

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

University of Nebraska Press -- Sample Books and
Chapters

University of Nebraska Press

2009

Bourdieu in Algeria: Colonial Politics, Ethnographic Practices, Theoretical Developments

Jane E. Goodman

Paul A. Silverstein

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/unpresssamples>



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#)

Goodman, Jane E. and Silverstein, Paul A., "Bourdieu in Algeria: Colonial Politics, Ethnographic Practices, Theoretical Developments" (2009). *University of Nebraska Press -- Sample Books and Chapters*. 18.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/unpresssamples/18>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University of Nebraska Press at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Nebraska Press -- Sample Books and Chapters by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

BOURDIEU IN ALGERIA

FRANCE OVERSEAS

Studies in Empire and Decolonization

SERIES EDITORS

Philip Boucher, A. J. B. Johnston,
James D. Le Sueur, and Tyler Stovall

[Buy the Book](#)

BOURDIEU IN ALGERIA

COLONIAL POLITICS,
ETHNOGRAPHIC PRACTICES,
THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENTS

Edited and with an introduction by

Jane E. Goodman and

Paul A. Silverstein

University of Nebraska Press | Lincoln & London

[Buy the Book](#)

© 2009 by the Board of Regents of
the University of Nebraska
All rights reserved
Manufactured in the
United States of America

Acknowledgment for previously
published material appears on p. 269,
which constitutes an extension of
the copyright page.



Library of Congress Cataloging-
in-Publication Data
Bourdieu in Algeria : colonial politics,
ethnographic practices, theoretical
developments / edited by Jane E. Goodman
and Paul A. Silverstein.
p. cm.—(France overseas: studies in
empire and decolonization)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-0-8032-1362-3 (pbk. : alk. paper)
1. Bourdieu, Pierre, 1930-2002—Criticism
and interpretation. 2. Ethnologists—Algeria—
Kabylia—Biography. 3. Ethnology—Algeria—
Kabylia—Fieldwork. 4. Kabyles—Algeria—Social
life and customs. 5. Kabylia (Algeria)—Social life
and customs. I. Goodman, Jane E., 1956-
II. Silverstein, Paul A., 1970-
GN21.B617B68 2009
305.800965—dc22
2009002372

Set in Sabon by Bob Reitz.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments . . . vii

Introduction: Bourdieu in Algeria . . . 1

PAUL A. SILVERSTEIN AND JANE E. GOODMAN

1. The Phantom of Dispossession: From *The Uprooting*
to *The Weight of the World* . . . 63

FANNY COLONNA

2. The Proverbial Bourdieu: *Habitus* and the Politics of
Representation in the Ethnography of Kabylia . . . 94

JANE E. GOODMAN

3. Bourdieu's Ethnography in Béarn and Kabylia:
The Peasant *Habitus* . . . 133

DEBORAH REED-DANAHAY

4. Of Rooting and Uprooting: Kabyle *Habitus*, Domesticity,
and Structural Nostalgia . . . 164

PAUL A. SILVERSTEIN

5. Phenomenology and Ethnography: On Kabyle *Habitus* in
the Work of Pierre Bourdieu . . . 199

ABDELLAH HAMMOUDI

Afterword: Re-reading Bourdieu on Kabylia in the
Twenty-first Century . . . 255

DALE F. EICKELMAN

Source Acknowledgments . . . 269

Contributors . . . 271

Index . . . 275

TABLE

1. Locating the *Outline* Villages . . . 102

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book has been a long time in the making. It originated in 2002 as a panel at the American Anthropological Association's annual meeting titled "Bringing Habitus Home: Reappraising Bourdieu's Studies of Kabylia." Since then, many individuals have contributed to its success. Dale Eickelman believed in the book from the beginning; we are grateful for his vision and guidance. Michael Herzfeld and Stefania Pandolfo offered invaluable comments and strong encouragement. Jeremy Lane provided a critical reading of the entire manuscript; we thank him along with anonymous press reviewers. Heather Lundine and Bridget Barry, our editors at the University of Nebraska Press, have been models of efficiency and a great pleasure to work with. Our series editor, James Le Sueur, infused the project with fresh energy; we thank Jim for including this book in the *France Overseas* series. Finally, we are most grateful to our contributors for their patience as well as for the unique perspective that each brings to bear on Bourdieu's Algerian ethnography.

Earlier versions of several of these chapters appeared elsewhere. We thank the publishers for permission to reprint.

Introduction

Bourdieu in Algeria

PAUL A. SILVERSTEIN AND JANE E. GOODMAN

For over thirty years Pierre Bourdieu's *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique* (1972) has been "good to think with," to invoke the famous phrase of Claude Lévi-Strauss. Translated into English and heavily revised, the *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (1977a) remains an anthropological standard, often overshadowing Bourdieu's own subsequent rewritings of the text in *The Logic of Practice* (1990) and *Pascalian Meditations* (2000). The theoretical constructs that Bourdieu developed in this work—most notably, *habitus*, misrecognition, and symbolic domination—have had a long and productive history in social theory and political philosophy. Yet these notions have entered the mainstream of social thought independently of the North African and French political and social contexts in which they were initially developed. Almost independently, that is. For the ethnographic exemplars of Bourdieu's concepts—the Kabyle Berbers of northern Algeria, distantly shadowed by the Béarnais peasants of southwestern France—have tended to accompany the theory that they supposedly incarnate: sometimes persistently reinvoked alongside the constructs that they help to illuminate, other times mere traces of their original embodiment as the ethnographic representatives

of Bourdieu's theories. Bourdieu himself would continue to draw on his Kabyle and Béarnais ethnography as the empirical base for his theoretical refinements throughout his career, even to his last publications before his untimely death on January 23, 2002 (see Bourdieu 2001, 2002).

At the same time that *habitus* has made the theoretical rounds, circulating widely across disciplines and geographies to illuminate new contexts and concerns, the politics of scholarship and the poetics of scholarly representation have come under increasing and well-deserved scrutiny (e.g., Clifford and Marcus 1986; Said 1978). Within this substantial literature, the representation of ethnic or indigenous Others as well as the colonial location of much ethnographic research have been subjected to special attention (Asad 1973; see also Cooper and Stoler 1997; Dirks 1992; among others). Bourdieu himself has been lauded for the way in which he “has taught us to ask in what field of power, and in what position in that field, any given author writes” (Rabinow 1986: 252). Yet the colonial location of Bourdieu's work is nearly impossible to discern from the *Outline*, the primary ethnographic study in which the notion of *habitus* was brought to maturity.¹ Bourdieu himself began to speak and write about it only during the final years of his life in publications that by and large appeared posthumously (see Bourdieu 2003a, 2003b, 2004a, 2004b, 2008; Bourdieu et al. 2002; Honneth et al. 1986). While Bourdieu's portrayals of Algerian Kabyles have received some critical attention, such critiques have largely been articulated in theoretical rather than ethnographic terms. For instance, his Kabyle ethnography has been variously evaluated as “occidentalizing” (Reed-Danahay 1995); as underwritten by untenable “dualistic typologies” (Free 1996: 412; cf. Lane 2000: 112); as overly Durkheimian in its presumption of a stark dichotomy between supposedly homogenous and differentiated

societies (Herzfeld 1987: 83–86; Free 1996; Lane 2000: 13–16); or as inattentive to national, regional, or colonial contexts (Herzfeld 1987: 7–8; Free 1996). Yet few scholars, to our knowledge, have revisited the ethnographic, historical, and political terrains within which Bourdieu developed his Kabyle corpus.

In this volume scholars of North Africa and France come together to critically reexamine some of Bourdieu’s foundational concepts in relation to the ethnographic, intellectual, and political contexts out of which they developed and in which they continue to circulate. Bourdieu’s Algerian oeuvre is predicated, we contend, on the colonial setting in which he carried out his research. This context led him to portray Algeria in terms of a profound cleavage: what Bourdieu understood to be an “originary” or precolonial Algerian society is set against a “destructured,” ruptured, and fragmented society that 130 years of colonial occupation had irrevocably destabilized. This fault line traverses nearly every aspect of Bourdieu’s Algerian ethnography. His books themselves line up along it: whereas the *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, *The Logic of Practice*, “The Kabyle House,” and companion studies portray a traditional Algerian Berber society seemingly untouched by colonial relations, emigration, or capitalism, a corollary set of writings—among them, *Travail et travailleurs en Algérie* (Work and Workers in Algeria, 1963) and *Le Déracinement* (The Uprooting, 1964)—depict an ethnically mixed (Berber and Arab) society fractured by colonial practices of land expropriation, capitalist regimes of labor, and large-scale population “resettlements” that were a key form of control throughout the colonial period, and particularly during the Algerian revolution. The methodologies that drive the two kinds of studies also diverge: whereas the latter set of works are supported by lengthy statistical analyses and extended interviews with named, situated informants,

the former are informed by structuralist and symbolic approaches to social behavior, albeit recalibrated to Bourdieu's practice-based theoretical framework. Informants themselves are disjunctively cast. They are quoted at length and highly individualized in the sociological studies, while they remain largely silent in the *Outline* and related works, where they are collapsed into timeless and nameless ethnic figures. The same kind of bifocal lens—focused through the angle of the rupture and fragmentation brought about by modernity—informs Bourdieu's analysis of both his natal province of Béarn (1962a, 1962b, 2002) and his more recent study of neoliberalism in contemporary France, *La Misère du monde* (Bourdieu et al. 1993), which explicitly follows from the earlier *Travail et travailleurs* project (Addi 2002: 38 n. 3; Sayad 2002: 71; Wacquant 2004: 407 n. 16; but see Colonna, this volume).

Our volume begins from this cleavage. In placing Bourdieu's "two Algerias" in productive tension with each other and with his work in Béarn, we seek to unsettle what Loïc Wacquant (1993) has rightly described as a tendency in American scholarship to import discrete aspects of Bourdieu's work while divorcing them from the larger intellectual and political projects in which Bourdieu was engaged. This results, Wacquant contends, in "partial and fractured understandings" and even "systematic misconstrual of [Bourdieu's] thought" (Wacquant 1993: 238–39). While we do not pretend to engage Bourdieu's lifetime scholarly trajectory, we seek to gesture toward the kind of inclusive reading Wacquant calls for by reconnecting the *Outline* and related works to the earlier and little-known set of sociological studies that Bourdieu carried out during the Algerian war as well as in his natal region.

Bourdieu's theories have been productively analyzed elsewhere with regards to their embeddedness in a European philosophical

tradition extending from Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, Bachelard, Panofsky, Lévi-Strauss, Canguilhem, and Althusser back to Marx, Durkheim, Mauss, Weber, Sombart, Husserl, and beyond (e.g., Addi 2002; Hérán 1987; Lahire 2001; Lane 2000; Pinto 1998; Shusterman 1999; Vandenberghe 1999), as well as in relation to Anglo-American social theory (Calhoun, LiPuma, and Postone 1993). While not neglecting these important trajectories, our primary focus lies with the relationship between theory and ethnography in Bourdieu's work. Bourdieu himself later narrated his development of practice theory as much as an outcome of his academic studies of phenomenology (and particularly his engagement with Husserl and Merleau-Ponty—see Hammodi, this volume) and his eventual philosophical break with the objectivist approach of anthropological structuralism, as a particular response to the specific problems encountered in the course of his Algerian field research (Honneth et al. 1986: 38–45; Wacquant 2004: 390–91). The authors in this volume are thus specifically concerned with the development of Bourdieu's theoretical project as it relates to at least five specific ethnographic contexts: first, the French-Algerian war,² in which Bourdieu himself was directly implicated initially as a member of the French military, and later as an engaged critic of both French colonialism and revolutionary utopianism; second, the ethnolinguistic and religious dimensions of the Kabyle region at the time of Bourdieu's research; third, Bourdieu's involvement with a particular constellation of Berber intellectuals during and after the war—most notably, novelists Mouloud Mammeri and Mouloud Feraoun and sociologist Abdelmalek Sayad; fourth, the transnational Berber Cultural Movement, with which Bourdieu was in dialogue at various points throughout his career; and finally, the resonances between Bourdieu's own upbringing in rural Béarn, his wartime research in Algeria, and his later intellectual life in Paris—including the twin

lenses of equilibrium and disjuncture through which he approached socio-spatial oppositions of rural/urban and colony/metropole.

It is easy, with some four decades of hindsight (decades that also witnessed the burgeoning of the field of postcolonial studies), to be critical of Bourdieu's Algerian ethnography. A self-taught ethnographer (Honneth et al. 1986: 38), Bourdieu was learning to do ethnographic research on the fly, at times with machine guns firing around him (Bourdieu 2004: 423). Conducting ethnography of and during wartime conditions,³ he worked in dangerous and unsettling situations that would discourage most researchers. Bourdieu's strong anticolonial stance and his unswerving advocacy of Algerian independence earned him the confidence of many of those Muslim Algerians he interviewed in Algiers and across the war-torn countryside. It also earned him a place on a Far Right assassination list and led to his precipitated departure from the country under cover of darkness during the final months of the war (Yacine 2004: 491). His work was principled and politically engaged at a time when colonialism was barely in the purview of most anthropologists. Yet our admiration for the intellectual, political, and personal risks Bourdieu took should not preclude critical engagement with his Algerian research. Indeed, such an engagement is long overdue.

Wartime Ethnographer

Writing on Bourdieu's life is a complicated task for, as his longtime translator Richard Nice has remarked, there exist "two versions of Bourdieu's past. One is the mythical one in which he is the peasant boy confronting urban civilization, and the other, which he actually thought more seriously, is what it's like to be a petit bourgeois and a success story" (Mahar 1990, quoted in Reed Danahay 2005: 34). In the case of his wartime years, the retrospective gaze of Bourdieu

and his students tends to promote a heroic image of an engaged intellectual battling the twinned distortions of colonialism and nationalist utopianism, risking his personal well-being for ethnographic truth and scientific valorization of Kabylia, and altering his academic trajectory according to a larger “civic impulse” (Bourdieu 2003b: 85; see Yacine 2004).

A more critical reading would underline Bourdieu’s professional ambition and intellectual continuity across his Algerian experience, emphasizing Bourdieu’s approach to Algeria as a “living laboratory” in which to conduct an “epistemological experiment” (Bourdieu 1972: 222; see Addi 2002: 42; Sayad 2002: 66; Wacquant 2004: 389; Yacine 2004: 498) into the continuity and rupture of social practices and cultural *doxa* in contexts of extreme upheaval. Such a reading would connect Bourdieu’s Algerian research to his ongoing philosophical interests in phenomenal fields (Hammoudi, this volume) and relations of domination and resistance (Colonna, this volume). It would further emphasize his metropolitan academic pedigree from the École Normale Supérieure, the support received from his family’s regional connections, and the later patronage offered by Raymond Aron—elements of class reproduction that Bourdieu himself would later examine in a variety of sociological and reflexive studies (Bourdieu 1988 [1984], 1996 [1989], 2004a; Bourdieu and Passeron 1970). This social and educational capital made possible a number of research and professional opportunities for Bourdieu in Algeria and later upon his return to Paris—opportunities unavailable to his indigenous Algerian collaborators like Mouloud Mammeri and Abdelmalek Sayad, who would later come to rely on Bourdieu’s own patronage during the postwar years. In the end, both “versions of Bourdieu’s past” obviously reflect important conditions in the production of Bourdieu’s Algerian ethnographic work and his elaboration

of specific ethnographic practices, and in what follows we attempt to demonstrate how they both are encapsulated within it.

Bourdieu's introduction to Algeria, like many colonial ethnographers before him, was mediated by his military service. In general, the ethnology of Algeria—and of Kabylia in particular—had been closely tied to military interests since the mid-nineteenth century, with most of the foundational ethnographies and linguistic studies written by military personnel (Lorcin 1995; Lucas and Vatin 1975). However, Bourdieu's relationship to the imperial project was quite different from the military ethnographers before him; he was deployed to Algeria, paradoxically, because he already opposed the military actions being taken to preserve French Algeria from the nationalist movement for independence. In spite of being a graduate of the *École Normale*, when Bourdieu was drafted into military service he refused to follow his peers into the Reserve Officers' College, to which elite young men were typically assigned. In his later narration of events, Bourdieu points to his upbringing in a petit bourgeois family in the rural French province of Béarn—where his father had been a postal worker and his grandfather a sharecropper—which made him ill at ease with class-based privilege and reluctant to separate himself from the “rank and file” (2004b: 416).⁴

Sent instead to serve with the Army Psychological Services in Versailles, he soon found himself at odds with his superiors over the Algerian question. As he describes it, “heated arguments” over whether Algeria should remain French or be granted independence led to his deployment to the French colony in October 1955 at the age of 25 (2004b: 416; see Yacine 2004: 490–91, 2008: 30). Once in Algeria, Bourdieu was initially part of a unit charged with guarding air bases and other strategic sites (including, at one point, a large munitions dump in the Chellif Valley) (Bourdieu 2004b: 416; Yacine 2004: 491,

2008:30). He appears to have become progressively disillusioned with what he characterized as his fellow soldiers' blind submission to authority, and increasingly interested in the dynamics of Algerian society (Bourdieu 2004b: 418). In 1956 during the final months of his tour of duty, Bourdieu was reassigned to clerical work in the documentation and information service of the French administration in Algeria, following his parents' intervention through Colonel Ducourneau, a member of the Algerian government who happened to be from Bourdieu's natal region of Béarn (Bourdieu 2004b: 419; Yacine 2004: 491, 2008: 30). There he had the opportunity to meet leading scholars of Algeria, among them Emile Dermenghem, archivist of the government's well-stocked Algerian library and author of key works on the Maghreb, as well as the young historian André Nouschi.⁵ Under Dermenghem's guidance and with Nouschi and other fellow-travelers as interlocutors, Bourdieu began to read "everything written about Algeria" (Yacine 2004: 490) and particularly about Kabyle culture, which had been deployed as a central ethnographic case in the emerging social sciences since Durkheim (Hammoudi, this volume).⁶

Like most wars the French-Algerian war was characterized as much by ideological struggles as by what transpired on the battlefield. In this case the opposing camps can be roughly grouped into proponents of a "French Algeria" (*Algérie française*) and an "Algerian Algeria" (*Algérie algérienne*). At the war's start many French and Algerian intellectuals associated with the "Ecole d'Alger"—including such respected figures as Albert Camus, the French sociologist and ethnographer Germaine Tillion, and the Algerian novelist and educator Mouloud Feraoun—favored a "reconciliation" between France and Algeria that would ensure a continued economic and political relationship between the metropole and the settler colony,

albeit one premised on the civic, political, and social equality of all subjects/citizens. Termed “integrationism,” this approach was increasingly adopted as state policy in the years following World War II and became enshrined in the 1958 Constitution of the Fifth Republic that simultaneously defended the territorial indivisibility of France, reaffirmed categories of legal subjectivity based on religious or geographic origin, and established policies of social promotion to ensure the future equality of all citizens.⁷ In contrast, from the earliest moments of the war, Bourdieu endorsed an “Algerian Algeria” that would be fully independent from the French state.

Yet Bourdieu sharply demarcated himself from other leading intellectual proponents of “Algerian Algeria”—most notably, Jean-Paul Sartre and Frantz Fanon. In Bourdieu’s view, Sartre, Fanon, and others aligned with the Communist Left were blind to the socioeconomic realities of the Algerian population. If the Far Right Orientalists, who dominated the University of Algiers during the war, were mired in a form of “colonial ethnology” fueled by studies of Arabic language and literature (Adnani and Yacine 2003: 232; Bourdieu 2003b: 6; Sprecher 2003: 297–300), the leftists sought to locate in the Algerian peasantry a nascent revolutionary consciousness that would align them with an emerging transnational proletariat (Le Sueur 2005: 253–54). For Bourdieu, as he later recalled, proponents of both positions were equally blind to the complex realities of Algerian society under colonial domination. He found the Left’s utopianism “misleading and dangerous” (Honneth et al. 1986: 40; see Addi 2002: 61–66; Lane 2000: 19–20) and even “irresponsible” (cited in LeSueur 2005: 252). The Left’s views were motivated, Bourdieu contended, by “Parisian” ideas (Le Sueur 2005: 252) that fed “a mythical conception of Algerian society” (Honneth et al. 1986: 38) but paid little heed to the “objective situation” of colonial Algeria.

While Bourdieu shared the Left's interest in the conditions of possibility for the development of revolutionary consciousness, he wrote that Algerians' support for the war did not necessarily make them—sociologically speaking—“revolutionaries” (Bourdieu 1961, 1962c). Instead he approached the Algerian peasant as caught up in a “millenarian utopianism” (Bourdieu 1958: 125) that was motivated by “an incoherent resentment” against the colonial situation rather than “a true revolutionary consciousness” (Bourdieu et al. 2002: 32). To gain critical purchase on their condition would require “a certain distance as well as the instruments of thought inseparable from education” (Bourdieu et al. 2002: 32). In these writings from within the wartime context, we see early formulations of Bourdieu's theorization of a divide between prereflexive and reflexive consciousness that runs through his later practice-oriented theoretical work (see Hammoudi, this volume), as well as initial intimations that literacy and education provided the only gateways to critical reflexivity (Goodman, this volume; Lane 2000: chapter 4).

As he was formulating these sociopolitical arguments, Bourdieu began working on a book for the popular French series “Que Sais-Je?”⁸ titled *Sociologie de l'Algérie* (Sociology of Algeria) based on the library research undertaken while finishing his military service. Tassadit Yacine (2004: 497) has averred that this early work establishes an “umbilical connection between politics and social science,” and Loïc Wacquant has underlined the book's political engagement, noting that the 1962 English translation featured on its cover the flag of the revolutionary National Liberation Front (FLN) prior to the independence of Algeria (Wacquant 2002: 551). Bourdieu himself, well after the fact, narrated his motivation somewhat differently, referring to the project as arising from a

civic, more than political impulse. I believe that the French of this period, whether they were for or against independence, converged in their lack of knowledge of the country, and they had poor reasons for being for or against independence. It was thus very important to provide the bases for a judgment, for an adequate understanding, not only for the French of the period, but also for educated Algerians who, for historical reasons, were ignorant of their own society. (Bourdieu 2003b: 85)

Sociologie de l'Algérie is the only work in which Bourdieu's "two Algerias" appear side by side, albeit fleetingly. The majority of the book is a study of the "objective structures" (economy and social organization) of traditional Algerian society. The first four chapters are devoted to discrete Algerian populations: three Berber groups (the Kabyles, the Shawiya, and the Ibadites) and "the Arab speakers." A fifth chapter ("A Common Stock") is concerned with the social, economic, and religious⁹ structures that Bourdieu thought united these various groups as "variations on a single theme" (1958: 80). The colonial project makes a brief appearance only in the final chapter ("Alienation") where it is portrayed in terms of profound disaggregation and de-culturation wrought on "traditional" Algerian society.¹⁰ The theme of rupture would subsequently come to dominate Bourdieu's writing on Algeria until after the war's end.

An Ethnography of Rupture

In 1958, the year *Sociologie de l'Algérie* appeared, Bourdieu took a position as assistant professor at the University of Algiers (1958–61) and began conducting research during the academic breaks as part of a team sponsored by ARDES (Association for Demographic, Economic, and Social Research), the Algerian branch of the French INSEE (the

National Institute for Statistics and Economic Studies). Issues of rupture, alienation, de-culturation, disaggregation, and uprooting characterize the two major studies that he carried out under the auspices of ARDES: an analysis of the “resettlement” centers established by the French army (Bourdieu and Sayad 1964) and a study of the impact of capitalist labor practices in Algerian cities and towns (Bourdieu et al. 1963). The projects were funded by the Algerian Development Fund and derived from the French “integrationist” policy of social service reforms designed to reduce economic inequality and through which the government sought to maintain control of the colony in the face of the burgeoning nationalist movement. An unanticipated result of such efforts was the arrival of many young functionaries and military recruits like Bourdieu who were not inclined to the same political conservatism of the colonial *ancien régime*. In the countryside they occupied the ranks of the Specialized Administrative Sections, army units deployed to gather intelligence and maintain local order while providing social, economic, educational, and medical aid (Bourdieu and Sayad 2004 [1964]: 479 n. 5). Likewise, in urban areas, such development initiatives resulted in the creation of a number of educational and social centers and services that brought young French and Algerian functionaries into close working relations.

The ARDES was one such organization that was established under Alain Darbel to provide the first comprehensive statistical survey of the Algerian populace—a project of both military and development interest. Upon the recommendation of Jacques Breil, a Catholic statistician who had previously worked with Bourdieu on an underdevelopment study (Yacine 2004: 503 n. 13), Darbel solicited Bourdieu in 1958–59 to provide sociological interpretation of the statistics gathered. A true “scientific entrepreneur,” Bourdieu accepted but expanded the project to include a full ethnographic study of housing and work conditions,

with teams of researchers headed by Bourdieu conducting fieldwork across the urban terrains of Algeria (Sayad 2002: 70–71). In the midst of this project, which would result in the *Travail et travailleurs* volume, the ARDES was similarly commissioned by the government to conduct a scientific investigation of conditions in the “resettlement centers” (*centres de regroupement*). These camps had been constructed and administered by the French army for resettled villagers from areas that the army had declared “forbidden zones” in an effort to dismantle the supply chains for the National Liberation Army (ALN). The metropolitan press had quickly denounced these centers as veritable concentration camps, an accusation the government sought to counter with the ARDES study (Sayad 2002: 72). Darbel opted to focus the investigation on some of the most war-torn areas (including Collo, the Ouarsenis, and Kabylia [Djemaa-Saharidj and Barbacha/Soummam]) and seconded the project to Bourdieu, who organized a research/interview team from among several of his liberal French and Algerian students from the University of Algiers—including Abdelmalek Sayad, with whom he later coauthored the resulting *Déracinement* study—and pursued a series of site visits in 1960. In spite of the limited government commission, the suspicion among interviewees that the research teams surely generated (and about which the researchers were self-reflexive), and the dangerous conditions under which the research was effectuated, the resulting studies masterfully melded statistical data, ethnographic description, and sociological analysis into the most comprehensive picture to date of the socioeconomic underdevelopment and dislocation of late-colonial Algeria. Because of the implicit (and sometimes explicit) political critique embedded in the two studies, neither saw publication until after the war ended (Yacine 2004: 501).

Both *Travail et travailleurs* and *Déracinement* are predicated on a “clash of civilizations” (*choc des civilisations*) model that Bourdieu

had initially outlined in an article of that title that appeared in the volume *Under-Development in Algeria* published by the Secrétariat Social, a Catholic development association based in Algiers (Bourdieu 1959).¹¹ In this article, Bourdieu took up key premises put forth by the sociologist Germaine Tillion, who had recently published an influential work outlining the political and economic conditions under which Algeria could viably remain part of France (Tillion 1958 [1957]).¹² Whereas Tillion refused to attribute the economic decline of Algeria's Aurès (Shawiya Berber) region entirely or even primarily to colonialism ("There is not and never has been a French settler living nearer than sixty miles," she would say [Tillion 1958: 17]), Bourdieu argued that almost from the moment the French set foot in Algeria, they had profoundly and irremediably disrupted the traditional socioeconomic organization.

Invoking Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits' acculturation model (1936), Bourdieu contended that this was no mere "contact of civilizations" in which the "receiving culture" could assimilate aspects of the new system into its own structure. As early as the *Sociologie de l'Algérie*, Bourdieu had invoked the pioneering work of Georges Balandier (1951) to insist that such "contact" occurred within an asymmetrical "colonial situation" of domination characterized by "cultural upheavals that were deliberately and knowingly provoked" (1958: 118, cited in Yacine 2004: 496–97). As he later elaborated, the resulting "shock" of colonialism altered the very foundations of the "original culture": "This society, . . . which was constituted through a totality of indissociable elements that were all expressions of the same original 'style,' suffered [*a subi*] the shock of another civilization that did not make itself felt in a piecemeal or targeted fashion but *in totality*, rupturing not only the economic order but also the social, psychological, moral, and ideological [spheres]" (1959: 57).

The initial moment of rupture for Bourdieu came with the Senatus Consultus decision of 1863 (reinforced by the Warnier law of 1873) to divide and privatize property that had formerly been tribally owned and conceived as “indivisible.” These laws constituted for Bourdieu a “master key” (*clé de voûte*, 1959: 59) that would set in motion the irrevocable crumbling of Algerian culture and society. In his view, Algerian peasants were not psychologically equipped to adjust to a new form of property organization: “It was dangerous to attribute private property to individuals lacking the psychological structures and ‘virtues’ that are not only its foundation but its condition of possibility” (1959: 59–60). In Bourdieu’s implicit equilibrium model of traditional Algerian society, to alter such a significant element was to produce a domino effect in which the entire social and cultural edifice would come crumbling down.

Bourdieu’s emphasis on colonial asymmetry and social rupture put him additionally at odds with the integrationist reforms that Tillion outlined, which ranged from massive investments in Algerian education and worker training to housing subsidies to modern social legislation (Tillion 1958). Such reforms missed the key point that the colonial system had already taken from the Algerians something they could never recover: their cultural unity, and in particular, the one-to-one mapping of objective and subjective structures that lent their former world its *doxic*, unquestionable character. *Travail et travailleurs* (1963) and *Le Déracinement* (1964), as well as the essays later collected in *Algérie 60* (1977), document Bourdieu’s ethnographic description and sociological analysis of this conundrum. In these works Bourdieu elaborated Algerian peasants’ encounters with a rationalized economic system in which labor, salary, time, and value are conjoined very differently than they were in the traditional “good faith” economy. Through this encounter, a new spirit

of calculation and a “diabolical ambition” came to negate “all the old wisdom”: “The growth of monetary circulation, together with the concomitant spread of an accompanying spirit, ate away at the enchanted naïveté of former times” (Bourdieu and Sayad 1964: 93). Patrilineal family structure; fraternal spirit; the values of honor and modesty; and the “mythical” connections between place, time, activity, and personhood were sundered.

Moreover, for Bourdieu and Sayad, such colonial capitalist processes disrupted peasants’ intimate connections with—their rooting in—the land they cultivated, which, in their reading, served as the site of their genealogical memory, the source of their symbolic economy, and the objectification of their moral values. As they maintained, “The peasant can only but live rooted in the land on which he was born and to which his habits and memories attach themselves. Up-rooted, there is a good chance he will die as a peasant, in that the passion which makes him a peasant dies within him” (Bourdieu and Sayad 1964: 115).¹³ With the commodification of property and the forcible resettlement of villagers, Algerian peasants were transformed in Bourdieu’s view into veritable cultural monsters, betwixt and between traditional and modern *habitus*, in a permanent state of social liminality, or what he called a *habitus clivé* (“split *habitus*”).¹⁴ What remained was “a new kind of men . . . who let themselves be defined negatively, by what they are no longer and are not yet, de-peasanted peasants, self-destructive, who carry in themselves all the opposites” (1964: 161).

Bourdieu simultaneously applied this same model of civilizational clash and de-peasantization to describe the social transformations his natal region of Béarn was undergoing, where the “rural exodus” to urban areas and the resulting high rate of bachelorhood challenged the ability of the cultural system to reproduce itself (Bourdieu 1962b).

Indeed Bourdieu pursued ethnographic research in Béarn in 1961 as he and Sayad were finishing the writing of *Le Déracinement* (Adnani and Yacine 2003: 240), and it is clear that the two fieldwork situations, although markedly different in terms of context of domination, became conjoined in Bourdieu's intervention into the Weber-Sombart debate. As Deborah Reed-Danahay discusses, Béarn and Kabylia became reflective lenses through which Bourdieu formulated his nostalgic construction of *tristes paysans* (Reed-Danahay 2005: 73–78, this volume).¹⁵

In Kabylia, Bourdieu and Sayad's deployment of a trope of rooting and uprooting functioned within the wartime context of their research as a critique of colonialism; yet, Bourdieu's application of it within the larger Mediterranean context presupposes a projection of "traditional," peasant culture as a unified—if not ahistorical—whole, with elements of dissonance or change emerging exogenously. Such a model of historical transformation as exogenous rupture would later inform his theories of practice, *doxa*, and *habitus* as they were formulated in *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (1977 [1972]), a work principally based on his Kabyle ethnographic data gathered under the ARDES project, and whose French edition was prefaced by three ethnological essays on Kabylia (including a reprint of his structuralist nod to Lévi-Strauss, "The Kabyle House, or the World Reversed" [1970]). While Bourdieu would later revise his theoretical model to recognize the internal symbolic flexibility, cultural dissonance, and possibility for endogenous transformation within social systems (see Bourdieu 1990 [1980], 2000 [1997]), his continued reliance on arboreal tropes of rooting and uprooting for depicting cultural contact/clash (Silverstein, this volume) weighted his avowedly dialectical formulations of *habitus* in the *Outline* to epistemological circularity and social reproduction, as a number of critics have commented (see Comaroff 1985: 5; de Certeau 1984: 57–59; Eickelman 1977: 40; Herzfeld 1987: 84).

In commenting on this limitation of Bourdieu's early culture concept, we of course do not wish to imply that the private property laws and resettlement policies that Bourdieu identifies were not pivotal and deeply problematic moments in Algerian history. Nor do we wish to suggest that the colonial project was not destructive of much of the Algerian social fabric; clearly it was. Yet to focus solely on moments of rupture and dislocation risks both neglecting the accommodations Algerians may have made to colonialism and obscuring from our analytical purview those areas of society that may have been less dramatically impacted by colonial relations.¹⁶ The "clash of civilizations" model that Bourdieu adopted as early as 1958 allowed Algerians minimal room for creative maneuvering or selective accommodation. It also neglected the specific ways that the "traditional" property order may have functioned to ensure individual land use even as it was ideologically grounded in principles of indivision. Instead Bourdieu's model placed colonial Algerians in the untenable position of being "between two worlds," of suffering from a *habitus clivé*, condemning them to the painful realization that the world that they had previously taken to be axiomatic (or *doxic*) was merely contingent, one of many possible configurations. At the same time, in his view Algerians lacked the reflexive and critical capacities to navigate successfully between and across these worlds. Their only possible condition was one of alienation.

What impact, if any, might Bourdieu's thesis of de-peasantization have had in Algeria itself?¹⁷ In the preface to *The Logic of Practice*, he wrote that a "desired reconciliation of the practical and the scientific intention" had animated some of his early works, and suggested that he had made "predictions, or rather warnings" at the conclusion of his "two empirical studies of Algerian society" (i.e., *Travail et travailleurs* and *Le Déracinement*). Yet these warnings, he went

on to say, “were subsequently used to justify some of the probable deviations which they strove in advance to prevent” (Bourdieu 1980: 2). It is admittedly difficult to ascertain the degree to which Algerian officials were cognizant of Bourdieu’s work, but the two “empirical studies”—unlike his more philosophically elaborated works—would have been accessible to educated lay readers. Yet it is undeniable that Algeria’s “Agrarian Revolution”¹⁸ was predicated on a model of the Algerian peasantry that was remarkably similar to Bourdieu’s dispossession model. Raffinot and Jaquemot, in a 1977 study of state capitalism in Algeria, make this clear: “The analysis of Pierre Bourdieu permits us to explain why we are witnessing the regression of the influence [of peasants] at the level of the governing authorities of the FLN when it started, beginning in 1965, to develop a structure and to define its nationalist project” (Raffinot and Jaquemot 1977: 47, also cited in Colonna 1987: 78).

The countryside, as Colonna has noted, was construed in both scientific and state discourse as a “sad object”: a “non-society,” a “non-culture” (Colonna 1987: 68; see also Colonna 1995). Yet if Bourdieu’s view of a broken and marginalized peasantry that could be characterized only in terms of loss became a cornerstone of independent Algeria’s Agrarian Revolution, this figure was continuously haunted by its opposite: the idealized “empeasanted peasant.” It is through Bourdieu’s reliance on this latter trope—a reliance that runs throughout his oeuvre—that we can perhaps understand Bourdieu as perpetuating a “mythical” view of Kabyle society.

Bourdieu’s Kabyle Myth

The war arguably overdetermined Bourdieu’s approach to Algerian society, furnishing a lens of rupture through which he viewed the entire 130-year colonial project. Yet although Bourdieu criticized

the French Left for its utopian view of the revolutionary potential of Algerian peasants, his ethnography of rupture is predicated on an equally untenable myth: that a precolonial Algerian society had existed in relative equilibrium prior to the imposition of colonialism. As Goodman (this volume) notes, it was among the “de-peasanted peasants” of the French army’s resettlement villages that Bourdieu’s theories of *habitus* and *doxa*, as formulated in the *Outline*, were born. Both during his initial wartime fieldwork and in his later revisiting of the ethnographic data collected, Bourdieu was clearly well aware that the traditional Kabylia he was writing about had long ago ceased to exist. In that sense, the “outline” can perhaps be understood to refer not only to a sketch of Bourdieu’s theory of practice; it was also his attempt to recover the nearly obliterated outlines of precolonial Kabylia, to resurrect a precontact traditional society from the ruins of resettlement camps and the detritus of war.

There was a clear political side to this recovery process, of which Bourdieu was aware at the time, and which he retrospectively acknowledged in his reflections on his Algerian research. In the first place, he viewed the larger descriptive enterprise as a vital contribution to finding a just solution to the question of Algerian independence. As he detailed in a 1986 interview:

I couldn’t be content with just reading books and visiting libraries. In a historical situation in which every moment, every political statement, every discussion, every petition, the whole reality was at stake, it was absolutely necessary to be at the heart of the events and to form one’s own opinion, however dangerous it might have been—and dangerous it was. To see, to record, to photograph. (Honneth et al. 1986: 39)

So pressing was the need that Bourdieu rushed into the ARDES research

with no formal training in qualitative field methods or Berber language (only later taking Berber classes at the Institut des Langues et Cultures Orientales [INALCO] in Paris), absorbing most of his knowledge of anthropology through his readings while working in the Algerian government library. He was particularly enthralled with the work of Margaret Mead, who more than anyone else linked ethnographic praxis to cultural critique and worked to position the anthropologist as a public intellectual with popular relevance (Nouschi 2003: 31; Sanson 2003: 284).

The pressing nature of Bourdieu's project was furthered by his distinct sense that "traditional" Kabyle culture was in danger of disappearing. Retrospectively, he understood his research and writing project as one of rehabilitation: "My goal was to provide information which was not at all accessible, and, bit by bit, I hoped for a recovery (*réhabilitation*). Dominant colonial society is not happy with simply exploiting; it destroys the dominated, it destroys them symbolically across time, through an entire operation. . . . It destroys them culturally" (Adnani and Yacine 2003: 232–33). He spoke of an "extreme sadness and anxiety" that drove him to "collect a game, to see such and such an artifact (a wedding lamp, an ancient coffer, or the inside of a well-preserved house, for instance)" (Bourdieu 2004b: 424), even at the risk of personal harm. What Marie-France Garcia-Parpet (2003: 146) has characterized as a "work of reconstitution of a traditional universe" thus amounted to an anthropological salvage operation, not for the purpose of merely archiving a series of disappearing practices, folklore, or technology, but with the goal of restoring a degree of dignity to the victims of colonization and abetting a larger public recognition of Algerians (and Kabyles in particular) as possessors of an integral (national) culture.¹⁹ "What one must rigorously demand of an ethnologist of the colonial situation is that he endeavor to restore

(*restituer*) to these other men a sense of the behaviors of which the colonial system has, among other things, dispossessed them,” Bourdieu would say (Bourdieu et al. 1963: 259). As Tassadit Yacine (2004: 498–99) has maintained, Bourdieu’s configuration of ethnosociology as an “instrument for rehabilitating peasant cultures”—for restoring a lost or endangered wholeness—thus emerged from the larger ethic of cultural relativism and egalitarianism prevalent in the late-Boasian anthropology of Mead and others.

Such a political ethic of restitution and cultural recognition has certain consequences.²⁰ In our experience, Kabyles today do talk about the loss of traditional lifeways much in the way Bourdieu describes, although they typically locate the “before” prior to the war rather than prior to colonial occupation (see Goodman 2005: chapter 3). Yet in taking people’s talk about “bygone days” (Briggs 1988) as evidence for how things once were, rather than as a form of “structural nostalgia” (Herzfeld 1997: 109), Bourdieu may have participated in the reification of a “time before time” in which a particular set of practices, institutions, or discourses stand in as a synecdoche for a Kabyle cultural integrality defined in contrast to the Algerian (post)colonial present (Goodman 2005; Silverstein, this volume). Such a “romanticizing nostalgia” (Reed-Danahay 2005: 75)—no doubt mediated by Bourdieu’s own rural upbringing—led him to regard ritual practices as well as oral sayings as “survivals” of an earlier era, as present windows into a lost past (Goodman, this volume). Even more explicitly, he viewed Kabylia itself as a survival of an originary, pan-Mediterranean society, preserving the symbolic oppositions and legal codes of ancient Greece or nineteenth-century France: “Kabylia preserved in a more durable manner—because there were rituals that kept them alive—many things that had been common across the Mediterranean, universals (*des invariants*)” (Adnani

and Yacine 2003: 239–40). Bourdieu returned to such Mediterranean universals in one of his last publications, *Masculine Domination*, which drew on his Kabyle ethnographic data as primary evidence of “the ‘phallonnarcissistic’ vision and the androcentric cosmology that are common to all Mediterranean societies and that survive even today, but in a partial, as it were, exploded state, in our own cognitive structures and social structures” (2001: 6, cited in Reed-Danahay 2005: 89).

The presentation of Kabyle ritual forms and social institutions as survivals of an integral Kabyle cultural, if not ur-Mediterranean, past in many ways recapitulates a *leitmotif* of the very colonial ethnography from which Bourdieu was at pains to distinguish his work. French military ethnographers consistently projected Berber-speakers in general—and Kabyles in particular—as the original inhabitants of North Africa who had preserved more than any other people their Mediterranean identity. General Edouard Brémont was perhaps the most outspoken in this regard: “If the Maghreb received nothing from Arabia, little from the Sudan, and almost everything from the Mediterranean, it has also many traits in common with our Middle Ages, traits which we have since forgotten” (1942: 362).²¹ Moreover, for colonial scholars Kabyles constituted the prime example of an *homme frontière* (“border man”), racially embodying the cultural heterogeneity marking the “genius” of the region, and thus positioning themselves as the perfect middleman between the Orient and the Occident, Europe and Africa.²²

These projected origins and racial affiliations bolstered parallel colonial presentations of Kabyles as sedentary, hard-working laborers who were less fanatically attached to Islam than their Arab neighbors and thus more obvious targets of the French “civilizing mission” (*mission civilisatrice*). Such representations—which date to the eve

of the conquest of Algiers, were particularly prevalent during the 1840–70 period, but continued to impact the later French colonial imaginary—have since been characterized as amounting to a “Kabyle Myth,” which, like the myths Roland Barthes (1957) examined, served to justify and naturalize the French imperial presence in Algeria (see Ageron 1961; Guilhaume 1992: 236–41; Lorcin 1995; Lucas and Vatin 1975: 45; Sayad 1992; Silverstein 2004: 52–67). While Kabyles never became the colonial toadies that later Algerian nationalists accused them of being—and indeed Kabylia was repeatedly the center of anticolonial resistance from the early period of conquest through the French-Algerian War—the myth of Kabyle autochthony, hybridity, and assimilability did have several concrete effects in colonial Algeria. It directed subsequent scientific study to the region, with ethnologists, folklorists, and archaeologists scouring the region for material artifacts, proverbs, and social institutions (particularly legal codes [*qanoun*] and political forms [such as the village assembly, or *tajmaat*]) that bespoke of a classical (Roman) heritage or even a neolithic Mediterranean past.²³ Further, the myth underwrote the preference for Kabylia as a space of colonial social experimentation in village planning and education, including the placing of some of the earliest Algerian teacher training schools in the region (Colonna 1975). It was precisely from these schools that many of Bourdieu’s own Kabyle interlocutors and collaborators emerged.

Thus, in spite of Bourdieu’s explicit rejection of the Orientalism, primitivism, imperial apologism, and material effects of this earlier research (see Bourdieu and Eribon 1980), the prominent place that Kabylia occupied in the colonial ethnographic and administrative imagination nonetheless influenced his own ethnosociological project of cultural recovery. His choice to devote his analytical energies to Kabylia rather than to the other field sites visited during his ARDES

research was no doubt shaped by his prior familiarity with the region gained through the wealth of earlier studies read in the government library at the end of his military service, by the centrality of Kabylia in the development of the French social scientific field (particularly in the work of Durkheim and his followers), and by the disproportionate number of Kabyle student-scholars with whom he had been in intellectual dialogue. He sustained colonial ethnography's reliance on material artifacts (particularly domestic architecture), proverbs, and legal codes—citing earlier observations and recorded sayings alongside those he himself collected (see Goodman, this volume)—even as he read these politically against the grain as embodiments of a threatened symbolic unity and materializations of vulnerable generative schemes of strategizing and practice (i.e., *habitus*) rather than as evidence of Kabyle autochthony or savage republicanism. While he criticized the earlier studies' disproportionate focus on magic and religion as “the racist arm used by colonial ethnology to discredit and thus claim that [the Kabyles] are primitive” (Adnani and Yacine 2003: 233), his own later salvaging of Kabyle myth and ritual and bracketing of Islamic religious or colonial education institutions (particularly in works published after 1966, see De Certeau 1984: 52; Lane 2000: 111; and Reed-Danahay 1995) arguably reinscribed the fantasy of primordial cultural unity that underwrote the Kabyle Myth. And his temporal and epistemological linking of Kabyle and Béarn peasant societies recapitulated earlier efforts to ascertain an ur-Mediterranean shared patrimony. In these ways anthropology's colonial legacy remained marked in Bourdieu's anticolonial ethnography and, indeed, in the ways in which his work has been appropriated into contemporary academic theorizing and postcolonial Kabyle identity projects.

Between Two Worlds

As much an inheritance from earlier colonial scholarship that emphasized the frontier or borderlands character of the Kabyle personality (the *homme frontière*), Bourdieu's description of a late-colonial *habitus clivé* also derived from the positioning of Bourdieu and his main informants as subjects self-consciously "between two worlds." Reed-Danahay (2005 and this volume) has discussed at some length Bourdieu's own awareness of himself as a child of a minor rural functionary and grandchild of a sharecropper whose academic success brought him into rarefied Parisian intellectual circles, and how such an identity of being betwixt and between different social worlds provided a unique perspective from which to examine the processes of social reproduction in both locales—a perspective of self-distancing he later termed "participant objectivation" (Bourdieu 2003c).²⁴ What is particularly interesting for the purposes of this volume is how he brought such a perspective to his research and writing concerning Algeria as well.

Beyond the influence of Bourdieu's Béarn upbringing on his military career (his refusal to join the officer ranks, his reassignment to the clerical position) already discussed, such identification with a peasant society furnished the basis for an imagined solidarity with his Kabyle informants. The romanticizing "structural nostalgia" (Herzfeld 1987) that Bourdieu's studies both drew on and reinforced did not simply derive from an anticolonial political project of cultural restitution but was also linked to an affective bind that Bourdieu deeply felt with Kabylia. As he later recounted,

I was crazy about the [Kabyle] country. I was really in love with the country. When I saw a Kabyle with his mustache, I found it amazing. I found these people wise, magnificent, intelligent, etc.

I was really moved to see these so unhappy people hurry towards us to tell us about their problems. . . . They wanted us to go report, witness them. At the same time, I had my own problems with ancient cultural traditions. That was my madness. (Adnani and Yacine 2003: 235)

In this sense, his Kabyle romanticism was less the urban pastoralism so present in the work of earlier colonial ethnologists as a nostalgia for a timeless, premodern Béarn, which he certainly never directly experienced, but which he had intimated in the stories and proverbs told by southwestern France's own mustachioed "men of honor." But, intimately familiar with the genre of peasant storytelling, he also questioned it as a window to any present empirical reality. "When I was in Kabylia, I distrusted those old Kabyles, while at the same time admiring them. . . . I said to myself: if that was an old Béarnais peasant who was telling me that, what would I think? I would take some, and I would leave some" (Adnani and Yacine 2003: 240). This skepticism was further bolstered by Bourdieu's ongoing statistical research, which demonstrated that certain elements that were orally represented (and anthropologically inscribed) as "rules"—such as Kabyle patrilineal parallel cousin (FBD–FBS) marriage, which in Bourdieu's empirical reckoning made up only 3–5 percent of village unions (Bourdieu 1977: 210n85; Honneth et al. 1986: 40)—were often rarely practiced. It directed Bourdieu's attention to the strategic interests and states of misrecognition manifested in his informants' speech acts, as well as the "officializing" and strategy-generating mechanism (*habitus*) that inspired them. It also motivated him to pursue simultaneous research in Béarn, so as to "gauge [the] instrument" of his own participant objectivation (Adnani and Yacine 2003: 240).

Bourdieu's own position "between two worlds"—Béarn and Paris,

Béarn and Kabylia, rural and urban, petit bourgeois and academic elite—suggests that he may have experienced himself as the “de-peasanted peasant” (*paysan dépayanné*) that he so eloquently described as inhabiting the Algerian resettlement camps and working in Algerian factories (Reed-Danahay, this volume). In contrast to the “em-peasanted peasant” (*paysan empaysanné*), a hapless creature whom Bourdieu saw as unable to adapt as the world changed around him, he thought that the de-peasanted peasant—although a tragic figure in his own right—was more easily able to move from one world to the other precisely because he was fully at home in neither. In describing his own experience of moving between seemingly incongruous social realities, Bourdieu found a parallel in the upbringing and experiences of his key Kabyle informants and interlocutors, most notably the sociologist Abdelmalek Sayad, the novelist and teacher Mouloud Feraoun, and later, the novelist, poetry specialist, and Berber cultural icon Mouloud Mammeri. Each of these figures was in his own way a “de-peasanted peasant”: like Bourdieu, each man was raised in a rural village from which he later separated; each was among a handful of indigenous Algerians to attend schools that catered primarily to the children of European settlers. Each moved between the worlds of school and home, city and village, colonizer and colonized.

As native intellectuals, Sayad, Feraoun, and Mammeri were all the kind of informant/interlocutor of whom Bourdieu should have been wary given his own theoretical proclivities: already outside the *doxa*, they could no longer speak of social practices from within the normative *habitus* but only from a *habitus clivé*. From this hybrid position, Kabylia could only appear as divided: on the far side was the precontact, quasi-mythical Kabyle culture, seemingly integral and intact; on the near side was war, emigration, and more than a

century of colonial occupation that had sundered traditional bonds and destroyed the social fabric. Whereas Sayad foregrounded the latter position in most of his writings, Feraoun and Mammeri wrote from both sides of the divide but—like Bourdieu—rarely bridged it in the same work.

Abdelmalek Sayad (1933–98), Bourdieu’s closest collaborator for his wartime studies, was a member of the ARDES team and coauthor of *Le Déracinement* as well as of one of Bourdieu’s later essays on Kabyle marriage practices (Bourdieu and Sayad 1972) and subsequently a formidable scholar of the Algerian emigrant/immigrant experience as seen from within (see Sayad 2004 [1999]). Sayad was the third child of a modest Kabyle family from the village of Aghbala, which later became one of the key resettlement villages in the ARDES study. Sayad’s minor notable (*qa’id*) great grandfather had built a school on his property for the education of his children and those of successive generations.²⁵ While initially schooled in the village setting, Sayad was quickly pushed by his father into classes normally reserved for the children of French settlers, and he later traveled to the provincial capital of Bougie (Bejaïa) and then on to Algiers for his secondary and university education.

Initially trained as a teacher and assigned to an elementary school in the Algiers Casbah during the early days of the war, Sayad later pursued graduate studies in philosophy and psychology at the University of Algiers, where he encountered Bourdieu. In the midst of a war-torn campus, Sayad became heavily involved in nationalist protests and student strikes, while maintaining his independence from the formal organization of the FLN, as one of the very few Muslim students on a mostly European campus dominated by student associations in favor of “French Algeria” (Sayad 2002: 50–59). Such involvement brought him into direct conversation and alliance with

the “Liberal” groups of European students—and particularly the Student Committee for Laïc and Democratic Action (CELAD)—and the few sympathetic professors, including Bourdieu (Sprecher 2003: 298–302).

In Bourdieu (who was but four years older than him), Sayad found a mentor, colleague, and friend, from whom he discovered that his academic education could be connected with his political aspirations for his country, and that sociology, by approaching society itself as an object of study, “a laboratory for experimentation and observation,” could serve as an “instrument for the construction and invention of [social] reality” (Sayad 2002: 59–60, 66–67). Employed in the ARDES studies and accompanying Bourdieu and his other European and Algerian students across the landscape of resettlement camps, Sayad rediscovered his country in a state of upheaval, which he saw anew with some analytical distance through the lens of “participant objectivation” and his assigned role as a cultural mediator/translator for Bourdieu. Through this experience he became a witness and—as Bourdieu (1991) later called him—a “public scribe” (*écrivain publique*) for a Kabylia in turmoil and subsequently for those displaced persons (resettled peasants, emigrants/immigrants) who could not write their own history.²⁶

If Sayad thus developed a role as an engaged and organic intellectual, such training and research experiences did not necessarily translate into a stable position at the war’s end, unlike for Bourdieu, who was able to transition seamlessly—thanks in part to Raymond Aron’s support—from Algeria to university positions at the Sorbonne, Lille, and later at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales and, eventually, the Collège de France. Rather, Sayad emerged from the war in a state of utter disenchantment and personal depression (Saint-Martin 1999: 36–37). Returning from France where he had

worked with Bourdieu on the latter's Béarn research and the writing of *Le Déracinement*, Sayad found independent Algeria to be in a state of "complete disorder" (*désordre intégral*), a perception that was doubled by the death of his father: "Everything was disoriented, in the literal sense of having 'lost its orientation': the system of references had foundered" (Sayad 2002: 83). Shortly after, in 1963, Sayad, with Bourdieu's help, left again for France and enrolled in doctoral studies in sociology with Aron. In spite of his failing health and frequent hospitalizations, Sayad pursued extended field research among Algerian immigrant workers and eventually found positions in Bourdieu's Center for European Studies, and, only after 1977, as a permanent member of the National Center for Scientific Research (CNRS). And yet, Sayad never fully joined the ranks of French intellectuals as Bourdieu did, refused French citizenship, and remained until his untimely death in 1998 on the margins of French academic society, an *homme frontière* until the end (Temime 1999).²⁷ Like the "de-peasanted" Kabyle peasants or the immigrant workers whose many qualities, sufferings, and struggles he viscerally embodied, Sayad was an "*atopos*, a quaint hybrid devoid of place, displaced, in the twofold sense of incongruous and inopportune, trapped in that 'mongrel' sector of social space betwixt and between social being and nonbeing" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 2000: 178).²⁸ In this way, his own *habitus clivé* was as much a scientific instrument for field research as a cardinal example through which he and Bourdieu could build a theory of societal rupture and its attendant cultural effects.

Bourdieu had a very different relationship with Mouloud Feraoun (1913–62), who is perhaps best known today for his ethnographic novels and in particular, *Le Fils du pauvre* (Son of a Pauper, 1992 [1950]), which portrays traditional Kabyle lifeways with a textured detail and local specificity largely absent from Bourdieu's ethnography.

A semi-autobiographical work, *Le Fils du pauvre* provides a first-hand account of growing up in a Kabyle village that culminates with the protagonist's departure for the regional capital Tizi-Ouzou as a scholarship student. In effect the book narrates Feraoun's own trajectory from an "em-peasanted" to a "de-peasanted" peasant, a trajectory accessible only to a privileged few *indigènes* (Feraoun was one of just twenty Algerians out of a total 318 students who entered the Ecole Normale of Bouzaréa in 1932, the same school Sayad would later attend). Following his studies, Feraoun was employed as a school teacher, first in the Kabyle region and, from 1957 on, in Algiers, where he was tapped in October of 1960 to work as an inspector for the Service des Centres Sociaux²⁹—a French liberal reformist educational organization designed to foster Franco-Muslim solidarity by providing educational opportunities, economic services, and medical care (Le Sueur 2000: xviii, 2005: chapter 3). Like Bourdieu's corpus, Feraoun's work lines up along a divide: whereas his early novels and essays afford an arguably idealized portrayal of Kabyle social institutions and traditions (cf. *Jours de Kabylie* [1992/1954]), he later wrote a compelling and graphic diary-style account of the French-Algerian war as he experienced it (Feraoun 2000 [1962]) over an eight-year period. The war would lead to his own tragic demise: he was assassinated by an ultra-Right paramilitary squad operated by dissident French military officers opposed to any accommodation (the Organization of the Secret Army or OAS) on March 15, 1962, mere days before a cease-fire agreement was reached.

If Feraoun's ethnographic novels foreground a kind of timeless Kabyle tradition, this was not only out of a nostalgic desire to resurrect what had already been lost. Rather, as for Bourdieu, it was also in response to what Feraoun viewed as the dangerous revolutionary ideology espoused by the French Left and embodied in Fanon and

Sartre. As Feraoun saw it, the revolution would not create a *tabula rasa* on which a “new man” could emerge, free from the yoke of patriarchal traditionalism and religious authority (Le Sueur 2000: xxviii). In contrast he saw the war as wreaking havoc, destroying what remained of the fabric of Algerian society while proposing only more violence in its place. Yet although committed in principle to the revolutionary cause, Feraoun was not ready to relinquish some of the benefits that accompanied colonization—in particular, education. He remained ultimately committed to the goals espoused by the Centres Sociaux even as he recognized that they came too late (Le Sueur 2000: xxxviii). As he would eloquently characterize his own duality: “The French are inside me, and the Kabyles are inside me” (Feraoun 2000 [1962]: 90).

Bourdieu appears to have discovered Mouloud Feraoun’s work early during his stay in Algeria; fellow Normalien Lucien Bianco, who followed Bourdieu into military service, recalled that Bourdieu had advised him to read Feraoun’s books before Bianco’s own deployment in 1958 (Bianco and Yacine 2003: 269). Feraoun was among the informants Bourdieu consulted in Algiers (Goodman, this volume); indeed, Bourdieu’s “ethnography” of Feraoun’s natal village Tizi Hibel, especially prominent in the 1966 essay “The Sentiment of Honour in Kabyle Society,” derived largely from those conversations (Bourdieu 1966: 233). Bourdieu would carry this ethnography into his later works; there, however, the village name dropped out and the ethnographic passages that had originally been linked to Tizi Hibel were integrated into what became Bourdieu’s larger, regional ethnography, joining the idealized precontact narratives that Bourdieu elicited from the “uprooted” Kabyles in the resettlement camps. Some of this ethnography may even have been drafted by Feraoun himself; Bourdieu noted at a 1997 conference that Feraoun

had read and annotated Bourdieu's earliest works on Algeria (Bourdieu 2003b: 7).

Bourdieu's encounters with Mouloud Mammeri (1917–89) were of yet a different nature. The two did not meet until well after Bourdieu had left Algeria, as Mammeri's subversive role in the anticolonial resistance during the early years of the war had forced him into hiding in Morocco beginning in 1957, following the arrest, imprisonment, and torture of his close collaborator Tahar Oussedik (Yacine 1990b). By the time Bourdieu and Mammeri met well after the war, Mammeri had already published several novels, had been appointed the first Algerian director of the Center for Archeological, Prehistoric, and Ethnological Research (CRAPE), and was a key figure in the burgeoning Berber cultural revival. Unlike Feraoun and Sayad, who hailed from modest backgrounds, Mammeri was born to privilege: he was the eldest son of a wealthy and highly respected family of metal workers in the village of Taourirt Mimoun (At Yenni). His father was the local *amin* (village leader) and had been among the first generation of Algerians to attend French schools; previous generations of Mammeris had been appointed to the status of *qa'id*, serving as liaisons between the French and the local populace (Arkoun 1990). Mammeri's own uprooting came at an early age: when he was eleven years old, he left his village to live with his uncle in Rabat, Morocco, where—like Sayad and Feraoun—he was one of the few *indigènes* to attend the French *lycée* (high school), returning home to his Kabyle village each summer. Mammeri would later narrate the first train trip to Rabat in terms of a fall from grace, recounting the experience as one of “banish[ment] from a lost paradise” (Yacine 1990a: 69) or as being abruptly torn from the cherished culture he had until then never called into question (Mammeri 1991 [1938]: 17).

At the same time, Mammeri acknowledged the many benefits

of the broad classical education he acquired; while studying Greek and Latin in school he simultaneously immersed himself at home in traditional Kabyle poetry, in which his father and uncle were both considered among the last remaining specialists (*imusnawen*). Subsequently, he would claim that it was in Rabat that he learned to situate his own cultural traditions on a par with the classics: “I felt that writing Berber verse was like Homer, who had composed the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*” (Yacine 1990a: 76). Mammeri went on to university study in Algiers and then Paris, although his studies were interrupted by World War II, during which he was drafted into the French army.³⁰ After completing his studies he taught secondary school in Algeria while editing the underground anticolonial publication *Espoir-Algérie* and composing eloquent letters and reports on behalf of Algerian independence, including a report for the FLN delegation to the United Nations.³¹

By turns a novelist, essayist, linguist, ethnographer, and ardent collector of Berber poetry, Mammeri became a central—indeed, a venerated—figure in the nascent Berber Cultural Movement during the 1970s and 1980s. Yet although Mammeri became an almost iconic representative of Kabyle tradition, Bourdieu—writing for *Le Monde* five days after Mammeri was killed in a car accident in February 1989—also acknowledged the ways in which he was “a doubled figure, divided against himself” (Bourdieu 1989: 1). From within his own *habitus clivé*, Mammeri (like myriad other postcolonial intellectuals) would seek to recover the culture and in particular the rich oral traditions of his people. As he would later put it, his work was intended as “an affirmation of something I saw dying out among the men who surrounded me” (Yacine 1990a: 71).

It was with regard to Berber oral traditions that Bourdieu and Mammeri engaged in their first published “dialogue” (Mammeri and

Bourdieu 2004 [1978]). Although perhaps intended as a conversation, this “dialogue” reads more like an interview, with Mammeri cast as the informant. Bourdieu was seeking to understand the figure of the *amusnaw*, or the highly respected sage who blends poetic language with political critique and local savvy, wielding *tamusni* (traditional wisdom) as art and social practice simultaneously. Bourdieu repeatedly pressed Mammeri to articulate how it was that poetry could be simultaneously “oral” and “*savant*,” reiterating that in the western tradition these qualities were rarely conjoined. Read retrospectively, Bourdieu’s position clearly betrays his own folk belief that oral traditions constitute unreflexive manifestations of *habitus* (Goodman, this volume).

Yet as Colonna (this volume) notes, Mammeri clearly established in this conversation the existence of a long and deep tradition of endogenous critique, thus calling into question Bourdieu’s positing of a “divide” between prereflexive and reflexive consciousness. Mammeri likewise obliquely criticized Bourdieu’s lack of ethnographic attention to the specificities of both regional history and Kabyle oral traditions. By furnishing a wealth of situated detail about both particular named poets and the social contexts in which oral poetry was produced, Mammeri demonstrated that Kabyle oral poetry did not emerge as a collective cultural product but was created by specific individuals responding to emergent sociopolitical concerns (see Goodman, this volume). However, Bourdieu never took up these challenges in his subsequent writings. Instead, he dubbed Mammeri a reinvented or resurrected *amusnaw*, able to “mobilize his people in mobilizing the words in which [his people] could recognize itself” (Bourdieu 1989: 2).

Bourdieu and Mammeri’s second dialogue, published in 1985 and titled “On the good use of ethnology,” was somewhat more reciprocal,

with both scholars discussing the implications and challenges of doing fieldwork in their own societies (Bourdieu and Mammeri 2003 [1985]). For Mammeri, “good” ethnology had to be useful not only in scientific terms but also—and perhaps primarily—as a vehicle for promoting the survival and flourishing of a people (see also Mammeri 1980, 1989). In “recovering” vanishing traditions, ethnology, Mammeri thought, was valuable in that it countered the standardization and homogenization of cultural difference promoted by a globalizing world of nation-states. Similarly, for Bourdieu, ethnology, even if admittedly a “phantasmic reconstruction,” “could be utilized as an ideological instrument of idealization” in ways that were both potentially dangerous and politically strategic: “the fact of developing representations, even if they are a bit delirious and contain a bit of mythic millenarianism, can have political utility” (Bourdieu and Mammeri 2003: 17).

In this second encounter, Mammeri was at times more directly critical of the kind of reconstructive scholarship to which Bourdieu had subjected Kabylia. For instance he questioned the way Bourdieu had drawn analogies between Béarn and Kabylia as “small autonomous republics that had their own customs . . . , the same masculine values, the same values of honor, democratic assemblies,” asking whether such a reconstructive portrayal was not “complicated by the fact that these societies . . . were in a state of total crisis?” (Bourdieu and Mammeri 2003: 15–16). This critique notwithstanding, in the context of 1970s and 1980s postcolonial Algeria, in which a strongly Jacobin government sought to “Arabize” the population and to actively suppress and even eradicate the Berber language and culture, an ethnography of a precontact Berber society—even if idealized—appeared politically necessary to both Bourdieu and Mammeri. For such an ethnographic myth could help establish Berber claims to authenticity,

thus providing symbolic capital that could be marshaled to legitimate Berber rights in the new nation-state. Mammeri admitted as much: “It remains obvious that in practice, for concrete reasons (political, social, and cultural), a Kabyle intellectual today is too often called upon to construct an ideal re-creation of his own society, particularly in reaction to the devalorizing image that those who would deny this society tend to offer” (Bourdieu and Mammeri 2003: 15).

Despite their shared engagement in Berber cultural politics, the relationship between Bourdieu and Mammeri would unavoidably bear the legacy of the colonial situation. Alongside the relative nonreciprocity of the “dialogues” (it would have been fascinating, for instance, to hear Mammeri ask Bourdieu about his own Kabyle ethnography), Bourdieu—as he did with Sayad—was the one to facilitate important institutional connections for Mammeri in the metropole, including sponsoring the publication of the journal *Awal* in which the second interview appeared. Given that Mammeri relied on this patronage relationship, he was not on equal footing; in such a context, he would have been hard pressed to engage directly in a critique of Bourdieu’s Kabyle ethnography.³²

Berber Cultural Movement

Today both Bourdieu and Mammeri have been almost mythologized in Berber cultural circles, where both seem to have achieved post-humously the status of *imusnawen*, sages who speak from a deep knowledge of Berber tradition and history, despite the fact that they could only imagine an integral Berber culture from their position of already existing between two worlds. Or perhaps because of this fact; indeed, avowals of in-betweenness generally chart the politics of the contemporary, transnational Berber Cultural Movement. Present-day Kabyle activists re-present organic intellectuals like Feraoun

and Mammeri as their forebears—if not martyrs—in the struggle to promote Tamazight (Berber language and culture) as the core of North Africa’s cultural particularity and as a middle ground between Islamic and Western civilizations. Bourdieu’s affinity with Mammeri as reflective *imusnawen* underwrote Bourdieu’s support for Berber studies in France—including his help in the foundation of the Groupe d’Etudes Berbères at the Université de Paris–Vincennes and later the Centre de Recherches et Etudes Amazigh at the Maison de Science de l’Homme—and the native anthropology that largely comprises it.³³ These centers and their respective publications (including Mammeri and Yacine’s journal *Awal*) have provided the intellectual basis and institutional support for Kabyle men and women (both in Kabylia and in the diaspora) to objectify their culture as a set of values to be learned, preserved, and fought for. The terms of this objectification and avowal largely follow from Bourdieu’s example, and share in a similar structural nostalgia for a “time before time” of colonial rupture and postindependence Arab national imposition.

As much as Bourdieu sought to restore dignity and modern value to Kabyle culture, the independent FLN government—ideologically uniting Islamic reformism, Arab nationalism, and state socialism—largely devalued it as a feudal survival and imperial construction, pointing to the colonial politics of the Kabyle Myth as evidence of its incompatibility with a new, decolonized Algeria.³⁴ Such a conflation of Berber identity and sectarianism was reinforced in September 1963 during a ten-month armed confrontation between the Algerian national army and fighters of the Kabyle leader Hocine Ait-Ahmed’s Socialist Forces Front (FFS), which sought greater autonomy for Kabylia. Ait-Ahmed’s arrest and flight to Europe shifted the locus of Berber political claims to the community of Kabyle emigrants and expatriates living in France, many of whom had been politicized during

the French-Algerian war by the FLN and its various antecedent and rival organizations. Drawing on this earlier history, in March 1967, a group of scholars (including Mammeri), artists (including singer Taos Amrouche), and FFS activists (including Bessaoud Mohand Arab) founded the Berber Academy for Cultural Exchange and Research (renamed in 1969 as Agraw Imazighen) in Paris.³⁵ While originally dedicated to the “universal” and “harmonious cooperation between all humanity,” the Agraw’s goals became increasingly irredentist—“to introduce the larger public to the history and civilisation of Berbers, including the promotion of the language and culture” as stated in the second article of its 1969 statutes. Adopting the appellation *Imazighen* (“free men”), members of the Academy worked to standardise Berber (Tamazight) and develop a neo-Tifinagh orthographic script; it pushed its ideology of a “Berber nation” through the medium of “Arab cafés” and the variety of village assemblies (*tajmaats*) transposed onto the French urban landscape (Chaker 1998: 44).

The Agraw’s efforts were carried over in the 1973 formation of the Groupe d’Études Berbères, which—with the aid of Bourdieu and other scholars of Berber societies like Ernest Gellner—dedicated itself to teaching Berber language and culture. In 1978 the organization spun off the Ateliers Imedyazen, a publication cooperative in Paris created to diffuse such intellectual debates to a wider audience. Over the course of the next several years, the cooperative published works on linguistics, theatre, poetry and other Berber fiction (including translations into Tamazight of the work of Brecht, among others), grammar manuals, *dossiers de presse* that followed events in Algeria, and political communiqués (including the 1979 FFS party platform). These publications were paralleled by the growth of a Kabyle recording industry in France, in which performers like Idir, Lounis Aït-Menguellat, Ferhat M’henni, and Lounès Matoub adapted traditional

poetry and folktales into “revolutionary songs of struggle” (to cite an early Ferhat album), and eventually came to play direct political roles in the struggle for Berber language rights.

In March–April 1980, the locus of Berber politics shifted back to Kabylia when—following the cancellation by the governor of the *wilaya* of Tizi-Ouzou of a lecture on ancient Berber poetry, which was to have been given at the University of Tizi Ouzou on March 10 by Mammeri—students occupied the university. When security forces arrived, violent confrontations broke out that would last for two weeks, culminating in widespread student demonstrations, a general strike throughout the region, and eventually a large number of arrests and beatings of many strikers when the newly-installed president Chadli Benjedid called in the military. These events, collectively known as the “Berber Spring,” concretized the previously amorphous Berber Cultural Movement (MCB) and initiated Berber identity politics as a force in postcolonial Algeria and the diaspora (see Chaker 1998; Goodman 2005: chapter 2; Maddy-Weitzman 2001; Roberts 1980; Silverstein 2003).³⁶ Successive waves of contestation to state authority in October 1988, the autumn of 1994, July 1998, and April 2001 have drawn directly on this early moment of confrontation for their spatial and ideological dimensions. Moreover, the 1980 events politicized the various Kabyle cultural organizations and artistic groups that formed across the French urban landscape after the legalization of immigrant associations in 1981. These associations became sites for political speeches and electioneering of the various factions of the MCB—as well as the FFS and Rally for Culture and Democracy (RCD), Kabyle parties legalized after 1989—which sought (in their different ways) the officialization of Tamazight as a national language of Algeria and for greater cultural and economic autonomy of Kabylia within a potentially federal state.

As we have argued elsewhere (see Goodman 2005: chapter 3; Silverstein, this volume), what has united these various manifestations of Kabyle cultural politics has been their reference to a timeless—but continually threatened if not partially submerged—Berber culture in dire need of preservation and rehabilitation. Cultural associations on both sides of the Mediterranean archive material artifacts and recorded poetry, songs, and rituals; sponsor lectures and conferences on Berber history and culture; teach courses in standard, written Tamazight; and stage public celebrations of seasonal festivals. These celebrations often include dance demonstrations and musical performances, actively seeking to transmit forms of cultural knowledge not taught in state educational systems. The symbolic repertoire mobilized in these performances closely parallels that highlighted by Bourdieu in his ethnography, drawing on gendered images of village or domestic settings (including the architectural features highlighted in his famous essay on the “Kabyle House” [1970]) while bracketing the “Islamic” or “modern” dimensions of Kabyle history or contemporary life (see Scheele 2007). Moreover, in their political discourse, Berber activists emphasize—like Bourdieu—the Mediterranean dimensions of Kabyle culture, distinguishing themselves from the peoples of the Middle East with whom Orientalist scholars and Arab nationalist ideologues had allied them. Like Bourdieu these activists draw on rooted tropes of Kabyle authenticity and autochthony.

More than simply sharing a similar structural nostalgia, Bourdieu and contemporary Berber activists are further linked by a politics of ethnography. Bourdieu explicitly prided himself on recuperating ethnology from a colonial science of racial domination to a modern instrument of cultural renewal or “liberation” for Kabylia (Adnani and Yacine 2003: 243). Bourdieu’s response to Mammeri’s subtle critique in their second dialogue is revealing:

I believe that ethnology, when it is done well, is a very important instrument of self-knowledge, a kind of social psychoanalysis which allows one to grasp the cultural unconscious which all who are born in that society have in their heads . . . and one must include in that cultural unconscious all the traces of colonization, the humiliating effects. . . . Claiming that ethnology is a colonial science, thus worthless, is a great stupidity. (Bourdieu and Mammeri 2003 [1985]: 15)

Bourdieu later summed up the dialogue by pointing to his role in “making ethnology acceptable for Kabyles”: “[The dialogue] attests to the fact that there is no antinomy between the intention of rehabilitation which animated Mammeri’s research on ancient Berber poetry of Kabylia, and the ethnological intention of interpretation. Ethnology opens one of the necessary paths to a true reflexivity, condition of self-knowledge as exploration of the historical unconscious” (Bourdieu 2003b: 87).

Kabyle intellectuals have followed in Bourdieu’s path by engaging in an archaeology of the Berber cultural “unconscious.” From the associations’ museological practices, to the compiling of a “Berber Encyclopedia,” to autodidact ethnography and folklore collection, to the enrollment of activists in degree programs in anthropology and linguistics, the Berber cultural movement has appropriated ethnology as an instrument of identity politics. This has included a rehabilitation of colonial studies—and particularly the work of the *Pères Blancs* Jesuit missionary educators like Devulder and Sanson with whom Bourdieu had been in close contact (cf. Adnani and Yacine 2003: 243; Sanson 2003)—which have been mined for evidence of precolonial Berber culture. Indeed, as contemporary ethnographers in North Africa, we have had the repeated experience of visiting

Berber associations and being presented with weathered copies of colonial military texts as the definitive sources on local tradition. And recently Bourdieu's works themselves have entered into this folk anthropological canon, not only as promoted by his Kabyle students (and students of students), but also by self-taught scholars on the North African periphery who can now access some of his texts via the Internet. Moreover, activists increasingly recognize Bourdieu's contributions to the Berber Cultural Movement even if they are less familiar with his theoretical work. Upon Bourdieu's death in January 2002, the president of the World Amazigh Congress, Mabrouk Ferkal, issued a communiqué rendering homage to the scholar as "one of the Kabyles' dearest friends" (cited in Silverstein, this volume). In this way, although Bourdieu remains best known for his contributions to a social theory of practice, symbolic violence, and social capital, the legacy of his early Algerian ethnography lives on in the contemporary cultural politics of the region.

Outline of the Volume

The chapters that comprise this volume explore these various aspects of Bourdieu's research and writing on Algeria, from the circumstances and politics of his early field studies, to their influence on his later theoretical development, to their legacies in later scholarship and social movements in and of Algeria. Although taking slightly different slices of Bourdieu's oeuvre as their objects of investigation and critique, each of the contributors emphasizes the symbiotic relationship between his fieldwork, ethnography, and theory, and the way in which all three of these practices evolved in concert with the changing political and material conditions under which he was operating. Overall, the chapters present a picture of a deeply engaged scholar whose work—in both its contributions and shortcomings—serves

as a model of self-reflexivity and intellectual and ethical commitment. Exploring Bourdieu's Algerian research gives us a window into larger, enduring issues surrounding the politics of ethnography in a changing world.

Fanny Colonna takes up what she characterizes as an agonistic social vision that runs through Bourdieu's corpus, from his earliest writings on Algeria (e.g., Bourdieu 1958; Bourdieu and Sayad 1964) to his 1993 landmark study *The Weight of the World* (1993) via *The Logic of Practice* (1980) and related works. She interrogates how the premise of radical deprivation repeatedly functions as the condition of possibility for a theory of domination, which constituted for Bourdieu the keystone of social relations. The implications of this theory of deprivation/domination for Bourdieu's ethnography of peasant societies in Algeria are dramatic: his description, and especially his theorization of the consequences of the social and spatial exclusion produced by colonization, take place at the expense of recognizing the peasants' own cultural resources in the form of written traditions or a meticulously preserved scriptural religion, both of which serve as endogenous reflections on their historical experience. Moving widely across Bourdieu's oeuvre, Colonna shows how the frame of his deprivation model repeatedly oversimplifies and obscures what was a far more complex social reality. For instance, drawing on Bourdieu's dialogues with Kabyle poetry expert and novelist Mouloud Mammeri (Mammeri and Bourdieu 2004 [1978]), Colonna contends that Mammeri's discussion of the historical reflexivity exercised by the Kabyle sages (*imusnawen*) was at odds with Bourdieu's "logic of practice" model, which would have denied them the capacity for critical reflection. If Colonna is critical of the ways in which Bourdieu's theory came at the expense of the ethnographic and historical record, she also acknowledges that Bourdieu's own praxis—in his

dual capacity as a teacher and as an engaged intellectual—was in many ways more complex, nuanced, and “variegated” (Corcuff 1995) than his theoretical model would have allowed for. In setting the trajectories of deprivation and domination in Bourdieu’s discourse against his own political commitments, Colonna shows how the latter worked to temper Bourdieu’s contention that domination alone constitutes the essence of the social—as was apparent in Bourdieu’s sustained engagement with the 1995 public worker strikes and demonstrations that sunk the austerity reforms proposed by then–Prime Minister Alain Juppé.

Jane Goodman makes the related point that Bourdieu’s portrayals of Algeria appear to be more a function of his theoretical proclivities than of indigenous practice. She begins from what she characterizes as a Manichean divide that underwrites Bourdieu’s representations of Algerian Kabyles: whereas those of the *Outline*, *The Logic of Practice*, and related works are made to represent a kind of enchanted precolonial order, the Kabyles of *Travail et travailleurs* and *Le Déracinement* appear solely in terms of dispossession and loss. As Goodman shows, Bourdieu constitutes this divide in part through representations of language: whereas the Kabyles in the latter works speak in eloquent, extended prose about the difficulties of their “uprooted” condition, those of the former speak in proverbs and sayings when they speak at all. Here Bourdieu was implicitly drawing on the Herderian tenet that oral lore provides a timeless conduit to a people’s identity, without heed for the pragmatics of contemporary proverb use. Moreover, Bourdieu intermingled texts elicited in war-torn Kabylia with those he found in colonial ethnographies and missionary publications, thus molding the particular products of historically positioned individuals into evidence for a shared *habitus*.

For Goodman, Bourdieu’s dualistic approach to language poses a

number of problems. Since Bourdieu maintains that informants cannot articulate the logic of their own practice, endogenous reflexivity is all but foreclosed: Kabyles can never exercise critical purchase on the conditions of their own social life. Instead they are either made to endlessly reproduce an enchanted universe (as exemplars of a western fantasy of precolonial Others) or are condemned as victims of war and outcasts of capitalist modernity. For Bourdieu literacy constituted a key pivot on which this dualism rested: he believed that literacy fostered a critical consciousness that orality precluded. Yet as Goodman notes, Bourdieu neglected historical evidence of literacy in Kabylia—a region that had long included literate scribes, *marabouts* (religious specialists), and calendrical experts. In locating the region on the far side of an unwarranted dichotomy between literate and illiterate societies, Bourdieu reinforced a view of Kabyle society as primarily oral that was ethnographically unsustainable and politically problematic. Theory, then, came at the expense of both methodological rigor and ethnographic evidence.

Deborah Reed-Danahay similarly emphasizes the split in Bourdieu's thinking between the "em-peasanted peasant" (*paysan empaysanné*) who fully embodies his *habitus* and the "de-peasanted peasant" (*paysan dépayanné*), a tragic figure unable to adapt to urbanizing or modernizing influences. Placing Bourdieu's work in rural France (specifically, in his natal province of Béarn) into dialogue with his research in Algeria, she finds versions of both figures in each place, suggesting that Bourdieu "was seeing French peasants in the faces and bodies of Algerians and perhaps vice versa" (this volume). Like Colonna, Reed-Danahay points to the discourse of dispossession that underwrites Bourdieu's theory, as several sets of victims are made to parallel each other: in Algeria, unemployed youth and dislocated peasants; in France, perpetual rural bachelors who lacked the symbolic

capital to attract a wife in a rapidly urbanizing society. Both figures, for Bourdieu, were portrayed as “locked in their *habitus*” (Goodman, this volume), unable to adapt to a changing world.

Bourdieu’s theory of *habitus*, Reed-Danahay further notes, was formulated in the 1960s (inspired by earlier work by Marcel Mauss and Norbert Elias) in the dual contexts of peasant studies and Mediterranean studies, both informed by a presumed dichotomy between urban and rural societies that itself was predicated on an equilibrium model of a premodern world subject to rupture and dislocation. Yet if Algeria and rural France constituted for Bourdieu “parallel worlds” in which he developed similar themes, they were also his own personal worlds. With Bourdieu’s upbringing in rural France and his subsequent entry into the environment of the *École Normale* and the French university system, perhaps Bourdieu himself, Reed-Danahay suggests, embodied or at least could identify with the “de-peasanted peasant.” In that sense Bourdieu’s own autobiography may have furnished a model for the figure of the “man between two worlds” that would become a key leitmotif of his early ethnography.

Paul Silverstein follows Reed-Danahay’s discussion of societal rupture with an exploration of the arboreal tropes of rooting and uprooting that underwrote Bourdieu’s discussion of social transformation as exogenous crisis. Focusing on Bourdieu’s essay on the Kabyle house (*akham*) and the later reappropriations of domestic architecture by the Berber cultural movement, Silverstein examines discourses of authenticity and autochthony embedded within a “structural nostalgia” (Herzfeld 1995) for a precolonial Kabylia shared by scholars and activists. In nostalgic practice, domesticity becomes a salient synecdoche for a rooted cultural tradition relatively untouched by a disruptive colonial and state-national modernity, and as such it is not surprising to find the *akham* (as described by Bourdieu) the object

of contemporary archiving, restoration, and rebuilding projects by organic Kabyle intellectuals.

At issue is the politics of ethnography—and ethnic representation more broadly—in an era where culture has become an object of human rights discourse. As overseas Kabyles incorporate aspects of idealized village public and domestic structures into their urbane everyday lives, they objectify their culture as a scarce and endangered resource to be preserved if not revived. Bourdieu's early writings, based largely on interviews with displaced villagers engaged in their own forms of structural nostalgia, participate in a similar ethic of recovery and rehabilitation, and thus find themselves open to later appropriation. The essay thus furthers Bourdieu's own interest in objectification and "objectivation," as it explores a particular case of how both academic and local synoptic representations of Kabyle social practice—of history-as-uprooting—are mutually determined.

Abdellah Hammoudi takes the volume full-circle, connecting Bourdieu's development of a theory of *habitus* in his Kabyle research to his earlier philosophical investigations of phenomenology. He discusses how *habitus*, in Bourdieu's later usage, retained many of the presumptions of the category of prerational, prereflexive "tradition" or "custom" found in earlier, colonial ethnological writings on Kabylia, as well as Bourdieu's initial publications. In elaborating and extending a theory of embodiment and the "feel for the game" (*le sens du jeu*) from Merleau-Ponty, Bourdieu actually emphasized the tendencies towards social reproduction and the limits placed on the improvisation—on the facts of practical and lived creativity—which Merleau-Ponty had seen as continuous and structurally effectual. In this respect, Bourdieu perfectly occupied the intellectual juncture between phenomenology and an emerging structuralism that marked the state of French social theory in the mid-1960s.

In like manner Hammoudi argues that such a model of *habitus* as a phenomenological field of reproduction recapitulates a division of labor between anthropology (as the study of peasant *habitus*) and Orientalism (as the study of more explicit, institutionalized cultural norms of language and religion). Hammoudi explores the ethnographic choices Bourdieu made to limit his scope of research to that of a “deep culture” (*culture profonde*) which bracketed dimensions of institutionalized Islam or an earlier history of social adaptations to the exigencies of Ottoman governance. Bourdieu’s relegation of these latter elements to a superficial “level” of cultural influence points to the continuity of his work with the colonial ethnology on which he drew.

Throughout all of the chapters, the authors engage with Bourdieu’s theoretical formulations in the various contexts in which they were developed. In pointing to the various shortcomings of his theories and descriptions, the authors are well aware that all ethnography is necessarily partial. We are convinced that critical engagement is the highest form of recognition and gratitude we can offer to a scholar as inspiring to our own projects and intellectual development as has been Pierre Bourdieu. We offer this volume in his memory.

Notes

1. In the wake of Bourdieu’s death, special issues of several academic journals—including *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales* (2003), *Awal* (2003), and *Ethnography* (2004)—and a published collection (Bourdieu 2008, which appeared as this volume was going to press) focusing on Bourdieu’s Algerian fieldwork experiences were edited by his former students and colleagues. These include republications of Bourdieu’s own earlier writings, interviews with Bourdieu and a number of his Algerian research collaborators, photographs taken by Bourdieu while in the field, and some of Bourdieu’s later thoughts on his earlier research, written just prior to his death. See also Addi (2002: 37–77); Lane (2000: 9–33); Reed-Danahay (2005: 69–98); Sayad (2002: 45–74); and

Yacine (2008) for further discussions of the colonial conditions of Bourdieu's ethnographic research and early theorization. Earlier discussions include De Certeau (1984: 50–60); Eickelman (1977); Lacoste-Dujardin (1976); and Reed-Danahay (1995).

2. Following Le Sueur (2005), we opt for the appellation “French-Algerian war” to underline the fact that the struggle constituted as much a civil war within France (insofar as the Algerian departments had been integrated into the juridical structure of the French state, and insofar as many of the events of the war were sited within metropolitan France) as a revolutionary war for independence. As Todd Shepard (2006: 1) emphasizes, “the Algerian Revolution was at the same time a French revolution.” Indeed, it was only in the final days of the struggle that “France” and “Algeria” emerged as separate legal categories.

3. Other anthropologists—from French colonial ethnologists of North Africa (e.g., Adolphe Hanoteau and Robert Montagne) through early British social anthropologists like E. E. Evans-Pritchard—had conducted ethnographic fieldwork as part of (or alongside) military ventures, but Bourdieu was among the first to engage in an anthropological project under wartime conditions that was separate from—if not in opposition to—military logistics. See Greenhouse, Mertz, and Warren (2002) and Nordstrom and Robben (1995) on conducting ethnography under conditions of war.

4. On how Bourdieu's rural upbringing may have helped to shape his scholarly interests, see Reed-Danahay (2005).

5. See Dermenghem (1954) and Nouschi (1961). Other scholars working in the government around that time included Germaine Tillion, Robert Lacoste, Jaques Soustelle, Vincent Monteil, and Louis Massignon (Yacine 2004: 490).

6. Bourdieu describes this period of research in several posthumously published essays (2003, 2004a, 2004b), and in a televised interview (Adnani and Yacine 2003). For well-documented accounts of the intellectual and political conditions of this formative moment in Bourdieu's work, see also Garcia-Parpet (2003); Nouschi (2003); Sanson (2003); Sayad (2002); Wacquant (2004); and Yacine (2004, 2008).

7. On “integration” as a political solution during the closing years of the war, see Le Sueur (2005: 23–24) and Shepard (2006: 45–53).

8. *Que Sais-Je?* (What Do I Know?) is a series of reference works on historical and contemporary issues geared to an educated general populace.

9. This is one of the few places in Bourdieu's oeuvre that he devotes sustained attention to Islam (Bourdieu 1958: 107–18). See Hammoudi (2000, this volume) and Reed-Danahay (2005: 18) for a discussion of the religious aporia in Bourdieu's work on Algeria.

10. The English translation (1962d) also includes an extended version of Bourdieu's essay "Revolution in the Revolution," initially published in 1961.

11. Bourdieu's "clash of civilizations" is obviously quite distinct from Bernard Lewis and Samuel Huntington's later use of the term to describe a post-Cold War conflict between Islamic and Western societies, or to encapsulate the "rage" experienced by "Muslims" when confronted with an imperializing, Christian-secular modernity (Lewis 1990; Huntington 1996). As is discussed below, Bourdieu's highlighting of the asymmetrical relations built into colonial situations is not predicated on a primordial Orient/Occident, Islam/West distinction, and indeed he explicitly rejected the Orientalist tendency of colonial ethnography to approach Algerians as principally Muslim subjects.

12. See Lane (2000: 12–15); Nouschi (2003: 31–32); Wacquant (2004: 393); and Yacine (2004: 496–98) for further discussions of Bourdieu's "clash of civilizations" model as a response to acculturation theory and modernization theory, and to the earlier work of Germaine Tillion in particular. Bourdieu's engagement with Tillion is further evidenced in his later collection of scholarly essays based on his ARDES research, *Algérie 60* (1977b), the title of which is calqued on Tillion's earlier *L'Algérie en 1957* (1957, later translated as *Algeria: The Realities* [1958]).

13. For a discussion of arboreal tropes of rooting and uprooting, see Silverstein, this volume.

14. See Turner (1967) on ritual liminality as a situation of being betwixt and between social states.

15. The formulation of *tristes paysans* is clearly a play on Lévi-Strauss's foundational travelogue-cum-ethnography of cultural dissolution and social displacement in South America, *Tristes tropiques* (1955).

16. See Partha Chatterjee's discussion of Indian anticolonial nationalist discourse, which emphasized a distinction between "spiritual" and "material" domains of cultural life, granting British superiority in the former, but maintaining the latter as a space of Indian authenticity (1993).

17. We are grateful to Jeremy Lane for calling our attention to this question. While a fuller treatment is surely called for, it is beyond our capacities in this book.

18. On Algeria's Agrarian Revolution see Benhouria (1980); Dahmani (1979); Martens (1973); and Raffinot and Jacquemot (1977).

19. Sayad (2002: 68) later recalled the outrage elicited by Bourdieu's 1960 Algiers public lecture on "Algerian Culture": "Even well before the event, the few small flyers announcing the lecture were perceived as a provocation, as calls for subversion, as attacks on 'French culture'—such was the only possible

and decent culture—or so one heard in Algiers, within ‘French Algeria’. And during and after the lecture there were cries of scandal! . . . How could one speak of culture, even in the anthropological sense, with regards to ‘savages’, ‘ignoramuses’, ‘fanatics?’”

20. See Lane (2000: 117–19) for a parallel discussion of the tension between “rehabilitation” and “romanticism” in Bourdieu’s Kabyle studies.

21. For similar colonial formulations of Berbers’ Mediterranean character, see Busset (1929); Demontès (1930); Guernier (1950); and Maunier (1922). For a further discussion of the place of Berbers in colonial constructions of the Mediterranean, see Silverstein (2002).

22. Berber racial identity and origins were a much debated subject in late-nineteenth-century scholarship. See Mercier (1871); Rinn (1889); and Tauxier (1862–63). For a general overview of racial stereotyping in colonial Algeria see Gross and McMurray (1993) and Lorcin (1995).

23. The works of military ethnologists Hanoteau and Letourneux on oral lore and *qanoun* (Hanoteau 1867; Hanoteau and Letourneux 1872–73) are exemplary in this regard and are repeatedly cited by subsequent authors including Bourdieu (1977: 16). For a discussion of their work in the context of French imperialism and Bourdieu’s oeuvre, see Goodman (2002 and this volume).

24. Bourdieu’s posthumously published autobiographical reflection, *Esquisse pour une auto-analyse* (2004, *Sketch for a Self-Analysis*), is instructive of how clearly self-conscious he was of his own medial class position and its effects on his professional life and scholarly perspective.

25. Biographical information on Sayad can be found on the website of the Association des Amis de Abdelmalek Sayad (AAAS): http://www.abdelmaleksayad.org/f_biographie.html. See also Sayad (2002).

26. “Abdelmalek Sayad gives us an exemplary figure of the sociologist as ‘public scribe’, who records and broadcasts, with anthropological acuity and poetic grace, the voice of those most cruelly dispossessed of it by the crushing weight of imperial subordination and class domination, without ever instituting himself as a spokesperson, without ever using these given words to give lessons except lessons in ethnographic integrity, scientific rigor, and civic courage” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 2000: 179).

27. “Caught between two worlds, he did not truly recognize himself in one or the other, but did not wish to renounce either, and intensely experienced a ‘sociological doubling’ or perhaps rather a permanent tension between systems of contradictory obligations and influences which constrain emigration but also the position of the critical sociologist. Defying all illusions, Sayad, who became a sociologist at the moment of the war of liberation, was always in the position

of the outsider, the marginal, the trickster (*porte-à-faux*) even when he became research director at the CNRS and was recognized by the international scientific community” (Saint-Martin 1999: 36).

28. For an incisive analysis of the marginal character of emigration that picks up exactly where *Le Déracinement* leaves off, see Sayad’s “Les trois ‘âges’ de l’émigration algérienne en France” (1977, translated and republished as “The Three Ages of Emigration” in Sayad 2004).

29. The Service des Centres Sociaux was the brainchild of Jacques Soustelle, governor general of Algeria beginning in 1955; however, it was Germaine Tillion who created a specific plan for educational reform and recruited Feraoun. For a history of the Service des Centres Sociaux, see LeSueur (2005: chap. 5).

30. Mammeri was active in the anticolonial resistance as early as the 1930s when he was a member of the maverick “Group of 7” whose mission was to “get France to leave” no matter the cost. Although World War II clearly interrupted their plans, Mammeri saw it as an opportunity to train himself in the art of war. See Yacine (1990b).

31. Some of these texts appear in Yacine (1990b: 112–35). See also Djeghloul (1990).

32. We are grateful to Jeremy Lane for helping us to clarify this point.

33. Bourdieu’s support for Kabyle scholars continued into his later years with the founding of the Committee for the Support of Algerian Intellectuals (CISIA) after the 1993 assassination of Kabyle journalist/novelist Tahar Djaout.

34. On the place of the “Berber” in Algerian nationalist ideology, see McDougall (2003).

35. For a history of Kabyle cultural politics in France, see Slimani-Direche (1997) and Silverstein (2003, 2004).

36. Bourdieu published an insightful analysis of the events as they were occurring, with Didier Eribon in the French socialist daily *Libération* (1980; see Lane 2000: 114–15).

Works Cited

- Addi, Lahouari. 2002. *Sociologie et anthropologie chez Pierre Bourdieu*. Paris: La Découverte.
- Adnani, Hafid and Tassadit Yacine. 2003. L’autre Bourdieu. *Awal* 27/28: 229–49.
- Ageron, Charles-Robert. 1960. La France a-t-elle un politique kabyle? *Revue Historique* 223: 311–52.
- Arkoun, Mohamed. 1990. Mouloud Mammeri à Taourirt Mimoun. *Awal* spécial: 9–13.

- Asad, Talal. 1973. *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. London: Ithaca Press.
- Balandier, Georges. 1951. La situation coloniale. *Cahiers Internationaux de Sociologie* 11: 44-79.
- Barthes, Roland. 1957. *Mythologies*. Paris: Seuil.
- Benhouria, Tahar. 1980. *L'Economie de l'Algérie*. Paris: Maspero.
- Bianco, Lucien and Tassadit Yacine. 2003. On n'avait jamais vu le 'monde': Nous étions une petite frange de gauche entre les communistes et les socialistes. *Awal* 27/28: 267-77.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1958. *Sociologie de l'Algérie*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- . 1959. Le choc des civilisations. In *Le Sous-développement en Algérie*. pp. 52-64. Algiers: Secrétariat Social.
- . 1961. Révolution dans la révolution. *Esprit* 1 (1): 27-40.
- . 1962a. Les relations entre les sexes dans la société paysanne. *Les Temps Modernes* 195: 307-311.
- . 1962b. Célibat et condition paysanne. *Etudes Rurales* 5/6: 32-136.
- . 1962c. De la guerre révolutionnaire à la révolution. In *L'Algérie de demain*, ed. François Perroux. pp. 5-13. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- . 1962d. *The Algerians*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- . 1966. The Sentiment of Honor in Kabyle Society. In *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*, ed. J. G. Peristiany, trans. Philip Sherard. pp. 191-241. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1970. La maison kabyle ou le monde renversé. In *Echanges et communications. Mélanges offerts à Claude Lévi-Strauss à l'occasion de son 60^e anniversaire*. Paris: Mouton.
- . 1972. *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique*. Geneva: Droz.
- . 1977a. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1977b. *Algérie 60. Structures économiques, structures temporelles*. Paris: Minuit.
- . 1988 [1984]. *Homo Academicus*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- . 1989. Mouloud Mammeri ou la colline retrouvée. *Awal* 5: 1-3.
- . 1990 [1980]. *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- . 1991. Préface. In *L'Immigration ou les paradoxes de l'altérité*, Abdelmalek Sayad. Brussels: De Boeck.
- . 1996 [1989]. *The State Nobility: Elite Schools in the Field of Power*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- . 2000 [1997]. *Pascalian Meditations*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- . 2001. *Masculine Domination*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- . 2002. *Le Bal des célibataires: Crise de la société paysanne en Béarn*. Paris: Points Seuil.
- . 2003a. *Images d'Algérie: Une affinité élective*, ed. Franz Schultheis. Arles: Actes Sud.
- . 2003b [2000]. Entre amis. *Awal* 27–28: 83–88.
- . 2003c. Participant Objectivation. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 9: 281–94.
- . 2004a. *Esquisse pour une auto-analyse*. Paris: Raisons d'Agir.
- . 2004b. Algerian Landing. *Ethnography* 5 (4): 415–44.
- . 2008 *Esquisses algériennes*, ed. Tassadit Yacine. Paris: Seuil.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, et al. 1993. *La Misère du monde*. Paris: Seuil.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, Alain Darbel, Jean-Pierre Rivet, and Claude Seibel. 1963. *Travail et travailleurs en Algérie*. Paris: Mouton.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Didier Eribon. 1980. Clou de Djeha: Des contradictions linguistiques léguées par le colonisateur. *Libération* 19–20 April: 13.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Mouloud Mammeri. 2003 [1985]. Du bon usage de l'ethnologie. *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales* 150: 9–18.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Jean-Claude Passeron. 1970. *La Réproduction: Eléments pour une théorie du système d'enseignement*. Paris: Minuit.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, Franck Poupeau, and Thierry Discepolo. 2002. *Interventions, 1961–2001: Science sociale et action politique*. Marseille: Agone.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Abdelmalek Sayad. 1964. *Le Déracinement. La Crise de l'agriculture traditionnelle en Algérie*. Paris: Minuit.
- . 1972. Stratégie et rituel dans le mariage kabyle. In *Mediterranean Family Structures*, ed. John G. Peristiany. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2004 [1964]. Colonial Rule and the Cultural Sabir. *Ethnography* 5 (4): 445–86.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Loïc Wacquant. 2000. The Organic Ethnologist of Algerian Migration. *Ethnography* 1 (2): 173–82.
- Briggs, Charles. 1988. *Competence in Performance: The Creativity of Tradition in Mexican Verbal Art*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Busset, Maurice, et al. 1929. *Maroc et l'Auvergne*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Calhoun, Craig, Edward LiPuma, and Moishe Postone, eds. 1993. *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chaker, Salem. 1998. *Berbères aujourd'hui*. Second Edition. Paris: Harmattan.

- Chatterjee, Partha. 1993. *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse?* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Clifford, James and George Marcus, eds. 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Santa Fe NM: SAR Press.
- Colonna, Fanny. 1975. *Instituteurs algériens, 1883–1939*. Paris: Presses de la Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques.
- . 1987. *Savants paysans: Eléments d'histoire sociale sur l'Algérie rurale*. Algiers: Office des Publications Universitaires.
- . 1995. *Les Versets de l'invincibilité: Permanence et changements religieux dans l'Algérie contemporaine*. Paris: Presses de la Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques.
- Comaroff, Jean. 1985. *Body of Power, Spirit of Resistance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cooper, Frederick and Ann Laura Stoler, eds. 1997. *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Corcuff, Philippe. 1995. *Les Nouvelles sociologies: Constructions de la réalité sociale*. Paris: Nathan.
- Dahmani, Mohamed. 1979. *L'Algérie: Légitimité historique et continuité politique*. Paris: Editions Le Sycomore.
- de Certeau, Michel. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Demontès, Victor. 1930. *L'Algérie économique*. Volume 3. Algiers: Gouvernement Général d'Algérie, Direction de l'Agriculture, du Commerce, et de la Colonisation.
- Dermenghem, Émile. 1954. *Le Culte des saints dans l'Islam maghrébin*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Dirks, Nicholas, ed. 1992. *Colonialism and Culture*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Djegloul, Abdelkader. 1990. Le courage lucide d'un intellectuel marginalisé. *Awal* 6/7: 79–98.
- Eickelman, Dale. 1977. Time in a Complex Society: A Moroccan Example. *Ethnology* 16 (1): 39–55.
- Feraoun, Mouloud. 1954 [1950]. *Le Fils du pauvre*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- . 1992 [1954]. *Jours de Kabylie, suivi de Le Fils du pauvre*. Algiers: ENAG.
- . 2000 [1962]. *Journal 1955–1962: Reflections on the French-Algerian War*, ed. James D. Le Sueur, trans. Mary Ellen Wolf and Claude Fouillade. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Free, Anthony. 1996. The Anthropology of Pierre Bourdieu: A Reconsideration. *Critique of Anthropology* 16 (4): 395–416.

- Garcia-Parpet, Marie-France. 2003. Des outsiders dans l'économie de marché. Pierre Bourdieu et les travaux sur l'Algérie. *Awal* 27/28: 139–52.
- Goodman, Jane. 2002. Writing Empire, Underwriting Nation: Discursive Histories of Kabyle Berber Oral Texts. *American Ethnologist* 29 (1): 86–122.
- . 2005. *Berber Culture on the World Stage*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Greenhouse, Carol J., Elizabeth Mertz and Kay B. Warren, eds. 2002. *Ethnography in Unstable Places: Everyday Lives in Contexts of Dramatic Political Change*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Gross, Joan and David McMurray. 1993. Berber Origins and the Politics of Ethnicity in Berber North Africa. *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 16 (2): 39–57.
- Guernier, Eugène. 1950. *La Berbérie, L'Islam, et la France*. Paris: Editions de l'Union Française.
- Guilhaume, Jean-François. 1992. *Les Mythes fondateurs de l'Algérie française*. Paris: Harmattan.
- Hammoudi, Abdellah. 2000. Pierre Bourdieu et l'anthropologie du Maghreb. *Awal* 21: 11–16.
- Hanoteau, Adolphe. 1867. *Poésies populaires de la Kabylie du Jurjura*. Paris: Imprimerie Impériale.
- Hanoteau, Adolphe and Aristide Letourneux. 1872–73. *La Kabylie et les coutumes kabyles*. 3 volumes. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Héran, François. 1987. La seconde nature de l'*habitus*. Tradition philosophique et sens commun dans le langage philosophique. *Revue Française de Sociologie* 28 (3): 385–416.
- Herzfeld, Michael. 1987. *Anthropology through the Looking Glass*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1997. *Cultural Intimacy*. London: Routledge.
- Honneth, Axel, Hermann Kocyba and Bernd Schwibs. 1986. The Struggle for Symbolic Order: An Interview with Pierre Bourdieu. *Theory, Culture and Society* 3 (3): 35–51.
- Huntington, Samuel. 1996. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Lacoste-Dujardin, Camille. 1976. A propos de P. Bourdieu et de l'*Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique*. *Hérodote* 2 (2): 103–16.
- Lahire, Bernard, ed. 1999. *Le Travail sociologique de Pierre Bourdieu. Dettes et critiques*. Paris: La Découverte.
- Lane, Jeremy F. 2000. *Pierre Bourdieu: A Critical Introduction*. London: Pluto Press.

- Le Sueur, James. 2005 [2001]. *Uncivil War: Intellectuals and Identity Politics during the Decolonization of Algeria*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- . 2000. Introduction. In *Journal 1955–1962: Reflections on the French-Algerian War*, Mouloud Feraoun. pp. ix–xlvi. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1955. *Tristes tropiques*. Paris: Plon.
- Lewis, Bernard. 1990. The Roots of Muslim Rage. *The Atlantic Monthly* 266 (3): 47–60.
- Lorcin, Patricia. 1995. *Imperial Identities: Stereotyping, Prejudice, and Race in Colonial Algeria*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Lucas, Philippe and Jean-Claude Vatin. 1975. *L'Algérie des anthropologues*. Paris: Maspero.
- Maddy-Weitzman, Bruce. 2001. Contested Identities: Berbers, “Berberism,” and the State in North Africa. *Journal of North African Studies* 6 (3): 23–47.
- Mahar, Cheleen. 1990. Pierre Bourdieu: The Intellectual Project. In *An Introduction to the Work of Pierre Bourdieu: In the Practice of Theory*, ed. Richard Harker, Cheleen Mahar and Chris Wilkes. pp. 26–57. London: Macmillan.
- Mammeri, Mouloud. 1980. *Poèmes kabyles anciens*. Paris: Maspero.
- . 1989. Une expérience de recherche anthropologique en Algérie. *Awal* 5: 15–23.
- . 1991 [1938]. La société berbère. In *Culture savante, culture vécue: Etudes 1938–1989*. Algiers: TALA.
- Mammeri, Mouloud and Pierre Bourdieu. 2004 [1978]. Dialogue on Oral Poetry. *Ethnography* 5 (4): 511–51.
- Martens, Jean-Claude. 1973. *Le Modèle algérien de développement: Bilan d'une décennie*. Algiers: Société Nationale d'Édition et de Diffusion.
- Maunier, René. 1922. Leçon d'ouverture d'un cours de sociologie algérienne. *Hespéris* 11: 93–107.
- McDougall, James. 2003. Myth and Counter-Myth: The “Berber” as National Signifier in Algerian Historiographies. *Radical History Review* 86: 66–88.
- Mercier, Ernst. 1871. Ethnographie de l'Afrique septentrionale. Notes sur l'origine du peuple berbère. *Revue Africaine* 40: 420–33.
- Nordstrom, Carolyn and Antonius C. G. M. Robben, eds. 1995. *Fieldwork under Fire: Contemporary Studies of Violence and Survival*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Nouschi, André. 1961. *Enquête sur le niveau de vie des populations rurales constantinoises*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- . 2003. Autour de *Sociologie de l'Algérie*. *Awal* 27/28: 29–36.

- Pinto, Louis. 1998. *Pierre Bourdieu et la théorie du monde social*. Paris: Albin Michel.
- Raffinot, Marc and Pierre Jacquemot. 1977. *Le Capitalism d'État algérien*. Paris: Maspéro.
- Redfield, Robert, Robert Linton and Melville J. Herskovits. 1936. Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation. *American Anthropologist* 38: 149–52.
- Reed-Danahay, Deborah. 1995. The Kabyle and the French: Occidentalism in Bourdieu's Theory of Practice. In *Occidentalism: Images of the West*, ed. James Carrier. pp. 61–84. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2005. *Locating Bourdieu*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Rinn, Louis. 1889. *Les Origines berbères. Etude linguistique et ethnologique*. Algiers: Jourdan.
- Roberts, Hugh. 1980. Towards an Understanding of the Kabyle Question in Contemporary Algeria. *Maghreb Review* 5 (5–6): 115–24.
- Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.
- Saint-Martin, Monique de. 1999. Un sociologue critique. *Migrance* 14: 36–39.
- Sanson, Henri. 2003. “C'était un esprit curieux.” *Awal* 27/28: 279–86.
- Sayad, Abdelmalek. 1977. Les “trois ages” de l'émigration algérienne en France. *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales* 15: 59–79.
- . 1992. Minorités et rapport à l'état dans le monde méditerranéen: le “mythe kabyle”. In *Connaissance de l'Islam*. pp. 135–81. Paris: Syros.
- . 2002. Entretien avec Hassan Afraoui. In *Histoire et recherche identitaire*. pp. 45–105. Algiers: Bouchène.
- . 2004 [1999]. *The Suffering of the Immigrant*, trans. David Macey. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Scheele, Judith. 2007. Recycling *Baraka*: Knowledge, Politics, and Religion in Contemporary Algeria. *Comparative Studies of Society and History* 49 (2): 304–28.
- Shepard, Todd. 2006. *The Invention of Decolonization: The Algerian War and the Remaking of France*. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.
- Shusterman, Richard, ed. 1999. *Bourdieu: A Critical Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Silverstein, Paul A. 2002. France's *Mare Nostrum*: Colonial and Post-Colonial Constructions of the French Mediterranean. *Journal of North African Studies* 7 (4): 1–22.
- . 2003. Martyrs and Patriots: Ethnic, National, and Transnational Dimensions of Kabyle Politics. *Journal of North African Studies* 8 (1): 87–111.
- . 2004. *Algeria in France: Transpolitics, Race, and Nation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- Slimani-Direche, Karima. 1997. *Histoire de l'émigration kabyle en France au XXe siècle: Réalités culturelles et politiques et appropriations identitaires*. Paris: Harmattan.
- Sprecher, Jean. 2003. "Il se sentait bien avec nous . . . cela signifiait qu'il était de notre bord." *Awal* 27/28: 295–305.
- Tauxier, Henri. 1862–63. Etudes sur les migrations des tribus berbères avant l'islamisme. *Revue Africaine* 18: 35–37.
- Temime, Emile. 1999. Un homme-frontière. *Migrance* 14: 28–34.
- Tillion, Germaine. 1957. *L'Algérie en 1957*. Paris: Minuit.
- . 1958. *Algeria: The Realities*. New York: Knopf.
- Turner, Victor. 1967. Betwixt and Between: The Liminal Period in *Rites de Passage*. In *The Forest of Symbols. Aspects of Ndembu Ritual*. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.
- Vandenberghe, Frédéric. 1999. "The Real is Relational": An Epistemological Analysis of Pierre Bourdieu's Generative Structuralism. *Sociological Theory* 17 (1): 32–67.
- Wacquant, Loïc. 1993. Bourdieu in America: Notes on the Transatlantic Importation of Social Theory. In *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives*, ed. Craig Calhoun, Edward LiPuma, and Moishe Postone. pp. 235–62. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 2002. The Sociological Life of Pierre Bourdieu. *International Sociology* 17 (4): 549–56.
- . 2004. Following Pierre Bourdieu into the Field. *Ethnography* 5 (4): 387–414.
- Yacine, Tassadit. 1990a. Aux origines de la quête: Mammeri parle . . . *Awal* 6/7: 67–77.
- . 1990b. Mouloud Mammeri dans la guerre. *Awal* 6/7: 105–41.
- . 2004. Pierre Bourdieu in Algeria at War: Notes on the Birth of an Engaged Ethnology. *Ethnography* 5 (4): 487–510.
- . 2008. Aux origines d'une ethnographie singulière. In *Esquisses algériennes, Pierre Bourdieu*. pp. 21–53. Paris: Seuil.