European descent. History continues to be divided into the ancient, medieval, modern and contemporary periods. The chronology relating to the contemporary period is even more controversial. In Algeria, 1830, the year of conquest and the beginning of French colonisation, is no longer considered as the starting point of history. The history of Algeria is written along longer time frames. In Tunisia, the new syllabi have witnessed two shifts. Tunisian nationalism is no longer born in the 1930s as a reaction to the French protectorate and thanks to the initiative of H.

Bourguiba as was the case formerly. Henceforth, it is considered part of the reformist trends of the nineteenth century and, as such, came before the protectorate. Similarly, in the chronology, internal changes prevail over external changes. These begin in 1881 and not in 1914 with the First World War as was the case before. Finally, Tunisian history is separated from world history. The latter has two periods: from 1914 to 1945 and then after World War II. The first substitutes the three traditional periods (post World War I, the party crisis of the 1930s up to 1945 and post World War II) with a four-period scenario: from 1881 to 1914, from 1914 to 1939, from 1939 to 1956 and from 1956 to 1964 (Abbassi 2002).

The second problem concerns the concepts and the vocabulary used. The content and meaning vary significantly from one author to another.

It is the multiple uses of the terms 'colonisation' and 'colony' that is discussed most. For M. Ferro, colonisation is not peculiar to the West. It existed in the Arab and Ottoman worlds whereas Russia and Japan carried out their territorial expansion later (Ferro 2003). The origins of the word colony go back to the Roman republic. A colony was a detachment of Roman citizens dispatched to occupy deserted territory or territory conquered by force. The English and the French adopted it at the beginning of the seventeenth century to name their new-found overseas possessions. The English derived a whole range of vocabulary from the word 'colony' before the French language used the word 'coloniser' – 'to colonise' – (1770) then the nouns 'colonisation' – 'colonisation' – (1790) and 'colonisateur' – 'coloniser' – (1835). From 1900, 'coloniser' took on a new meaning. In dictionaries 'to colonise a country (or people) means subjecting them to the status of colony, that is, dependency.' (See Perville, 1993 for these developments in semantics).

The differences between the terms 'colony', 'protectorate' and 'mandate' are based on the status of the dependent territories and their relations with the mother countries. In France for example, Tunisia and Morocco were placed under the ministry of foreign affairs while Algeria was placed under the ministry of the interior. In protectorates, the pre-colonial states continued to exist under the authority of a resident general whereas in the colonies they were destroyed by war. Mandates, described legally by the League of

Nations, were, in principle, expected to become independent before long.

The notions of colonialism and imperialism appeared at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth. They were more commonly used in political literature produced by colonised people and anti-colonialists. Colonised people talked more of colonialism than of colonisation. In 1955, the conference of Bandung (Indonesia) proclaimed that colonialism in all its forms was an evil that needed to be uprooted forthwith, that the submission of people to the yoke of a foreign state, to its domination and exploitation were a negation of fundamental human rights, which is contrary to the United Nations Charter. The expression neo-colonialism was used for the first time by K. Nkrumah, prime minister of newly-independent Ghana. It denoted 'the situation of a state which is independent in theory and has the attributes of sovereignty but whose policy is, in reality, directed from outside'. The term imperialism was coined by economists before being adopted by Marxism. Hilferding and Lenin devoted whole works to it. For the latter, it was the ultimate stage of capitalism.

All these concepts and terms do not always have exact equivalents in the Arabic language. The vocabulary most commonly used in books includes: *Ihtilal*, *Isti'mar*, *Imperialia*, *Qawmia*, *Thawra*. The first is close to the French word for conquest or occupation; the second to populating, colonisation and colonialism. The third is an Arabic adaptation of the word imperialism. The fourth and fifth refer to nationalism and revolution or uprising.

The third problem concerns the content of textbooks and the education system. Didactic transposition should not translate into oversimplification of the complexity of the colonial fact and event. It could revolve around three basic questions. The first would be described as unequal history and would assume the perspective of a comparative history between Europe and the rest of the world towards 1815. The progress of Europe and the accumulation of technical and material resources will be explored. They are followed by the stages and methods of conquest and colonisation. The second deals with the colonial situation itself. It focuses on the structures and their permanency at the time of colonisation and domination. It includes the presentation of the colonisers, that of the colonised and relations between them in all domains. The third examines ten-

sions and conflicts. The most tangible outcome of colonisation is the strengthening and/or emergence of strong nationalist movements. There are three aspects to these: the production of national imaginations, lawful anti-colonial struggles, armed struggles and decolonisation.

The fourth and last problem has to do with documentation that can be used in schools or in textbooks. There is a lot of it, but it is produced for the most part by the colonisers. It should be balanced with the points of view of the colonised. The documentation in European languages is impressive. The 'colonial gesture' has generated a lot of discourse and commentary. The archives are now open to researchers and authors of books. The archives of decolonisation have been declassified progressively, depending on the legislation in force in the countries. In France, the military archives of the Algerian War have been accessible since 1992. Maps and statistics are also available. Like with the archives, some are published in books and periodicals. The use of image, photography, film and cartoons has become more convenient as researchers became interested in such tools.

The availability of documents of colonial origin tends to subdue the voices of the colonised. The colonial situation, the political struggles, then the wars of independence, were hardly conducive to the preservation of archives. However, newspapers in Arabic were published in the three countries of the Maghreb by the political parties and associations during the colonisation period. This literature was reprinted, partially or in its entirety, after independence. Many oral or written testimonies have been, or are being, published. The phenomenon has gathered momentum since the 1980–1990 decade. Literature, poetry and folk traditions enable people to transcend the vision of the elite.

## Notes

\* Paper presented during the colloquium "La Storia è di Tutti Nuovi orizzonti e buone pratiche nell' insegnamento della Storia". Modena, Italy, 5-10 September 2005.

1. This appellation corresponds to the French usage; whereas in Algeria other appellations are used in political, media and research discourse. As far back as in the 1990s, I used the term 'war of independence'.
2. On 27 February 1992. No formal survey has been carried out in the Maghreb on the impact of the teaching of history and the way it is received by young people. How-

- ever, the press publishes the opinions of teachers, parents and high school students. *Algérie-Actualité*, a now defunct weekly published an on-the-job survey it carried out (No. 1098, 30 October 1986).
- See *Le Monde* and *Actes du colloque. La guerre d'Algérie dans l'enseignement en France et en Algérie*, 1993, Paris: IMA-CNDP.
  - The reform was implemented in Tunisia in 1991. Morocco and Algeria are working on new curricula and textbooks.
  - Official gazette of the French Republic, 24 February 2005.
  - A group of teachers and historians launched on 25 March in the newspaper *Le Monde* a petition captioned: 'Colonisation: non à l'enseignement d'une histoire officielle'.
  - J.A./L'intelligent*, No. 2319, 19-25 June 2005; *Le Monde*, 1 July 2005.
- References**
- Abbassi, D., 2002, 'Le traitement de la période coloniale dans les manuels scolaires tunisiens de 1980 à 1998: entre histoire et mémoire', *AAN*, T XL.
- Actes du colloque La guerre d'Algérie dans l'enseignement en France et en Algérie*, 1993, Paris: IMA-CNDP.
- Bairoch, P., 1963, *Révolution industrielle et sous-développement*, Paris: Sedes.
- Bancel, N., Blanchard, P., Vergés, N., 2003, *La République coloniale: essai sur une utopie*, Paris: A. Michel.
- Berger, S., 2003, *Notre première mondialisation*, Paris: Seuil.
- Bourdieu, P. 1960, *Travail et travailleurs en Algérie*, Paris: Éd. de Minuit.
- Chenntouf, T., 2003, *Le Maghreb au présent*, Alger: Office des publications universitaires (in particular, the chapter on post-colonial Maghreb).
- Chenntouf, T., 2005, 'La naissance d'une discipline scolaire. L'histoire en Algérie', *Actes du colloque organisé par l'Institut Georg Eckert* (Brunschvig, avril 2004).
- Cot, J. P, 1984, *À l'épreuve du pouvoir. Le Tiers-mondisme pourquoi faire?* Paris: Le Seuil.
- Fanon, F., 1961, *Les damnés de la terre*, Paris: F. Maspero.
- Ferro, M. 2001, *Histoire des colonisations. Des conquêtes aux indépendances*, Paris: Le Seuil, nouvelle édition.
- Ferro, M., 2003, *Le livre noir du colonialisme 16e-21e siècles: de l'extermination à la repentance*, Paris: R. Laffont.
- Lantheaume, F., 2002, *L'enseignement de l'histoire de la colonisation de l'Algérie depuis les années 30 [texte imprimé]: Etats-nation, identités nationales, critique des valeurs. Essai de sociologie du curriculum*, 504 p. Thèse doctorat.
- Lacheraf, M., 1962, *L'Algérie, nation et société*, Paris: Maspero.
- Laroui, A., 1986, *Les origines sociales et culturelles du nationalisme marocain*, Paris: Maspero.
- Lefeuve, D., 1997, *Chère Algérie (1830-1962)*, Paris: SFHOM.
- Lefeuve, D., 1993, 'L'Algérie dans les manuels scolaires d'histoire et de géographie de 1930 à nos jours', in *Actes du colloque: La guerre d'Algérie dans l'enseignement en France et en Algérie*. Paris: CNDP.
- 'Les manuels scolaires', 2002, in: *Apprendre et enseigner la guerre d'Algérie et le Maghreb contemporain*, Versailles: CRDP.
- Marseille, J., 1984, *Empire colonial et capitalisme français. Histoire d'un divorce*, Paris: A. Michel.
- Maschino, M. T., 2001, 'La décolonisation telle qu'on l'enseigne', *Le Monde diplomatique*, février.
- Memmi, A., 1954, *Portrait du colonisé, précédé du Portrait du colonisateur*, Paris: Buchet-Chastel.
- Pervillé, G., 1993, *De l'empire français à la décolonisation*, Paris: Hachette.
- Wallerstein, I., ed., 1966, *Social Change: The Colonial Situation*, New-York Sydney: John Wiley and Sons, 674 p.

## From 'Foreign Natives' to 'Native Foreigners' Explaining Xenophobia in Post-apartheid South Africa: Citizenship and Nationalism, Identity and Politics

Michael Neocosmos

'Questions of how belonging and exclusion occur and what is at stake in assertions of citizenship lie at the very heart of modern social life. In this trenchant critique of liberal politics and sociality, Neocosmos probes the etiology of xenophobia in South Africa, implicating the discursive practices and the historical trajectory of the State and the hegemonic language and ideology of Human Rights, in the emergence of xenophobic anxieties. In this analysis, and the prescription of an alternative politics that follows, the resolution to forms of marginality and disenfranchisement must be initiated in a space outside of the state, in the realm of the "popular" and the "emancipatory". In this sense, the meaning of politics itself must be rethought in order to transcend the dominant paradigms within which political intercourse occurs'.

**Kavita Misra, Yale University, USA.**

'This is a timely book as xenophobia, narrow nationalism and chauvinism afflict many of our societies. Many descriptions and lamentations exist; but this is among the first to give us an explanation. And it is pre-eminently a political explanation to do with state and popular politics. Xenophobic discourses are ultimately structured by the state but contested in civil societies. They are neither inevitable nor insurmountable and can be transcended to build truly emancipatory discourses and courses of action. That is the message of the book; a remarkable intervention in the murky waters of divisive ideologies'.

**Issa G. Shivji, University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.**



November 2006; 160 p.  
ISBN 2-86978-200-4;  
Africa: CFA 7500; \$15;  
Elsewhere: £12.95 /\$22.95