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The question of why the works of Michel Foucault, Pierre Bourdieu and Jacques Derrida are often attributed to France by HE lecturers and students when the origins or developments of their key ideas come from Africa is examined from critical and personal standpoints. The article joins the call for the decolonisation of the HE curriculum and gives detail to why the theory of these oft-cited thinkers and philosophers comes ‘out of Africa’ through an examination of their experiences in the Moorish regions of Tunisia and Algeria. Reasons for the attribution of the ideas to France are given including Eurocentrism, Wikipedisation of theory and the mythologization of France. This article is a response to the act of positioning theory which came from Africa as French in HE lectures. The authors consider why they might have done this including a deep reflection on the subject, listening to voices from Africa.
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Introduction

Foucault was, of course, French. This is made very clear in the introduction to Aubrey and Riley’s (2017) chapter on Foucault: ‘Michel Foucault …one of the most influential French philosophers…Published in French…born in Poitiers, France…Following the German invasion of France’ (93-4). It is also clear to our students: on asking a question to a class, “What do you know about Foucault?” we received the (rather depressing) answer, “He was French”. In an undergraduate assignment in Education Studies set by one of the authors where Foucault’s work was central to the topic out of 26 students, 16 mentioned France/French. In an assignment for an undergraduate module set by one of the authors on Public Relations which also used Foucault’s theory out of 58 essays, 31 mentioned France/French. Eribon’s (1991) biography of Foucault mentions France/French 159 times. His Frenchness is also known to lecturing staff at universities, as, sitting in on a lecture of first year Education Studies university students in November 2018 the lecturer started with, “What do we know about Michel Foucault? He was French, obviously”. Frustrations about the foregrounded Frenchness, personal experience of Algeria and epistemological concerns about the attribution of knowledge to a birthplace prompted us to write this article reviewing the origins of social science theory. It feels frustrating to us, not because we dispute the French nationality of Foucault, but rather because there is no or little reference to where the formative ideas were first created in HE lectures and subsequently, essays. This even happens when a so-called ‘French thinker’ was born in Algeria such as in the case of Jacques Derrida. In this paper, we investigate the African origin of the work of three key thinkers that affect arts, humanities and social science studies today and the reasons why it has been appropriated into the canon of French theory. We are interested in an ‘epistemological mooring’ (see Goswami 2013) - returning the ideas to the area they were formed in. Given that this is in the Moorish or Maghreb region of Africa it is a more literal epistemological Moor-ing.

The chosen three - Michel Foucault, Pierre Bourdieu and Jacques Derrida - have become the part of, ‘The return of grand theory in the human sciences’ (Skinner 1994). The term ‘grand theory’ re-appropriated from Mills’s (1959) derogatory sense to mean: ‘individual thinkers who have played…a role of exceptional importance in helping to bring about…changes
of theoretical allegiance’ (Skinner 1994, 6). The three have been among the most cited authors of the past 12 years: in 2007, Foucault, Bourdieu, Derrida respectively were the top three for arts, humanities and social science (Thomson Reuters quoted in THES 2007) and, in 2018, the most cited in all disciplines, Foucault at number one, Bourdieu at number two and Derrida at 28 (Google 2018). These three thinkers, we show, have their Frenchness foregrounded in lectures, essays, articles and online sources and the African influences minimised. We give some reasons why this might be, including Eurocentrism and the ‘Wikipedisation’ of information. With this paper, we join the call for those teaching in HE to be part of a decolonisation of academia (see also, SOAS 2019; PBRN 2019; Bhambra, Gebrial and Nişancıoğluand 2018) by acknowledging and celebrating the African origin of some key social science theory.

In writing this article we recognise in ourselves, and the practice of many of our colleagues at HE-level, the unequal treatment of scholarship by political forces that reduce the West to an entity that has existed in isolation and has led the way with no reference to its past or biographies of its driving forces. We situate ourselves in this process having done the same at university-level in both the fields of education and culture and communication when we have ascribed ideas not to the country of origin and its political and social circumstances but to the birthplace of the theorist. We are not, therefore, ‘standing on a balcony during a carnival’ (see Apple 2003, 223) but exploring reasons why we did this with a view to sharing this with our students when we next approach the theorists’ work. What we are proposing in this paper is the application of thought pioneered by Young (1990, 2001) who upended the argument that ideas come exclusively from the West: ‘Structuralism came from the East, poststructuralism from the South. Many of those who developed the theoretical positions subsequently characterised as poststructuralism came from Algeria or had been involved in the war of independence. Fanon, Memmi, Bourdieu, Althusser, Lyotard, Derrida, Cixous – they were all in or from Algeria’ (2001, 413-4). Along with Ahluwalia we ask: ‘Why has there been a silence, suppression or, at best, a belated acknowledgement of the colonial roots and affiliations of these theorists? Is it because such an acknowledgement might well challenge the very belief in the superiority of the French on which the modern French nation has been constructed?’ (2010, 138).

This paper came about from a combination of John Keenan’s frustrations when reading about the country of birth of the theorist in essays without useful epistemological supporting commentary and Karima Kadi-Hanifi’s more personal experience triggered by visiting a small public lending library in Algiers in 2018 - Nos Richesses. The librarian told Karima, ‘Algeria was key in the development of European ideas during the occupation. Remember, it was the capital of ‘France libre’ during the second World War but unfortunately only French writers had the advantages that indigenous Algerians, no matter how gifted they were, could not have; so there was inequality from the start and in flagrant contradiction with the fight against fascism in Europe at the time; an inhuman double standard that led to the radicalisation of the colonised
even more even in the domain of great ideas and anti-colonialist theory’ (author’s translation). Alongside this, Karima was reading Rouben Valery’s work and was struck by this line: ‘With total media indifference, the first black African Goncourt prize winner of 1921, Rene Maran, dies in Paris on 11th May 1960. Only his intellectual and literary friends, as well as a great many black thinkers will remember him as they saw in him the announcer of a literary movement destined to re-establish the honour of those who had been badly treated: The negritude movement’ (own translation from French of Valery [2014: 183]). These experiences of reading about Maran led to comparison to that well-documented book published in 1927 by Andre Gide, ‘Voyage au Congo’. Both Maran (with his other book, ‘Djouma chien de brousse’) and Gide were not only published in the same year but were also critical of colonialism, but Gide’s is widely known and feted whereas Maran’s is rarely, if ever, on the syllabuses of most arts, humanities or social science university courses. The question we asked ourselves was therefore: why it has to be a white intellectual bringing to the fore the injustice of colonialism before we start listening more seriously? Equally, it led to Karima wondering why it has to be white French men that could radicalise the thinking of many generations when all along they had been working closely with Algerian thinkers and writers such as Mouloud Feraoun, Mouloud Mammeri, Kateb Yacine and Jean Amrouche, to name but a few. These are voices that Karima accesses in her reflection on what it means to be Algerian and to see and even teach the ideas from her own region of Africa as if they belonged elsewhere. The inequality and double standards seem to be continuing in an age of supposed critical opening.

This article is in two parts – one an investigation into the African origin and ‘Frenchification’ of social science theory and second a reflection on being Algerian and seeing the place of one’s own birth symbolically annihilated (Gerbner, 1972; see also Coleman and Yochim, 2008) through practice in universities. The piece is written partly as a critical discussion about the African origin of social science theory and its attribution to France and partly as a reflective, meditative piece, informed by personal, familial and friend views on what it means, as an African, to find theory which should be attributed to the continent colonised by the West. We feel that there is an urgent need to resist and counteract the simplified discourse of ‘alterity’ as being about ‘otherness’ or ‘difference’ (in opposition to self), rather than a deeply ethical responsibility towards the ‘other’. The subjectivity of the three thinkers focused on in this article and how they encompassed the influences of ‘others’ they met face-to-face, triggers in us an ethical responsibility to go back to the varied encounters that helped form them. They are recalled in this article by the voices Karima Kadi-Hanifi, encountered as she traversed the streets of Algiers in 2018 or read Algerian authors or followed the millions of Algerians in their recent ‘renaissance’ protest marches in 2019.

In this section we examine the African origins of theory of the three ‘grand theorists’: Foucault, Bourdieu and Derrida and reasons why it is attributed to France. The two main countries from which many ideas in social science originate, Tunisia and Algeria, share much in common. Along with the third country, Morocco, they have a collective name of the Maghreb sharing commonalities of being Arab/Berber-Islamic, occupation by France and independence in the 1950s-60s when the boundaries between them were fixed (see Charrad 2001). From this region the ideas of Foucault, Bourdieu and Derrida were formed. We take each theorist separately to establish how the region affected the ideas so prominent in Western academic thought.

Foucault, while a visiting professor of philosophy at the University of Tunis from 1966 to 1968 (see Afary and Anderson 2005), ‘lived like an ascetic’ (Defert, quoted in Gordon 2016, 228) giving him the time and ‘first hand knowledge of the rebarbative effects of colonialism’ (Ahluwalia 2010, 599) to write the lectures (Legg 2016, 268) which became Archaeology of Knowledge (1969). It was a formative period to his greatest ideas (Miller 1993; Macey 1994; Young 2001) which turned him from the archaeology of ‘anonymous production of knowledges and discourses’ (Mills 2003, 23) where discourse is viewed in a fixed history to ‘genealogy’ where it was in a process of negotiation, formed by forces and in transition (see Foucault 1980), a change, ‘undoubtedly triggered by his residence in the postcolony of Tunisia’ (Ahluwalia 2010, 600). Foucault’s witness of the ‘necessity for a struggle’ (Foucault 1991, 138) with the year-long student protests in Tunisia (which he supported [Miller, 2000]) left him ‘profoundly struck and amazed’ (Foucault 1991, 134) by the risks taken by the Tunisian students and the conclusion that it was because of ‘power’ (see Macdonald 2006, 103). Also, in Tunisia, a ‘vocally militant Foucault’ emerged (Macey 1994, 206) as he saw it, ‘vital to engage in work that had political meaning’ (Ahluwalia 2010, 148). Foucault, ‘used his distance from France while working in a postcolonial state the better to develop an ethnological perspective on French culture’ (Young 2001, 396) and through his creative redefinition of existing terms (see Young 2001) developed the language by which society is analysed at university today. On leaving Tunisia, the African influence continued as he maintained contact with students (Ahluwalia 2010, 568) through friendship with Algerian author Albert Camus (who was present at his Nobel Prize ceremony [see Ahluwalia 2010]) and through his lifelong partner, Daniel Defret’s Tunisian experience.

Bourdieu’s time in Algeria studying culture for the French government (who had a colonial view of changing ‘hearts and minds’) formed his theory and thinking (Driver 2011) and ‘prefigure(d) some of the most salient features’ (Peters 2016, 132) of his work. These included
alienation (see the final chapter Sociologie de l’Algérie) a subject, ‘which would dominate Bourdieu’s work’ (Goodman and Silverstein 2009) and while he had not conceptualised and termed (see Swedberg 2011, 69) many of the other ideas which would lead to his worldwide academic recognition - habitus, field and capital - the origins are in the Algerian writings (see Davis 2011; Steinmetz 2011). Bourdieu’s Algerian work also started his lifetime fascination with key ideas of symbolic violence and power (see Calhoun 2006; Peters 2016). His first conceptual experience of the country would have been through his Algerian philosophy tutor Louis Althusser then, experience of the ‘gruesome realities’ (Wacquant 2006, 215) of the Algerian War which prompted him to turn to ethnology and sociology in order to ‘make sense of the social cataclysm wrought by the clash between imperial capitalism and homegrown nationalism’ (Wacquant 2006, 215). From this ‘Algerian crucible, suffused by fear, risk, and ‘ambient fascism’’ (Yacine 2004, 487) Bourdieu gained his political sense, positioned both against the forces of French colonialism and the idealism of revolution. Like Foucault, the political unrest brought a desire to make a change to society through ‘practice theory’ (Silverstein and Goodman 2009, 5). As with Foucault, this experience stayed with him through his life with Outline of a Theory of Practice (Bourdieu 1972), largely based on his studies in northern Algeria. Bourdieu was indebted to many Algerian sociologists including Abdelmalek Sayad, his ‘mentor, colleague, and friend’ (Goodman and Silverstein 2009, 31), the novelist and teacher Mouloud Feraoun and Mouloud Mammeri who acted as translator, mediator and contextualiser.

Derrida, being Derrida, complexified the very ‘inadequate’ or ‘limited’ understanding of how context affects the text partly through the ‘absence of intention’ (see Derrida 1988) and the complexity of communications. The idea, then, of reading his work through the context of his Algerian upbringing would be imposing an ‘outside text’, on his work, giving an intention which he did not necessarily mean. Derrida avoided interviews as much as possible but on being ‘caught’ (Ahluwalia 2010, 143) he responded to a question about Algeria: ‘Ah, you want me to tell you things like “I-was-born-in-El-Biar-in-the-suburbs-of- Algiers-in-a-petit-bourgeois-Jewish-family-which-was-assimilated” but…is this really necessary?’. While it may not be necessary to introduce the origins of motives from his experience in the country to his work he was clear that being brought up in Algeria helped to form his worldview. The Algerian War had a major influence on his ideas: ‘As a child, I had the instinctive feeling that the end of the world was at hand…No one could escape that violence and fear’ (Derrida as quoted in Wood and Bernasconi 1988, 74) to the extent that: ‘If “so-called poststructuralism” is the product of a single historical moment, then that moment is…the Algerian War of Independence.’ (Young 1990 as quoted in Ahluwalia 2010, 138). The ideas also formed from Derrida being ‘tattered of identity and rootless, neither here nor there’ (Ofrat, as quoted in Ahluwalia 2010, 146). In Monolingualism of the Other Derrida ‘unequivocally presents himself
as a Franco-Maghrebian’ (Ahluwalia 2010, 147) and a ‘very black, very Arab Jew’ (as quoted in Davis 2011, 137) who had a strong sense of non-belonging. Derrida could see how this ‘Judeo-Franco-Maghrebian genealogy does not clarify everything…But could I, explain anything without it? No.’ (Derrida 1998, 71-2). As an Algerian Jew he was rejected by the French rulers his family worked for (see Ahluwalia 2010, 148) and from this feeling of being ‘displaced’ (Derrida as quoted in Ahluwalia 2010, 144) and an insider-outsider came the ability to deconstruct ‘the concept, the authority, and assumed primacy of, the category of “the West”’ (Young, 1990, 51). Derrida began a ‘strategy of postcolonial retaliation, of overturning… (the) incredible discipline, a fable and bible…a doctrine on indoctrination almost ineffaceable for children of my generation’ (Derrida 1998, 44) of French thought and history. This makes his appropriation into the canon of French thought all the more unpalatable when it was, arguably, a means for intellectual liberation and decolonisation: a ‘surgical operation’ directed at ‘an ontological violence that sustains the western metaphysical and ideological systems with the force and actual violence that has sustained the western nations in their colonial and imperial policies, a structural relation of power that had to be teased apart if it was ever to be overturned’ (Young 2001, 416).

Foucault, Bourdieu and Derrida, therefore, join, ‘a long list of canonical ‘French’ thinkers who were impacted by events in Algeria: Louis Althusser, Pierre Bourdieu, Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, Hélène Cixous, Albert Camus and François Lyotard, to name a few.’ (Davis 2011, 136). That their ideas formed in Africa has been well-documented yet still their Frenchness is often mentioned in lectures, essays and articles and too-rarely the African experience which originated the theory. For example, the start page of the Wikipedia (accessed 14.11.18) entry for Foucault reads: ‘Michel Foucault (French: [miʃɛl fuko]), was a French philosopher’ and the article goes on to mention France/French 67 times. Bourdieu’s obituary writer Douglas Johnson stated that ‘Bourdieu's death deprives France of one of its great post-war intellectuals’ (The Guardian 2002). There is a ‘Failure to take Bourdieu’s work in Algeria seriously enough’ (Goodman and Silverstein 2009, 13) and so ‘very few scholars have engaged with his early studies on Algeria’ (Purser 2010). Likewise, the work of Derrida gets attributed to France. He was, according to the Encyclopaedia Britannica (accessed 19.3.19), a ‘French philosopher… Educated in the French tradition…(who) went to France…welcomed in France’ and even his place of birth is called ‘French-governed Algeria’. The cliché is to call Derrida a ‘French thinker’ (the terms searched for in Google [on 18.3.19] yielded over 11,400 results while the equivalent search for ‘Algerian thinker’ brought 142 results).

That Foucault, Bourdieu and Derrida’s work gets attributed to France brings the question of why place would be attributed at all and how much validity is there in the concept of ‘place’ anyway? All three thinkers were part of ‘the new world order of mobility, of rootless histories’ (Clifford as quoted in Ahluwalia 2001, 128) who were, ‘at home in motion’
(Ahluwalia, 2011). Anyway, as Helene Cixous noted, Algerian was an adjective before it was a noun (see Still 2010, 158) so to attribute anything to ‘Algeria’ is a ‘mutilation in advance’ (Derrida as quoted in Ahluwalia 2010, 137) as it has already taken on board the colonial lie that the country exists - The European settlers of Algeria were labelled ‘Algerian’, whereas the real indigenous Algerians were called ‘indegenes’ or ‘Arabs’, keeping them away from any notion of nationhood. While it may be complex to define which country the writer is from with globalisation (see Giddens 2000) and multiculturalisation, the origins of the author is clearly a matter of importance to those thinking about the content who seem to need to contextualise or make an epistemological point about nationhood. Perhaps this is why Salman Rushdie bemoaned: ‘“Indian-born British writer” has been invented to explain me’ (as quoted in Ahluwalia 2010, 137). Place is referred to in lectures, in essays and was a matter of importance to another ‘grand theorist’, Edward Said (1983) for whom the locatedness, or ‘affiliation’ of the text gives it ‘a material presence, a cultural and social history, a political and even an economic being’ (Ahluwalia 2010, 141). If it is important to locate theory to a space then we should locate it to the place where it was first envisioned – to the immediate personal, social, cultural and geographical circumstances of its origin and in the case of the chosen theorists in this article, this is Africa. Ahluwalia (2010, 297) noted how the ‘impact of colonial Africa on French theory is pervasive’ – the well-chosen adjective speaking both of the way Africa, and the situation of France in Africa, in particular, spread through a community of thinkers, but also the implication that this was an unwelcome development by both the French government and later by an academic establishment in whose interest it was to promote Western thought.

There can be a dismissal of the African work of Foucault and Bourdieu giving a sense that this was mere juvenilia. For Bourdieu, ‘Sociologists also tended to assume his work on Algeria was somehow of a different, ‘anthropological’ genre, and of interest mainly with regard to ‘traditional society’ (see Calhoun 2006) which was not relevant until his work was applied to the West. France may also be cited as the context of the theory because it was the country which imposed the language the theorists used for publication (even Algerian Derrida was published in Paris by Éditions de Minuit in 1967). Franz Fanon called French, ‘a key capable of opening doors that were barred…Mastery of language affords remarkable power’ (as quoted in Ahluwalia 2010, 146). Derrida to his frustration stated, ‘I concede that I have contracted a shameful but intractable intolerance…I cannot bear or admire anything other than pure French’ (Derrida as quoted in Ahluwalia 2010, 147). In this we might see a manifestation of ‘European cultural superiority’ (Driver 2011) – French above Arabic. More practically, by being written in French, the theory becomes available to the West and the quick translation into other European languages, particularly English which is a route to America (see Sallaz and Zavisca [2007] for a review on Bourdieu’s popularity in America).
Another reason for the Frenchification of the theory may be system overload leading to a simplification or, what might be called, Wikipedisation of theory – where it becomes a series of soundbites, headlines and ‘facts’ and ideas are simplified to non-specialist level away from the specialist origins of such complex thinkers as Foucault, Bourdieu and Derrida. For example, with Bourdieu’s 37 books and over 400 articles, ‘oft couched in a difficult technical idiom, Bourdieu’s thought might seem on first look dispersed and daunting, if not intractable’ (Wacquant 2006, 263). Likewise, Derrida who even Foucault accused of academic terrorism: ‘He writes so obscurely you can’t tell what he’s saying, that’s the obscurantism part, and then when you criticize him, he can always say, ‘You didn’t understand me; you’re an idiot.’ That’s the terrorism part’ (as quoted in Reason 2000). In an information-rich but time-short academic world then shortcuts are made from any, ‘sprawling oeuvre’ (Wacquant 2006, 263). When information is complex, humans tend to simplify in a heuristic manner (see Gilovich, Griffin and Kahneman 2002) and Africa may not form part of the, what they call in news selection, ‘consonance’ (see Galtung and Ruge 1965) aspect necessary to make information easily understandable. It is easier to see Foucault, Bourdieu and Derrida’s theories, embedded in a linear narrative of French philosophy because the country is mythologised (see Barthes 2014) - another White Mythology (see Young 1990) as a place of philosophical thought. Perhaps this is also why the Wikipedia entry [accessed on 3.3.19] for Claude Levi Strauss states, ‘Claude Levi Strauss was a French anthropologist…’ while listing his birthplace as Belgium.

France also had the material and political circumstances to publish. It was possible to publish in Algeria (as Camus did with Charlot, in Algiers – until the publishing house was targeted by French conservative white settlers and burned to the ground) but censorship plagued all of African publishing during the colonial period. Novelist Rene Maran was ‘placed in considerable difficulties with colonial officials and French literary critics, because of his naturalistic depiction of the material deprivation which French colonialism visited on Africans’ (Onoge 2007, 464) and Aime Cesaire declared ‘Under a colonial society...everything goes well so long as nothing happens to disrupt the hierarchy’ (as quoted in Onoge 2007, 464). Those, who resisted the colonial powers, like Sayad, who refused French citizenship and remained an ‘homme frontière’ until his death in 1988 (Goodman and Silverstein 2009) gained little of the academic fame and success afforded Foucault, Bourdieu and Derrida. Feraoun, author of semi-autobiographic ethnographic novels such as Le Fils du Pauvre (1950) fared worse - assassinated by a far-right French paramilitary squad on March 15th, 1962, in Algeria (see McNair 2018).

These historical examples of racism and European elitism are with us today when we side-line African thinkers and do not acknowledge the African roots of theory. As Said believed: ‘contemporary criticism is an institution for publicly affirming the values of our, that is, European, dominant elite culture’ (Said 1983, 25). It might be that such authors, like Fanon (1986 2001) who supported violence (in Black Skin, White Masks) to move people from
‘abjection’ to ‘agency’ do not conform to the myth of the Enlightenment Humanism of Western academia (see Nayar 2011). Equally, a Western culture grounded in its own sense of importance may not be willing to sacrifice it no matter how (neo)liberal and humanistic it claims to be. Perhaps it is also uncomfortable in the West to admit that the ideas of Foucault, Bourdieu and Derrida are the result of French oppression of African people. Their presence in Africa was because, or in aid of, French colonisation and allaying the government’s fear of: ‘a real invasion and a berberisation of whole neighborhoods’ (1947 as quoted in Conelly 2002, 12). To admit this would open up the idea of the vicious slavery Western countries created for African people, and, by the time the Algerian War finished in 1962, the million-plus civilians and freedom fighters who were dead, along with nearly 40,000 French soldiers and ‘pieds-noirs’. In 1921, Maran, in his novel ‘Batouala’, stated that the colonisers were ‘intellectually anaemic’ and unable to see the horrors of their treatment of Africans and this may be the case today.

Perhaps this was a reason the theorists themselves may have wanted to ‘whitewash’ the history. Foucault, Bourdieu and Derrida perhaps knew they were ‘public intellectuals’ (Goodman and Silverstein 2009) good at the ‘media game’ (Wacquant 2006, 263) and did not want to jeopardise their role as the France’s ‘intellectual reference’ (The Guardian 2002). Foucault did not write about his experiences of Tunisia keeping a ‘scrupulous silence on such issues and has, as a result, been widely criticized for Eurocentrism’ (Young 2001, 397). This is something we might see with his later (1991, 144) statement that ‘without May of ’68, I would never have done the things I’m doing today’ (May being the French student riot date). So, Tunisia became a ‘backdrop’ (Afary and Anderson 2005, 141) or in Legg’s (2016, 265) words both an ‘absent presence’ and a ‘haunting presence’ to his work. Perhaps, though, this was because he was part of the ‘tourist culture’ (see Afary and Anderson 2005, 141) who were out to get what pleasures they could from the country and leave. Added to this it may have been their ‘coloniser guilt’ or ‘survivor guilt’ as they all, when the reality of the war threatened their lives, were safely removed from danger.

Part Two: A Personal and Political Reflection on the Colonisation of the African Origin of the Works of Foucault, Bourdieu and Derrida by Karima Kadi-Hanifi

I have a portrait of Fanon above my desk but everyone asks, “Who is he?” even those who specialise in inclusive educational practice. When I explain who he is, their eyes seem to glaze over and no follow-up questions are asked. ‘Decolonisation is the veritable creation of new men, new language and new humanity’ wrote Franz Fanon (2001, 28). Fanon, a Martinique black man, was radicalised by what he saw in Algeria and wrote the inspired
'Wretched of the Earth’, a universal classic in any course on colonisation, imperialism and their devastating impacts on the peoples of Africa. We want there to be a new wave and one that speaks the voice of the suppressed majority, whether they are labelled ‘subaltern’ (see Spivak 1988) or ‘indegene’, ‘colonised’ in the South and East, or ‘serfs’, ‘slaves’ or, more recently, ‘disadvantaged’ in the West, such as those who perished in Grenfell Tower, or the 34,361 ‘migrants’ who drowned in the sea trying to reach Europe since 1993 (Guardian 2018). Today, even more than at any other time, we feel that there is an urgent need to resist and counteract the discourse of a simplified ‘alterity’. We want there to be a deeper understanding of humanity that transcends national borders and acknowledges the unequal treatment of scholarship by political forces that want to reduce the West to an entity that has existed in isolation and has led the way with no reference to its past or the biographies of its driving forces. No West has ever existed without the conscious presence of the East and the South, and we owe it to our students to begin to redress the balance and deconstruct ‘European’ thought by revealing the past of French colonisation, of fascism in Europe, and how both were resisted and gave birth to new grand theory that burgeoned in North Africa (during the rise of fascism in Europe and the Second World War) took hold in Algeria and then in France (from the 1960s onwards) before it spread all over the world.

It is arguable that Foucault, Bourdieu, Derrida and others of today’s ‘superstars’ of philosophy, literature and social science that emerged from the 20th Century would not be the pantheons of knowledge today if they were not given the French and the easy access to English translation. But equally, we contend that if they had not been given the Algerian special circumstances of a ruthless colonisation and the near annihilation of a free people, they would never have been the radical ‘French’ thinkers that we all think they are. They are French of a certain category, the one that encompasses thinking against conservative French values of slavery, imperialism, exploitation and colonisation. In that sense, they are African-French and inextricably so. Denying this knowledge to our students, perpetuates the racism and colonisation of the curriculum that aims to establish that the enlightenment is only possible in the West and divorced from any possibility of European influence from or on the black continent.

I am so obsessed with post-colonial literature that the first thing I did when I leafed through a new book about ‘Education Studies: the Key Concepts’ (Trotman, Lees and Willoughby 2017) was check the entry on ‘racism’ and was heartened to find that Parminder Assi, who was the author of that section, had mentioned Fanon - in fact, I was jubilant! But there needs to be more of this. And, I shouldn’t be nervously awaiting the emergence of such worry about the representation of post-colonial thought! Not in this day and age, surely? None of our students ever mention the Algerian roots of some of the best progressive thinking of Althusser and Derrida. On the reverse, the reading lists are all about the writings of white,
mainly Anglo-Saxon, and mostly, men. Still to this day, and we are in 2019 after all, only Camus is considered an Algerian and that is when he is even mentioned by any of the lecturers.

I read Camus’s ‘Carnets’ (1942) and feel his angst as he says that ‘we must get rid of all past states [i.e., ‘states of being’] and use all our strength for not unlearning anything, and then patiently continue learning’. At the same time, though, I read Kamel Daoud’s novel ‘Meursault, Contre Enquete’ (2013) who talks of Camus as ‘a man who can write and who killed an Arab who doesn’t even have a name…’. Daoud responds to this: ‘The absurd is my brother and I who carry it on our backs, or in the heart of our lands, not the Other’. The protagonist ‘Haroun’ in Daoud’s novel clearly states that he is writing this sequel to L’Etranger, not wholly to vent his anger about his brother’s absurd death nor to try and redress this old crime in a court of law but for reasons of reaching an equilibrium which needs to be established at last. This imagined scenario captures my imagination, at a time, where like countless others, I too want to find a way to balance the knowledge out there about colonisation and its eradication of the ‘other’ that such acts attempt. With that, also comes my obsession with the systematic rupture that Europe has had with its African origins, or, rather, as Rodney (2012) once wrote in the book by the same title: ‘how Europe underdeveloped Africa’. And it continues to do that, through Education.

The Algerian writer and Lawyer Wassyla Tamzali made me feel so proud as, for once I was reading someone, and a woman of substance, who was actually there during the construction of Algeria at ‘year zero’ (as she calls it) of its independence, as she vividly explains the complexities of the national reconstruction project, in her book ‘Une Education Algerienne’ (2013). She is right to write that Algeria had been through 130 years of ‘dispossession’ and that in 1962, at independence, everything had to start being reversed - no mean feat. The French conquest of Algeria (according to Algerian writer Wassyla Tamzali) could well have been about freeing the land from the Muslims that had conquered it in antique times and punish the country of St Augustine (as, after all, Algeria had been a place of Christianity well before Rome) for having embraced Islam. This is an interesting proposition, but whatever the reasons were for the colonisation of Algeria, as I walk through the Algiers of today, it is visible how the architecture is a mix of French, Italian, Spanish styles and still, though, with the Casbah in the background! Tamzali states that, however, nothing has ever altered Algiers’s soul (its habitus?), despite the different historical offensives on its fabric, as it had always been conquered by various people in the past. I feel the immanence of that soul, as it is in the complex outlook of its physical appearance, but also in its resilience in the face of worst pain ever inflicted on a people in my more recent memory of it. Is that why I often metaphorically speak with those who fought the war of independence (having been 3 years old when the country became independent)? Is this why I ended up watching the film of Larbi Ben M’hidi, only yesterday about a commander of the underground guerrilla war of independence in
the Casbah (well documented in ‘The Battle of Algiers’ film) who was tortured and then summarily executed by the French in 1957?

M’hidi was not the only one. My own father was part of that movement, sentenced to death and tortured too, in 1945. It is no wonder that people felt alienated, that the men and women of Algeria who survived the horrors of that war, often suffered from ridiculously long periods of physical and mental breakdowns that Fanon has written about. I witness it even today when, hardly any one family of Algerians, can survive for a day without mentioning the war, and the same applies to the French too! There always is some reference to the Algerian war in French films; it is engrained in both nations’ psyches. As the current events unfold with mass demonstrations of Algerians against a totalitarian regime that they reckon has further enslaved them since independence in 1962, I listen to free radio stations, such as Al Maghribiya, or watch Youtube videos of the demonstrations, speeches and debates, as well as collect images and thoughts from my family and friends’ Whatsapps who are there ‘on the ground’ waving the flag for which this country sacrificed a lot in the bloodiest war of independence Africa ever witnessed. I recognise the words and the symbols for liberation now in 2019 are of the same ilk as those at independence in 1962. Phrases like ‘I was hypnotised, now I am awake’ uttered by an activist send shivers down my spine. Or, when a radio caller says ‘Since the Emir Abdelkader lost his first insurrection against the French invasion of 1830, Algeria has had bad eggs laid upon her. Now we understand.’ The movement in 2019 is unprecedented in the history of a free people in that it is organised, massive and peaceful. The ‘rumblings’ started from the ground and are staying there, resisting the hegemony of a regime deemed too ‘colonial’ still (interesting that French President Emmanuel Macron is accused by the demonstrators of having written the letter for the ailing president Bouteflika to address his people as they revolt, urging them to accept a way of re-organising top-down again). To me, it is the continuation of what has always been the Algerian condition – a hotbed of radical ideas either against fascism in the 1940s, colonialism in the 1950s and 1960s, and now neocolonialism and corruption in the 2010s. I feel that perhaps that is what the history of colonialism has done to me, in my present state of recognising its past amplitude, but not letting that stop me from continuing to learn, just like my people are asking on the street today. The abuse of racism and colonisation must not freeze one from moving forwards, no matter how painful!

By resisting the Frenchification of theory we also stop assuming that we can reduce the identity of complex human beings (see also the Liquid Modernity of Bauman, [2000] to one homogeneous nationality, as if alterity through history (not just through recent colonialist periods) has not exerted any influence on anyone, and in particular, on such wandering, open-minded and radical thinkers as those we tackle in this article. Alterity is also in acts such as the Algerian who gave money to Edmond Charlot when his lending library was destroyed in the
early 1960s by the OAS (a secret fascist paramilitary organisation of ‘French pieds noirs’ who were against the independence of Algeria). Without this selfless act by a ‘dispossessed indigenous Algerian, simply called Momo, and a poet from the poor district of the Casbah of Algiers, who gave all his savings to Charlot because he saw the worth of such an independent thinking place’ (own translation) as the librarian of Nos Richesses said to me in 2018, the works of the greats of French literature and philosophy, such as Camus, Rables, Gide and others, might have been lost to humanity.

Learning from the other has always been a natural phenomenon that has enlightened Europeans from well before colonialist interests took a few countries by surprise and occupied them for centuries. Indeed, the search for the ‘Orient’, for example (see Enard, 2015) and learning from it, is almost as old as the world. Now we need to find a middle and, whilst able to recognise the terrifying violence of colonialism, start a new vision that does not see Islam and Africa as ‘alterity’; that Europe and the Orient cannot be separated - ‘we are one world without a civilizational other’ (see Ahmed 2010). European artists, writers and thinkers, such as Wagner, Schubert, Kafka, Beethoven were heavily influenced by the East, including Islamic culture - even to the point of insanity with Rimbaud, such was his thirst for an ‘illuminated’ world of ‘Wonders’. Others frequented the places (in European capitals, such as Vienna and Paris) where famous Orientalists, such as Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall, were - ‘what a world was the start of the 19th Century, when Orientalists visited princes, Balzac and talented musicians’ (Enard 2015, 113). However, what happened is that the ‘other’ ceased to be the better half and very quickly was either erased from collective memory or deemed to be less able than his/her European counterpart.

I was avidly reading the fascinating ‘Noir Blanc Rouge’ a book by Valery, published in 2014, and, in which, 35 black men and women are given due regard and celebrated for the way they shaped French history, arts and philosophy, among them Paulette Nardal, Aimee Cesaire and Josephine Baker. This is very much similar to the amazing book about ‘Black British’ (Olusoga 2016) and the subsequent documentary that illustrated the influence of black people on British history (BBC 2018). The issue of distorted representation is well-known now through the work of writers such as Said. The ‘Prix Goncourt’ winner of 2015, Mathias Enard’s ‘Boussole’ is testimony of this new wave. He champions the ‘enlightened East’ and shows that the most important figures of European arts and literature, people such as Schubert and Nietzsche were a lot more open to the East (and crucially, influenced by it) than we have been led to believe. Enard also charts some key ‘Orientalists’ of the past who were far more respectful of the East than we thought. The distortion and disregard happened afterwards and were politically motivated. Slavery also did not help nor the pseudo-scientific research of anthropologists who proclaimed that ‘white’ brains were superior to black ones. And, hence, a period of colonisation was legitimised and the civilizational West became the norm.
Boussole, the girlfriend of the protagonist contends, that ‘Orientalism is humanism’. In essence, yes, if it is not corrupted by the ideology of the colonisers. I really like his analysis of Kafka’s work, for example, when he says that in his short story entitled ‘Jackals and Arabs’, Kafka tackles ‘displacement’ as a symptom of his hybrid-identity (like Derrida perhaps?) born out of a decaying Austrian empire and the necessity to accept ‘alterity’ as being an integral part of his being, and consequently, a fertile contradiction. This means that creativity could thrive in the most unusual circumstances, but ultimately, it needs the ethical embedding of the ‘other’ into who we are.

**Conclusion**

This article has presented an issue we feel is pertinent in HE today – the mis-attribution to France of the most commonly used theory in the human and social sciences. The authors have re-examined their practice and there is a hope that the article might offer a way of doing so for others. It is worth asking what is lost, say, from ignoring Bourdieu’s African roots. We lose the colonial nature seen in the ‘participant objectification’ (see Bourdieu 2003), the absence of awareness of the role Islam was playing in the societies studied. We also cannot see that the way his idea of a collective habitus ‘conflated oral texts gathered across a hundred-year period by different individuals and in diverse locations’ and claimed a unique Berber cultural heritage’ (Goodman and Silverstein 2009, 108) mean his ‘Mediterranean universals’ (the very nature of which was Eurocentric as it suggests Africa does not matter until it is applied to the West - see Said [1984]) came from flawed ‘data’ as it were. So, ‘habitus’, ‘capital’, ‘discourse’ come from ‘partial and fractured understandings (and)...systematic misconstrual of...thought’ (Wacquant 1993, 238-9) and therefore must be questioned further. What results from ignoring the African origin of the theory is that notions becoming ‘theoretically thinner’ (see Calhoun 2006) from complex source to soundbite to: ‘Read in English narrowly as texts in the sociology or anthropology of education’ (Gorski 2013, 44).

What is also lost is the humanity and humility of the West in acknowledging that knowledge is global. Camus wrote about the ‘fear’ the colonisers had while walking around colonised Africa: ‘with veils covering half their faces and their beautifully soft and sensual eyes above the white mask. Though fatalistic and exhausted, they were so numerous in the neighbourhoods where they clustered that there hovered an invisible threat which you could sniff in the air’ (as quoted in Aldrich 1996, 141). We suggest that, perhaps unconsciously Western academics can smell the fear from ideas and literature that does not come from Europe. This may be because there is an agenda which does not agree with Western ideas and may be because racism blinds and there is a prejudiced view of intellectual work coming ‘out of
Africa’. We have selected just three thinkers in this article but out of Algeria, also came Jean-Francois Lyotard’s rejection of meta-narratives and onto the formation of what became known (and taught) as postmodernism as he saw an ‘entire people, from a great civilization, wronged, humiliated, denied their identity’ (Lyotard 1993, 170). The article, we hope, is another small step in the right direction and it would start in the lecture hall with the words, “What do we know about Foucault? His ideas were developed in Tunisia, obviously.”
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