In No Man's Land: Blurred Boundaries between Colony and Metropole in 19th Century Mediterranean Anthropology

Carlos Cañete

Journal of Mediterranean Studies

➥ For additional information about this article
https://muse.jhu.edu/article/692295

IN NO MAN'S LAND:
BLURRED BOUNDARIES BETWEEN COLONY AND METROPOLE IN 19ᵀᴴ CENTURY MEDITERRANEAN ANTHROPOLOGY

CARLOS CAÑETE

Instituto de Lenguas y Culturas del Mediterráneo y del Oriente Próximo (CSIC)

Postcolonial approaches are nowadays widely accepted and influential in cultural and anthropological studies. This current relevance, however, has not hampered the emergence of intense controversy over their scope and implications. Certain concepts developed within postcolonial approaches to overcome the effects of colonial discourse, such as hybridity, have been criticised for neglecting the historicity, materiality, and power relations intrinsic to colonial situations. This article intervenes in this debate using a case study of anthropological studies in the Mediterranean during the nineteenth century as a common ground which integrates all of these considerations. It suggests the adoption of an approach that transcends the strict differentiation between European and colonial contexts, instead drawing from the notion of a common 'civilising process'.

Key words: Mediterranean Anthropology; Human Classification; Postcolonial Theory; Scientific Expeditions; Colonisation; Hybridity; Civilisation.

Introduction

In recent decades, postcolonial approaches have become an increasingly recognised and prominent element within cultural and anthropological studies. Undoubtedly, this progression is yet another manifestation of the current trend to adopt more self-conscious and critical stances towards traditional practices of knowledge. Overall, this situation represents a warning about the social and political aspects contained in each statement about reality and these contributions offer alternatives to the social and epistemic model of modernity. Within this context, considering colonialism as an embodiment of the contradictions of the modern programme has situated it as a fundamental and recurrent element in this rethinking. However, this awareness regarding colonialism's centrality to understanding our world has certainly not hampered the emergence of polemic and differing opinions. This article will offer a reinterpretation of current trends in postcolonial studies which could overcome some of its conflicts using as an example the history of nineteenth-century anthropology in the Mediterranean. Towards that goal, it will be necessary to first present a brief summary of the development of postcolonial approaches up to the present.

Within postcolonial studies the earliest works focused on the necessity of recognising the agency of colonised communities. This early trend, which could be termed 'anti-colonial', had as its immediate context the process of decolonisation and the wars of independence of the mid-twentieth century. At that time, the work of Frantz Fanon and Aimé Césaire promoted a strong commitment to struggle against domination, contesting colonial representations, and the necessity of asserting the identity of colonised communities (Amselle 2012: 37). However, such

affirmations based on opposition and resistance often simply reversed the dominant schemes and categories (Rowlands 1995: 36). Thus, despite recognising the agency and autonomy of local communities, this 'anti-colonial' critique often reproduced the colonial logic of representation. One example of how this approach was applied to the history of the Maghreb is the proposal for the decolonisation of history written by Mohamed Sahli (1965), later continued by Abdallah Laroui (1970) and Marcel Bénabou (1976). These works exhibit the central elements of this anti-colonial trend, emphasising the role of indigenous resistance and the conservation of cultural essence throughout history. As has been suggested, these discursive actions coincided with a nationalist affirmation that in many ways reproduced the political and administrative dimensions of the colonial period (Vega 2003: 22). That system has also been denounced for allowing the replacement of former colonial administrators by local elites, maintaining a hierarchical system that relegated large parts of society to marginalisation and political alienation (Guha 1983; 1997; Prakash 1995: 10; for a political critique of postcolonial theory see also: Ahmad 1992).

The realisation that the dynamics of colonial representations were much more complex led to the adoption of more subtle and nuanced approaches. The traditional view of colonial discourse as purely antagonistic rhetoric, portraying 'the other' in an exclusively negative manner, came to be considered simplistic. Instead, a new image of colonial discourse was suggested based on the notion of ambivalence. Colonial discourse, it was argued, had an ambivalent nature which oscillated constantly between assimilation and rejection (Laroui 2001: 164; Bhabha 1994: 121-131). This ambivalence produced a discursive indeterminacy which facilitated a certain degree of negotiation and re-appropriation of meaning. This brought into question the traditional binary scheme that sharply distinguished between coloniser and colonised and created a certain vision of colonial society as a dynamic and culturally hybrid context.

Taken together, these contributions have helped create a rich and complex view of the processes and representations of colonial systems (Van Dommelen 2006). Yet, objections to this more recent line of thought remain common. Paradoxically, one of the most recurrent objections is that the critique of colonial discourse today still permits the reproduction of neo-colonial thinking (Spivak 1999: 1). Thus, despite the previously discussed contributions, we still find complaints about the constant reproduction of colonial categories, especially the binary scheme perpetuating difference between dominator and dominated (Fischer-Tiné & Gehrmann 2009: 4). A clear example is the continuing pre-eminence of the views of Edward Said (1978; denounced by Pouillon 2014). Although Said nuanced his views later in his career, his seminal work *Orientalism* instituted a perspective still common today which denounces the simplistic characterisation of the 'Orient' as a homogeneous entity, while at the same time offering a similarly homogenised and simplified image of Europe. An effort to confront this has been the push to 'provincialise' Europe, to overcome an illusory homogeneity which obscures both its internal differences and the diverse responses and approaches that were developed within the colonial enterprise (Chakrabarty 2000: 3-4; Festa & Carey 2009: 5-6).

Some critics of recent trends in postcolonial theory have gone even further. Although concepts such as hybridisation or negotiation were a major step towards overcoming binary schemes, they have encountered specific critiques. It has been argued that the celebration of cosmopolitanism or hybridity only benefits a Western-educated elite, while representing a traumatic experience for millions of people who have suffered and continue to suffer displacement (Žižek 2007: 62). Furthermore, it has been suggested that the notion of cultural

identity as a process in constant negotiation frequently results in the reintroduction of conventional and essentialist considerations of culture (Kuper 2001: 277). Likewise, it is often noted that the application of these notions of postcolonial theory to analysing colonial processes often lacks historicity and neglects the particularities of the different historical situations and contexts. Hence, the materialist critiques of postcolonial theory have recently advocated for the recovery of the social and economic dimensions of colonial situations, including a permanent concern with power relations (Parry 2004; Murphy 2007). According to these recent critiques, hybridisation provides an illusory symmetrical image of social relations within the colony masking undeniable examples of subjugation, domination, and exploitation (González-Ruibal 2008; 2010). Overall, these contributions warn against the depoliticisation derived from the current application of postcolonial theoretical tenets, which have even been denounced as a manifestation of post-politics: an ideological tendency to facilitate the neutralisation of dissent and social demands (Mouffe 2005: 2; Žižek 2007: 40).

This long and arduous debate demonstrates that while in recent years postcolonial theory has greatly expanded our awareness of the relationship between knowledge and political commitment, how ─ if at all ─ this approach should be applied has been hotly debated. The successive objections described above can be defined as a double scepticism. On the one hand, there are critics of the system of representations and differences that served to affirm colonial domination. On the other hand, the methods and perspectives suggested to overcome these representations have also been criticised for obfuscating power relations, the principal value of any critical approach to the processes of colonisation (Rowlands 1998: 328). From my perspective, these two positions are not irreconcilable. Work completed in recent years has provided elements which suggest the possibility of reconciling the criticism of colonial representations and the political practices to overcome them. In this article, I will propose a reinterpretation which could help resolve the current conflicts regarding the application of postcolonial theory.

Towards that goal, I will present a study of the anthropological representations of various societies in the Mediterranean during the nineteenth century. The analysis will demonstrate that this anthropological discourse acquired an antagonistic tone while simultaneously establishing frequent analogies between European and North-African territories. This ambivalent discourse was the result of a common ideological framework that motivated interventions which aimed to civilise both North Africa and Europe, generating tensions, exclusions, and similarities between and within these territories. In the first section, I describe French interventionism across the Mediterranean during the first half of the nineteenth century taking into consideration the similarities and differences established between various communities in that region. Following that, I illustrate the appropriation of that same discourse into Spanish politics and science during the second half of the nineteenth century. I then provide a general interpretation of this process comparing it to other examples of anthropological discourses of that time. In the concluding section, I argue how this interpretation could help to transcend current conflicts over the application of postcolonial theory.

Interventions

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, two ships named *Géographe* and *Naturaliste* sailed from the French port of Le Havre on a journey of exploration around the Cape of Good Hope

that would take them to the Pacific Ocean. This expedition, led by Captain Nicolas Baudin, took place between 1800 and 1803. Its crew was composed of naturalists, geographers, artists and soldiers. Among the main achievements of the expedition was the first detailed, geographic description of the Atlantic Archipelagos as well as the Australian Coast. Precisely because of these explorations, a young member of the expedition, the soldier and naturalist Jean-Baptiste Bory de Saint-Vincent (1778-1846), published a work on the Canary Islands (Bory de Saint-Vincent 1803). In it, the young author presented a geographic and naturalistic description of the archipelago and explained the origin of the Guanche people by establishing analogies with Egyptian customs and architecture. Bory de Saint-Vincent agreed with the eighteenth-century astronomer and historian Jean Sylvain Bailly (1777-1779: 425) that similar cultural traits between societies indicated an earlier shared civilisation. The young naturalist also agreed that the original source was a highly developed civilisation in Tartary which later migrated to the Middle East, Europe, North Africa and, eventually, Atlantis — the remains of which became the Atlantic Archipelagos, including the Canary Islands (which was an idea previously defended by Buffon 1778: 193-195). From his point of view, favourable climatic conditions permitted the extraordinary development of that civilisation on the mythical continent. This Golden Age would end after the collapse of the mythical continent which was followed by impoverishment, knowledge loss, and the massive migration of people to North Africa and southern Europe — through the, by that time connected, Strait of Gibraltar. The Atlantean civilisation was described positively by Bory de Saint-Vincent as a state of perfection that should be recovered, projecting onto it modern expectations and interests for the future (Ferrière 2009: 62-63; cf. also Ciardi 2002; Vidal-Naquet 2006).

Years later, Bory de Saint-Vincent would be a member of the Napoleonic army occupying the Iberian Peninsula (1808-1814). Although initially the French image of the Spanish population was positive, the intensification of the conflict resulted in the case being made for a war to restore civilisation to a people which were then regarded as subjected to despotic rulers, condemned to ignorance by the strength of the Inquisition and the Church and comparable to the Egyptian *fallāḥīn* (Bonaparte 1821: 291, 314, 332-333). During this period, Bory de Saint-Vincent was responsible for reconnaissance missions and the elaboration of a detailed cartography of the Peninsula, all while he continued gathering specimens for his naturalist collection. In his writings, he expressed an attraction for the exoticism of a country that he described favourably as an 'African Peninsula' (Ferrière 2009: 101-104). However, the negative outcome of the struggle against the Spaniards altered his previously favourable vision based on the idea of the Atlantean Golden Age. Thus, at the end of the war while in full retreat, the soldier-naturalist penned harsh criticisms against the Spaniards in his diary (Romieux 1934: 13-14). Later, in a letter to his colleague Léon Dufour, he explicitly stated his perception of the racial inferiority of the Spanish population (Lauzun 1908: 182).

Years after the withdrawal of the Napoleonic forces from the Peninsula, Bory de Saint-Vincent published a guidebook for travellers to Spain and Portugal which was widely distributed and reviewed. In that book, he signalled that in those territories the 'most abhorrent' institutions impede progress, imposing degeneration onto an already miserable population. For him, this was due to the African character of the land and its people, derived from its former geographic connection to the African continent (Bory de Saint-Vincent 1823: 4, 226-227, 232). The accompanying maps, the product of his surveys during the Napoleonic occupation, graphically illustrated these arguments by placing the beginning of Europe beyond the Pyrenees. Atlantis

was thus stripped of all the golden attributes that had previously characterized it as the recipient of a lost civilisation, capable of guiding the transformative process of modernity. It was now the background by which to define a backward and recalcitrant people marked by their African character on both shores of the Strait of Gibraltar. Interestingly, those critiques of peninsular backwardness were published during the Spanish Liberal Triennium, a period that sought social transformation and emancipation from the *Ancien Régime*. At that same time a French translation of the history of Spain by John Bigland (1810) also appeared which included an updated cartography of the Peninsula by Bory de Saint-Vincent (1823). In the section authored by the French naturalist he insisted on the African image portrayed in his guide for travelers, adding that Spanish blood retains something primitive that favors any southern invasion while rejecting any civilising influence from the north (Bory de Saint-Vincent 1824: 11-12). He also suggested that if the Napoleonic Expedition in Egypt had produced such a great cartography as the one by Colonel Jacotin, the success of the mission of the French army in Spain should provide a map of equal importance (Bory de Saint-Vincent 1824: 9-10). He was referring to the expedition of the Hundred Thousand Sons of Saint Louis, sent from France to restore the absolute monarchy of Fernando VII in Spain and which was as celebrated in France as the previous Napoleonic intervention in the Peninsula, despite being inspired by completely opposing political tendencies (Chateaubriand 2006: 1573). This, once again, reveals how interventions and their associated discourses were frequently independent of the actual situation within the affected area, instead often depending on the interests of the groups benefiting from those same interventions.

By this time, his travels, publications, and work in various scientific institutions had awarded Bory de Saint-Vincent a prominent position within naturalistic studies. He then coordinated the important work *Dictionnaire Classique d'Histoire Naturelle* (1822-1831). In this major publication, he authored the entry 'Homme', in which he summarized his anthropological ideas — a piece that would also gain success later as an independent publication (Bory de Saint-Vincent 1825). In that text, his naturalistic approach was obvious in the classificatory scheme of the study, ordering humanity into fifteen different species following his polygenetic views. Although conceived from zoological perspectives, the descriptions included multiple references to customs, history, and institutions. Thus, within the Mediterranean region, he established a difference between the European species (Japhetic), '*la plus belle*', and the Arabic species which in his view was marked by religious fanaticism. He argued that this Arabic species could be further divided into two races. Eastern North Africa and the Middle East constituted the land of the Adamic race, while western North Africa, the Canary Islands and the Iberian Peninsula were home to the Atlantic race. This Atlantic race embraced the former existence of Atlantis and the phenomena of collapse and migration. In this work the negative description of these people remained, continuing their exclusion from the civilised model.

A few years later, William Frederic Edwards (1777-1842), a major figure in early French anthropology, published *Des caractères physiologiques des races humaines* (1829), a work intended as a state-of-the-field and manifesto for the burgeoning field of physical anthropology, explaining the potential to the history of human societies of studying man from a naturalistic perspective. This proposal ultimately led to the founding of the *Société Ethnologique* (1839), chaired by Edwards himself, and later the *Société d'Anthropologie de Paris* (1859). In his text, Edwards lamented the lack of data available to fully define the historical development of societies. Despite this, he added, expeditions such as Napoleon's in Egypt offered a great opportunity to expand that knowledge. He also referred to an expedition occurring while he was

writing: the French expedition in the Morea (Greece). He claimed that this exploration, at the end of the Greek War of Independence, could help rehabilitate the old distinction between Pelasgians and Hellenes, which could ultimately serve to identify a group suitable for re-civilisation. According to him, this would finally facilitate the definitive affirmation of the Greek nation by rehabilitating the classical tradition as well as the assertion of European civilisation in opposition to the Ottoman Empire (Edwards 1841: 94-97 and 101). The French expedition in Greece traversed the Peloponnese Peninsula between 1828 and 1831 continuing the totalising spirit of the Napoleonic exploration of Egypt. As in Egypt, the task consisted of extending methods previously applied in the metropole. For example, the statistical procedures developed for the administration of the city of Paris or the cartographies developed for French territory were direct models for the Greek expedition (Lepetit 1998: 102-103). Bory de Saint-Vincent was the leader of the mission and was responsible for the cartographic and anthropological studies. In his resulting works, he again utilized a naturalistic anthropological approach based on physical characteristics but, in practice, relied on frequent references to customs and beliefs to justify his classificatory criteria. Thus, physical identification established through the comparison of human types with ancient statues was complimented by its comparison with certain social practices. This resulted in a defence of the Greek people as the direct descendants of the Pelasgians and this continuity led the author to suggest the possibility of a future restoration of democracy and civilised splendour, after the removal of any expression of Islamic cultural manifestations (Thomson 1998: 279-281).

So far, we have seen the process of anthropological classification of the Mediterranean corresponds to the particularities of French interventionist policy in this region. The positive portrayal of Iberian peoples as part of the glorious Atlantean Golden Age (an idea defended by Bory de Saint-Vincent in his work on the Canary Islands), was transformed into a negative view following the progressive marginalization of North African and Spanish territories by the results of the French intervention in the Peninsula. In the Greek case, the expedition took place once the area was pacified and the anthropological arguments drew a positive image which integrated that population within the European context while at the same time reinforcing its differences from the Ottoman Empire. Hence, by the early thirties, we find a divided vision of the Mediterranean: on one side integrating Greece into Europe and, on the other, assimilating the Iberian Peninsula into Africa. This image would continue until the deployment of the next expedition which would reproduce the model inaugurated by the Egyptian expedition (Bourguet *et al.* 1998; 1999).

Since the beginning of the French occupation of Algeria in 1830, there were frequent calls to acquire a more complete knowledge of the region to ensure its control. We thus find once again the project of a scientific-military exploratory endeavour wed to a totalising aim. The leading role in that mission was again assigned to Bory de Saint-Vincent. The field work occurred between 1839 and 1842 and was followed by a long editorial process ultimately producing a monumental set of volumes, including some dedicated to historical and anthropological sciences. Before the mission, in his preliminary project, Bory de Saint-Vincent had included many references to the cultural condition of that territory, maintaining the image of the indigenous population as aggressive and uncivilised (Bory de Saint-Vincent 1838: 10). However, through this expedition that image was completely transformed. When preparing the official publication Bory de Saint-Vincent was, once again, responsible for the anthropological section. Although he died in 1846 just as the material was being prepared for publication, he was able to present a brief contribution summarising his new classificatory scheme for Algeria and

correcting everything he had previously advocated (Bory de Saint-Vincent 1845). In this contribution, he proposed that the population of Algeria was composed of three types among which only one could be considered truly indigenous. This indigenous group corresponded to the Atlantean type integrating the entire series of categories that in previous years had been associated with the autochthonous: Kabylian, Moorish, Berber, Libyan and Garamantes. Citing his earlier contributions, in particular his work on the Canaries, he argued that the original territorial expansion of the Atlantean population included the Atlantic Islands, North Africa, and the Iberian Peninsula, reaching all the way to Aquitaine in France. Regarding those natives from Atlantis, Bory de Saint-Vincent wrote: 'great people, from heroic times, that were the first celebrated in the West for their science, art, and warfare' (1845: 1816), thus reviving in this text the positive and inspiring role he had attributed to them in his first publication. Within this tripartite scheme of Algeria's population, another anthropological type corresponded to the Adamic people, formed by the Arabic Bedouins, which the author completely separated from the Atlantean type, thereby correcting the statements in his entry in the *Dictionnaire Classique d'Histoire Naturelle* in which he considered them as part of the same human species. With a nomadic lifestyle, an inclination towards theft, and grouping into independent tribes, the Adamic people could not form any kind of empire, despite their belligerent character. Finally, he identified the third group as the Ethiopian type whose origin he located in the black communities of Central Africa and which he associated with animality. For Bory de Saint-Vincent, the Atlantean type became a group that also included the Celts, connecting the French and North African territories. Hence, in his view, the native North-African human substrate maintained its potential for re-civilisation, thus justifying French intervention to restore the former glory of these people. However, this reversal from his earlier opinion did not arise spontaneously.

To understand this changing perspective it is necessary to consider the entourage accompanying Bory de Saint-Vincent during the expedition. The mission included several members of the Saint-Simonian group, including its leader during that time, Barthélemy Prosper Enfantin (1796-1864). The doctrine of Saint-Simon was a genre of utopian thinking that was particularly influential at the time in France and is frequently cited as the origin of such seemingly disparate trends as positivism, technocracy, sexual freedom, or the European Union (Saint-Simon & Thierry 2008). Saint-Simonianism held a prominent position within key institutions developing and implementing the modern program in France, such as the *École Polytechnique,* the *École d'application de Metz,* and the *École de Médecine de Paris*. This reveals the intimate relationship of Saint-Simonianism with the programme of social transformations based on applying expertise and, above all, implementing the principles of progress and civilisation. Although it appears that the condemnation of the Saint-Simonian group in France in 1832 was what triggered the transfer of their projects to North Africa, the Napoleonic campaign in Egypt already represented a paradigm for the formation of the *École Polytechnique*. Thus, it seems certain that from the beginning of French interventionism in North Africa, the growing relevance of Saint-Simonians in French society and their consideration as technical experts specialising in the development of industrial programs and agricultural expansion — previously implemented in the metropolitan territory — situated Saint-Simonians in a prominent position to influence the actions taken in North Africa. In this sense, the application of Saint-Simonian principles led to the defence of programmes of social transformation based on the massive introduction of technology and administration. Examples of such programmes included rational exploitation and the reformation of institutions which had been previously completed in

France and resulted in such colossal projects as the construction of the Suez Canal which was promoted by Ferdinand de Lesseps. Other smaller interventions were also implemented such as the construction of the first railway between Algiers and Blida in 1853, which had been preceded by the first French railway between Saint-Etienne and Lyon in 1833. The discourse accompanying these practical actions was articulated through mystical ideas of Mediterranean unification with the 'Oriental Mother', which Saint-Simonians thought would finally generate a network of exchange and productive encounters (Lorcin 1995: 101-117; Temime 2002: 32-51). As a manifestation of this ideology, the work of the Saint-Simonian members of the Algerian expedition led by Bory de Saint-Vincent would result in a permanent defence of that mystical unification and continuous references to the brotherhood of France and the Maghreb.

Opposing perspectives that saw local populations as primitive and anarchic and advocated outright extermination (Le Cour Grandmaison 2005), was an emerging indigenist vision which maintained a positive view of this population and insisted on its potential for re-civilisation (Cañete 2006). This identification was built heavily upon the alleged distinction between an indigenous anthropological substratum and the external Arabic cultural component. This separation was based on the distinction between a Berber group associated with sedentarism, independence, democratic attitudes, and weak Islamic influence compared to an Arab group related to nomadism, despotism, and religious intolerance. This distinction between Arab and Berber anthropological categories has been described as the deliberate product of a colonial policy intending to control the land through the principle of 'divide and rule'. However, this idea of applying a fully conscious and planned classificatory scheme has been questioned by pointing out the pre-existence of that same classificatory logic before the military conquest. Hence, this anthropological scheme could be considered a product of applying to Algeria a classificatory perspective based on the perceived proximity of groups to the notion of civilisation, which was already producing tensions and divisions within Europe (Ferrié & Boëtsch 1990; Boëtsch & Ferrié 1996). Therefore, these categories were not the product of conquest, but rather, the manifestation of an already active ideological system which had inspired military intervention for restoring civilisation in the first place (Thomson 1987: 2-9, 144-146). The development of colonial policy after the Algerian expedition based on the reproduction of these anthropological categories stemmed from the absolute faith of the colonial administrators in that very classificatory system to such an extent that it has been considered a sort of mythology (Mahé 2001: 147-157). This ideological system based on classification according to the civilised ideal also guided actions within France and helped establish both analogies and differences with the North African territory as demonstrated by the negative view of Provence in France and its definition as an African region (Nordman 1996: 235-245) or the marginalisation of French settlers in Algeria *vis-à-vis* the metropolitan population (Ferro 2005: 36).

Thus, analogies between European and North African communities became a frequent feature of the anthropological *milieu* following the Algerian expedition. Although the name of Bory de Saint-Vincent faded into oblivion after his death, largely due to the increasing abandonment of polygenist theories, his ideas on the common origin of North African, Iberian, and French communities remained firmly present during debates in the newly created *Société d'Anthropologie de Paris*. In the first volume of the society's bulletins there is a contribution by Paul Broca (1824-1880), surgeon, former *polytechnicien*, professor at the *Faculté de médicine de Paris*, and promoter of anthropological studies in France. In this piece, Broca presented an overview of anthropological research in France reproducing all the ideas described above (Broca

1859). Later volumes contain constant references to the distinction between Arabs and Berbers and the analogies between North Africans, Iberians, Celts, and Guanches, connecting them with the mythical continent of Atlantis. The frequency and interest surrounding these debates demonstrates the significance of these ideas within the anthropological panorama of the second half of the century which led to the development of a unitary anthropological model of the Mediterranean (Ferrié 1993; Cañete 2010).

Dissemination

Another participant of the debates at the *Société d'Anthropologie de Paris* offered an overview of anthropological studies in Spain. In this contribution, Pruner-Bey (1808-1882), physician and anthropologist who had spent most of his career in Egypt, began by praising the pioneering work of French anthropology and its central role in establishing the foundations of a discipline that was only later adopted in other countries. He welcomed the recent establishment of the *Sociedad española de antropología* which, in his opinion, demonstrated that despite its ethnic mix and pre-Aryan background, Spain could also demonstrate scientific aptitude (Pruner-Bey 1865). Meanwhile, Francisco María Tubino (1833-1888), who would become one of the leading promoters of anthropological studies in Spain, lamented the poor perception of Spanish science held in other countries. He criticised the continuation of prejudices which he attributed to the deformation of Spanish achievements in France and Germany but also to Spain's lack of involvement in any modernising agenda. Still, he added, a transformative process had begun which must be continued in order to definitively integrate the country into the European context (Tubino 1869). Tubino, who by then was the secretary of the *Sociedad española de antropología* and responsible for its journal, undertook intense activity abroad, participating in numerous scientific meetings and acting as a link between Spanish and foreign academies. His central position within the Spanish anthropological scene has often led him to be regarded as the original author of certain ideas of which he was, in fact, just conveying. In a work on the origin of Iberian communities, through anthropometric comparisons and with reference to many French works from the colonial context, he defended the common origin of Berbers, Guanches, and Iberians. He identified this group with the Cro-Magnon type, and argued that it formerly occupied a common space in a remote time when the Iberian Peninsula, North Africa, and the Canary Islands formed a united continent (Tubino 1876). Considering the long history of the ideas described above, it is surprising that Tubino attributed the authorship of this theory to himself. Nevertheless, such claims probably evoked the sense of a permanent renewal of such ideas which was so appealing to the modernising spirit.

Tubino's work as a press correspondent in the War of Africa (occurring between 1859 and 1860 and involving a confrontation between the Spanish Army and the Moroccan Sultanate Army) is usually interpreted as the context which inclined him to defend anthropological Africanism. Hence, attributing the originality of these ideas to Tubino has frequently led us to believe that the idea of an ethnic bond between Iberian and North African communities was created as a specific justification for Spanish colonial action in the Maghreb with its origin typically situated in the War of Africa. Nonetheless, as we have seen, the genealogy of those analogies has a longer history and probably — as in the case of French intervention in Algeria-stimulated that very intervention in Morocco. In any case, this conflict led to the development of initiatives promoting commercial and colonial intervention on a larger scale. Such projects were

mostly channelled through institutions such as the *Sociedad geográfica de Madrid* and the *Sociedad española de africanistas y colonistas*. These institutions organised numerous missions as well as speeches and publications displaying all the themes and discursive elements previously described. In various issues of the bulletin of the *Sociedad geográfica de Madrid* we find (alongside contributions devoted to summarising the progress of other colonising countries during their exploratory and engineering projects in Africa), frequent references to the former existence of Atlantis, the common origin of Iberian and North African peoples, and the need to re-establish a once lost civilisation. By that time, in Spain, one name stood out among the advocates of colonising action. Joaquín Costa (1846-1911), a historian, lawyer, and politician, was a key figure in the development of Spanish colonial institutions and discourses through numerous publications and speeches. He advocated for the brotherhood of Iberian and Moroccan peoples, an ethnic kinship stemming from their common origin. He situated this origin in the legendary continent of Atlantis, the remains of which he interpreted to be the Iberian Peninsula, North Africa, and the Atlantic Islands (Costa 1886).

However, the idea of an ethnic bond linking these populations did not only stimulate colonial action across the Strait of Gibraltar. Costa was also acclaimed for his studies on Iberian paleoethnology which he systematically defined based on the idea of an ancestral physical and cultural unity with North Africa. This approach allowed him to skirt the lack of data from remote times in the Peninsula and to complete his anthropological descriptions with frequent direct analogies to North African customs documented by French colonial agents (Costa 1895). The very idea of the Spanish nation was thus constructed through an expanded vision that included North African territories. For Costa, this characterization was meant to provide inroads into Iberian cultural development in order to identify the problems or the atavism burdening the development of the nation. It is no surprise that figures such as Costa, who were key promoters of colonial action, were also the strongest advocates for modernising action within Spain. That was the precise task of the *Institución Libre de Enseñanza*, to which Costa was strongly tied, and it was the touchstone for educational renewal and social transformation in Spain in that period. This institution promoted numerous educational projects, health campaigns, and programmes of industrial and agricultural development. Within this context, identifying the nation's essence with an ethnic background defined according to popular manifestations of culture required a complete ethnographic description of the population to implement the task of modernisation. Numerous studies were conducted on folklore and customs. In fact, one of the main studies was led by Costa himself, involving many of the most relevant Spanish intellectuals of the time. This collective work was published in 1902 as *Derecho consuetudinario y economía popular de España* presenting an extensive catalogue of popular customs and norms. Interestingly, much of the inspiration for this work came from the studies on customary law of the Algerian region of Kabylie elaborated by Hanoteau and Letourneaux (*La Kabylie et les coutumes kabyles* 1873), which Costa had used extensively for his work on Iberian paleoethnology.

In Spain, the increasing analogies with North African communities became a frequent feature of the programmes of colonial action, internal modernisation, the construction of an anthropological model of the Peninsula and, more generally, the formation of a national idea. A telling example of this phenomenon is the progressive integration of the Africanist paradigm — the common origin of Iberians and North Africans — in general histories published during that time. The gradual introduction of this perspective can be seen in the more liberal works of Manuel Sales y Ferré (1883) or Miguel Morayta y Sagrario (1886) but also in more conservative

ones such as that directed by Antonio Cánovas del Castillo (1890). By the end of the century the general history written by Rafael Altamira (1900) also included these ideas summing up many of those previous contributions and advancing the transformations which would come to define twentieth century historiography.

By the turn of the century, Spain's loss of its last overseas colonies of Cuba and the Philippines became a milestone in the national consciousness, a crisis that would from then on be called the 'Desastre' (disaster). The pessimism invading Spanish reforming circles was manifested in their constant search for the causes of the collapse. Again, Joaquín Costa was responsible for shaping this movement through a work which included contributions from the most prominent Spanish intellectuals of the time. That work, *Oligarquía y caciquismo* (1901), sought to identify the problems of the nation so as to provide a modernising solution, suggesting that a corrupt and despotic political class impeded the development of the nation. The barbaric character of this system of government was highlighted while stressing the necessity of its eradication to initiate national development through pedagogic, economic, financial, and social policies intended to improve the racial characteristics of Spaniards according to the European type. To defend these ideas, Costa used the work of the French sociologist Alfred Fouillée (1838-1912), who by then had argued that the material misery of Spain was due to mental degeneration produced by centuries of decline marked by the African character of the Spanish race (Fouillée 1899: 482).

The idea of national decline was highlighted through images of the degeneration of disadvantaged social groups in anthropological discourses. This categorisation, developed through problematising attitudes and behaviours regarded as potentially dangerous or deviant from the civilised ideal, expanded to include ever larger sections of the population. This period saw the development of numerous studies seeking to identify and resolve this dreaded social degeneracy. These works attracted many reformers, hygienists, criminologists, and psychiatrists. At the turn of the century there was an impressive proliferation of studies dedicated to the so-called 'low life' in cities across Europe and America, aimed at identifying and cataloguing these human groups in an effort to control and reform them as well as provide a counterpoint to the civilised ideal (Campos 2009). Among these was a book dedicated to the 'low life' in Madrid in which the people of the slums, interpreted as the popular substratum of the city, were compared with savages or primitive societies (Bernaldo de Quirós & Llanas Aguilaniedo 1901: 123).

The idea of degeneration was often broadened to include larger groups. Among them we find groups of workers, especially those who rejected codes of obedience and subordination. In this regard, the criminologist Rafael Salillas' commentary to the press at the time is revealing as he discussed anarchist peasants in Jerez de la Frontera in Andalusia, whom he described as 'a herd of fools' stating that 'the sun, the wine, the South or even Africa had come up to their heads' (Salillas 1892: 1). This menace was not, however, solely perceived by bourgeois reformers or supporters of repressive policies. In time, even socialist and anarchist texts began to problematize aspects of behaviour and physical appearance, warning of the risk of degeneration (Campos *et al*. 2000: 218).

This period also saw the beginnings of the academic institutionalisation of anthropology in Spain, led by Manuel Antón y Ferrándiz (1849-1929) who situated the Africanist theory and the Atlantean race as the axes of Iberian anthropology (Anton y Ferrándiz 1895). This model would be reproduced by his disciples, such as Luis de Hoyos Sainz (Ortiz 1987: 262), and became a ubiquitous feature of the Spanish colonial deployment in Morocco which finally occurred in the early twentieth century (De Felipe 2009: 117).

All the images and dreams fueling interventions across the Mediterranean by French forces in the preceding period remained during Spanish colonial action in North Africa. More than a century and a half after the beginning of French interventions, the French sociologist Jacques Berque (1910-1995) penned a historical review of sociological studies in the Maghreb. In his contribution, Berque, while recalling the figure of the Saint-Simonian geographer and explorer Henri Duveyrier (1840-1892), commented that his descriptions of North African territory conveyed a vivid and resonant impression that three generations later still fed 'the suspicious romanticism of *L'Atlantide*' (Berque 1956: 303). In this case *L'Atlantide* referred to the novel by the French author Pierre Benoit (1886-1962) that won the French Academy's grand prize in 1919. This novel, which narrated adventures and great discoveries in North Africa, concentrated more than a century of exotic images, hopes, and analogies driven by the idea of the Atlantean common origin and the civilising mission in a single piece of literature. Its immense success was, at the time, related to the need for mental escape following the colossal shock of the Great War (Ortega y Gasset 1985: 44-45). However, these images and hopes had a long history throughout the previous century during which they were accompanied by the transformations, interventions, and tensions produced by the application of the modernising program in Europe and the Maghreb. The definitive abandonment of cultural analogies between both territories, and its associated myths, did not occur until the mid-twentieth century, coinciding with the wars of independence. However, as noted, such abandonment could also be understood as a result of growing disillusionment regarding the transformative potential of colonial action (Fernandez 2001) or, moreover, growing disillusionment with the system of thought that had fuelled intervention and transformation in all those places, whether they were called colonies or not.

Common Places

The long trajectory traced here of the analogies established between different territories and groups across the Mediterranean during the nineteenth century, forces us to confront a much more complex situation than is typically acknowledged in the study of colonial discourses. In fact, the objections posed by cases such as the Spanish one to the current history of anthropological studies points to the necessity of reconsidering the instability of discourses and the need for contextualisation (Goode 2009: 5). The frequent analogies between European and North African groups or nations challenges the image of discourses about non-European societies as purely antagonistic rhetoric and, indeed, confirms warnings about the indeterminacy of the classificatory process (Stoler 2009: 1). Likewise, the many tensions and rejections produced amidst defining communities within Europe is far from the uniform image that Said presented while denouncing the idea of the Orient as an artificially homogeneous construct suited to European interventionist ambitions. This essentialisation of Europe has even inspired the application of the term 'Occidentalism' paralleling the one used by Said for the Oriental case (Carrier 1995).

These objections, however, require an alternative interpretation which will unite the multifarious situations and interventions connected by the common discursive trajectory described above. Such an alternative would need to integrate the progressive alienation of Spain and North Africa from Europe, the analogies established between these two territories, the subsequent analogy between France and the Maghreb, and finally the dissemination of this thought within Spain and its relationship with Spanish interventionism in the Maghreb. This

alternative should also integrate the internal estrangement of certain groups or regions within Spain or France as well as their analogy with African communities. Similar processes took place in Germany and Italy in relation to their own colonial actions and their subordination of internal regions during their respective national formations (Johnson & Coleman 2012; see also Mellino 2012 for the Italian case). Bearing this in mind, we cannot assume that anthropological representations in the Mediterranean were only established according to a neat distinction between north and south. The rejection of European nations or groups while assimilating Maghrebian areas or groups complicates this simplistic idea of a discursive process imposing a strict divide over representations and devices depending on whether these were applied to the colony or to the metropole. The alternative must be, then, an explanation that includes both assimilation and rejection, of all, and for all contexts and groups involved.

It must be assumed that during this period a general process of transformation occurred, driven by confidence in progress and reason. This perspective resulted in the emergence of certain groups that would monopolize the symbolic and material benefits resulting from applying these modern tenets (Hobsbawm 1971: 26-53). These groups seized responsibility for the management and promotion of the values and principles composing this new system of thought and behaviour represented by the notion of civilisation. However, lurking behind the supposed universality of civilisation lies nothing more than the product of the self-representation of the groups benefiting from the changes imposed by the modern system (Elias 2009: 48, 117, 559). Hence, even though the civilised ideal was presented as a universal system it was simply an expression of the rules and interests of particular groups, even within Europe. The inevitable underachievement of the rest of the population when compared to that system of values justified the transformative intervention that affected groups and nations both within Europe and in extra-European territories. This universal will, however, had to be constantly cancelled out to prevent complete homogenisation and to maintain the social distinctions that gave meaning to that system of values. From that tension arose an ambivalent discursive system that constantly oscillated between assimilation and rejection (Bhabha 1994: 121-131).

Still nowadays, within the history of anthropological studies there remains a noticeable difference in the consideration afforded to anthropological theories and practices depending on whether these were developed in colonial or European contexts. However, as we have seen, during that period there were many similarities and transferences between these two contexts. Previous works have already warned about the illusory nature of an overly strict differentiation between the processes and tensions occurring in both areas. Some examples being the denunciation of the recurring absence of any reference to the social differences between the local population in the colonial areas, the homogenisation of the social circumstances in the metropole, or the differences between colonists (Stoler 1989). This prevents observing the continuities between both contexts and, above all, disguises under an exclusively cultural facade processes and situations that quite often had a socio-economic basis. All of this suggests that maintaining these distinctions only perpetuates the very differences that we pretend to abolish. So, it should be noted that we are dealing with general processes which affected regions and groups within Europe as well as those traditionally identified as colonial. Not surprisingly, the devices and strategies usually associated with control and development in the colonies were the same that permitted the affirmation of nation-states in Europe. The census, the map, and the museum were key devices for administering and controlling a common totalising system (Anderson 1991: 184). It is precisely this continuity which has inspired references to 'the internal Others' (Johnson &

Coleman 2012: 867), internal and external colonies (Cohn 1996: 11) or classical and internal colonialism (Díaz-Andreu 2007: 278).

A large-scale manifestation of that system is found in the French military-scientific explorations that took place in both African (Egypt, Algeria) and European regions (Spain, Greece). They form a singular model of control and administration based on the civilising mission that resulted in a common anthropological discourse. The strategies and groups involved in promoting this interventionist attitude were the same as those involved in social transformation within France. This situation was later reproduced in Spain by the groups that similarly benefited from the transformations of Spanish society and the intervention in the Maghreb. These efforts were all based on a universalist and positive discourse, focusing on accommodation and mutual progress (Rabinow 1989: 277-278), addressing Kabyle people in Algeria as well as the popular classes in Paris (Le Cour Grandmaison 2005: 281-287). The result was a continuous flow of cultural analogies, the greatest example of which was the Africanist anthropological approach based on a common Atlantean origin. This also fomented multiple methodological transfers between contexts which virtually ensured that any medical, social, or scientific project in the metropole was preceded by prior experimentation across the sea (Keller 2007: 17).

The extension of this paradigm produced tensions in all contexts. The comparison of different groups and societies with the civilised ideal (which, we should remember, was nothing but the sum of the interests and values of those benefitting from the extension of the modern system) resulted in the inevitable confirmation of the inadequacy of large parts of the population, which in turn stimulated interventionism and reproduced the self-image of the promoters of these interventions. There was an extraordinary increase in references to the degeneration of groups, societies, or individuals during the second half of the nineteenth century. This concern with degeneration permeated all dimensions of cultural and social life and was accompanied by discussions on how to reverse it. This problematisation, often associated with notions of pathology or criminality, further encouraged intervention and social control, only confirming the position of the promoters of those categories and the modern program (Pick 1989: 4-21; Hoyt 2001: 334).

The results of applying that system are manifest in the differentiations and analogies established during explorations across the Mediterranean. This same scheme would later be internalised and applied by the Spanish elites through their descriptions of low life in Spanish cities, the description of the working classes, and justifications of national underdevelopment. But we also find this in the study of the working and marginalised classes of London conducted by the social researcher Henry Mayhew (1812-1887) during the mid-nineteenth century. In the introductory section of his book, Mayhew (1851) discussed the physical and behavioural differences between civilised and uncivilised groups. He then stated that civilised groups were always surrounded by non-civilised groups; nomads who lived by pillaging the products of the civilised. He expressed surprise that everyone before him had failed to notice the existence of non-civilised groups within London's population and their analogous nature with non-civilised groups in extra-European territories. He stressed the need to define and study these non-civilised groups in London which he attributed with their own particular physical and linguistic characteristics (Mayhew 1851: 2). This task was continued at the end of the century by Charles Booth (1840-1916), who expanded the description and definition of the working and marginalised classes through the application of cartographic devices (Booth 1889). The adoption of a linguistic criterion for the exclusion of non-civilised domestic groups is comparable to what

occurred in France. Such a process led to the adoption of the linguistic practices of the Parisian elite as a standard for the national language that served both to locate deviants and reproduce differences between social groups (Bourdieu 1991: 43-65). Ultimately, this demonstrates that the internal exclusions produced by a civilising process generated a consensus about the need for that same process through images of violence and degeneration (Wood 2004).

Around this time, the Italian criminal-anthropologist Cesare Lombroso (1835-1909), leader of the so called *Scuola Positiva Italiana*, was exploring the differences between various human races. Towards that goal he discarded the concept that similarities in customs and institutions indicated blood ties. Instead, he argued that these were only reproduced because they were the most suitable for social development and that the adoption of customs and practices followed a clear line that ultimately led to the more complex and perfect forms sustained by the white man. The rest of the races were degenerate examples compared to this civilised model (Lombroso 1871). The same scheme would serve him years later for his work on crime in European society, establishing an analogy between criminals and savages (Lombroso 1895: 438). As it has been noted, 'even though Lombroso never left Europe, in a sense he became a colonialist within his own country, extending state control over a population deemed inferior, subjugating criminals to anthropological and legal scrutiny' (Rafter 2008: 72).

It was precisely that system of representation, which generated analogies or distinctions by comparison to the civilised ideal, and thus reinforced adherences and rejections, that created the ideological context for the intensification of rivalry between European states. The military outcome of the Great War (1914-1918) was largely justified by the need for self-affirmation against others and the avoidance of degeneration. That conflict was the perfect context for the dissemination of classificatory techniques previously applied in non-European territories. Prison camps were transformed into experimental laboratories where Europeans

> were placed into subject positions that were almost identical to those of many non-Europeans in similar camps created during earlier colonial wars. Indeed, in this prison environment the distinction between Europeans and non-Europeans quickly collapsed, replaced by a new constellation that sharply contrasted a variety of national and ethnic groups with their captors. (Evans 2010: 138)

No wonder then that Hannah Arendt established a correlation between the imperialist process and the emergence of the rivalries, devices, and identities that formed the basis of totalitarian regimes within Europe (Arendt 1974). Even years after the Great War, the French historian and demographer Louis Chevalier (1911-2011), in his study of Parisian society during the early 19th century, associated working classes and 'dangerous classes' utilising the same devices that determined categories in the preceding century. Through statistics, demographics, and even literature, he defined a process of social and biological modification of Parisian society, affected by increasing immigration and ethnic mixtures which, he argued, were manifested in the increase of indigence, madness, prostitution, and cohabitation (Chevalier 1958).

Truly Postcolonial

The process described above, involving analogies and differences established between various European and North African groups and regions during the nineteenth century, demonstrates certain features that could be useful in the current debate concerning postcolonial theory. As we saw in the introductory section, still today we find recurrent critiques of the reproduction of colonial

categories, particularly the binary scheme opposing coloniser and colonised. Additionally, the strategies that have been proposed to overcome such situations (based on acknowledging the ambivalent nature of colonial discourse and how it creates space for negotiation and hybridisation) are accused of establishing an artificial symmetry which neglects historical particularities and conceals forms of domination and inequality that must be denounced. However, the analysis presented here confirms that this discourse did possess a decidedly ambivalent character. It was not based on a strict differentiation between communities but, instead on a permanent oscillation between rejection and assimilation. Thus, both analogies and differences were established between Europe and North Africa. However, this ambivalent discourse also affected communities within Europe. The fact that this intra-European situation was not solely manifest in comparisons between nations but also included descriptions of particular groups within a single nation, requires a new framework that could encompass all of these situations. Hence, it is necessary to appeal to a model that transcends the traditional references to Europe, Africa, or nation-states. As proposed here, what acted as a reference for all these representations was, ultimately, the notion of civilisation. This concept, despite its alleged universal character, was only based on the practices, customs, and interests that conformed to the self-representation of the groups benefiting from the program of modernisation. The development of these transformations was inspired and reproduced through the conviction of the necessity of the civilising mission, promoting intervention and the application of techniques of control and administration. However, the fact that the notion of civilisation was no more than the self-image of the groups benefitting from these transformations meant that the universalist intentions needed to be constantly cancelled out to ensure the social distinctions required to maintain that very self-representation. A discourse emerged that sought neither the complete assimilation of the other nor its complete dissociation but, instead, was fuelled by the constant failure of these two intents. This is the key to understanding the ambivalence affecting all of those representations: 'the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, *as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite*' (Bhabha 1994: 122). However, beyond the situations described by Bhabha (who reduces that discourse to its colonial dimension), I suggest that ultimately the measuring stick of the civilised ideal, as well as the articulation of its resulting ambivalent discourse, was only a portion of the European population and its nations. Therefore, these transformations within Europe were driven by those same civilising ideals. This required the dissemination of that ambivalent discourse by the groups benefiting from it, through its application to disadvantaged groups within their own national boundaries as well as other European nations, both of which implied frequent analogies with extra-European territories. Overall this ambivalent logic served to produce and reproduce the very necessity of modernising intervention.

Considering this ambivalent discourse in these terms facilitates the resolution of many issues raised in the introduction. On the one hand, it provides a perspective that definitively overcomes the recurring description of this discourse in antagonistic and binary terms. It also addresses the necessity to provincialise the European context, so far considered as a unitary entity. It additionally recovers an economic and social approach for the analysis of those interventionist processes which has been repeatedly demanded by critics. Taken together, these elements lead us to the necessity to definitively overcome the idea of the specificity of colonial situations. Such a perspective hides behind an exclusively cultural facade a process that had an eminently social and economic nature, and forces the constant reproduction of identities that were — to a great extent — a mere product of that process. A truly and definitive postcolonial approach will not come until we assume the problematic nature of the label 'colonial' itself (Stoler & Strassler

2000: 4) and, ultimately, until we admit that what is really at stake are the forms of domination exerted by an alien society, 'whether alien in culture, language, social group, or place of origin' (Given 2004: 163; see also Bhambra 2007; Costa 2006; Seth 2009). As the Moroccan historian Abdallah Laroui once wrote: 'Therefore, what could we say of colonialism that could not be said of war and politics? Is it not but another aspect of that human activity that we call historical because historians recreate, comment or analyse it?' (Laroui 2001: 161).

However, we must still answer the other objections raised in the introduction. Those are objections to the idea of the ambivalent nature of discourses and, in particular, to how these allow a space of negotiation and indeterminacy which favours the emergence of hybrid cultural manifestations. According to these critiques the notion of hybridity creates an illusory symmetry that masks the historical evidence of domination. Therefore, a perspective that addresses calls for reconciliation between the notion of hybridisation and forms of domination is necessary (Liebmann 2008: 5). Although the analysis presented above has demonstrated the economic and social roots of interventionist processes we should consider a series of issues. As mentioned elsewhere (Cañete & Vives Ferrándiz 2011: 127), Bhabha, inspired by the linguistic work of Mikhail Bakhtin, already warned of the subversive dimension that hybrid cultural manifestations posed (Young 1995: 20-22). He related the subversive character of hybrid cultural manifestations to their ability to challenge the hypocrisy of the universalist appearance of the civilising discourse by demonstrating its ambivalent nature and, therefore, how it fails itself by cancelling its own universal aspirations. Most current authors interpret such considerations as a defence for the direct equivalence between hybridisation and subversive practices. However, Bhabha himself warned that such a subversive dimension is merely 'potential' or 'immanent', and that it is only actualised if the dominated become aware of the discursive ambivalence and exert deliberate creative action. Until this occurs, forms of hybridisation remain simply manifestations of a system of representation through an ambivalent discourse. This discourse generates an illusion of participation or consensus while simultaneously imposing limitations that maintain the legitimacy of those benefiting from the control of economic and symbolic transactions. Hence, this suggests not only that hybrid cultural manifestations could coexist with systems of domination but, moreover, that most of the time hybridity serves to affirm and reproduce dominance.

The processes that have occurred over the last centuries — of which I have tried to offer a synthesis — confront us with an undoubtedly complex and unstable phenomenon. The ideas in this article are intended to provide a framework that could give meaning to some of the questions that continually arise when trying to fulfil the task of historical analysis without forgetting political commitments. There are many other issues yet to be resolved. It seems clear, however, that we must overcome the illusory universal image of modernity to make way for a perspective that values the particular experiences of different groups involved and the multiple and sometimes contradictory responses they offered and continue to offer (Gaonkar 2001; Wagner 2008).

Acknowledgments

References

Ahmad, A. 1992. *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures*. London/New York: Verso.

Altamira, R. 1900. *Historia de España y de la civilización española*. Barcelona: Juan Gili

Amselle, J.-L. 2012. *L'anthropologue et le politique*. Paris: Lignes.

Anderson, B. 1991. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.

Antón y Ferrándiz, M. 1895. *Razas y naciones de Europa. Discurso leído en la Universidad Central en la solemne inauguración del curso académico de 1895 á 1896*. Madrid: Imprenta Colonial.

Arendt, H. 1974 [1951]. *Los orígenes del totalitarismo*. Madrid: Taurus.

Bailly, J. S. 1777-1779. *Lettres sur l'Atlantide de Platon et sur l'ancienne histoire de l'Asie: pour servir de suite aux Lettres sur l'origine des sciences, adressées à M. de Voltaire*. Londres: M. Elmesly.

Bhambra, G. K. 2007. *Rethinking Modernity. Postcolonialism and the Sociological Imagination*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bénabou, M. 1976. *La Résistance africaine à la Romanisation*. Paris: Maspero.

Bernaldo de Quirós, C. & Llanas Aguilaniedo, J. M. 1997 [1901]. *La mala vida en Madrid: Estudio psicosociológico con dibujos y fotografías del natural*. Zaragoza: Egido editorial.

Berque, J. 1956. Cent vingt-cinq ans de sociologie maghrébine. *Annales ESC* **11(3):** 296-324.

Bhabha, H. K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Bigland, J. 1810. *The History of Spain, from the earliest period to the close of the year 1809*. London: Longman & Co.

––– 1823. *Histoire d'Espagne, traduite de l'anglais, et continuée jusqu'à l'époque de la restauration de 1814: Ouvrage revu et corrigé par le comte Mathieu Dumas*. Paris: F. Didot.

Boëtsch, G. & Ferrié, J.-N. 1996. Classification et pratique classificatoire dans l'anthropologie physique du nord de l'afrique. *Préhistoire anthropologie méditerranéennes* **5:** 17-33.

Bonaparte, N. 1821. *Oeuvres de Napoléon Bonaparte*, vol. 4. Paris: Panckoucke.

Booth, C. 1889. *Life and Labour of the People*. London: Williams and Norgate.

Bory de Saint-Vincent, J.-B. 1803. *Essais sur les isles Fortunées et l'antique Atlantide, ou Précis de l'histoire générale de l'archipel des Canaries*. Paris: Baudouin.

––– 1823. *Guide du voyageur en Espagne*. Paris: L. Janet.

––– 1824. *Notice sur la nouvelle carte d'Espagne, jointe à cet ouvrage*. Paris: Giraldon-Bovinet.

––– 1825. *L'homme (homo), essai zoologique sur le genre humain*. Paris: Le Normand Fils.

––– 1845. Sur l'anthropologie de l'Afrique française. *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de l'Academie des sciences* XX, 30th June 1845: 1812-1825.

––– 1938. *Note sur la commission exploratrice et scientifique d'Algérie*. Paris: Cosson.

Bourdieu, P. 1991. *Language & symbolic power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourguet, M.-N.; Lepetit, B.; Nordman, D. & Sinarellis, M. (eds.) 1998. *L'invention scientifique de la Méditerranée. Egypte, Morée, Algérie*. Paris: Éditions de l'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales.

Bourguet, M.-N.; Nordman, D.; Panayotopoulos, V. & Sinarellis, M. (eds.) 1999. *Enquêtes en Méditerranée. Les expéditions françaises d'Egypte, de Morée et d'Algérie*. Paris: Éditions de l'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales.

Broca, P. 1859. Recherches sur l'ethnologie de la France. *Bulletins de la Société d'anthropologie de Paris*, 4th August 1859, 6-30.

Buffon, G.-L. 1778. *Des époques de la nature*. Paris: Impr. Royale.

Campos, R. 2009. La clasificación de lo difuso: el concepto de 'Mala vida' en la literatura criminológica de cambio de siglo. *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* **10(4):** 399-422.

Campos, R.; Martínez, J. & Huertas, R. 2000. *Los ilegales de la naturaleza. Medicina y degeneracionismo en la España de la Restauración (1876-1923)*. Madrid: CSIC.

Cañete, C. 2006. La antigüedad en la comisión de exploración científica de Argelia (s.XIX): variabilidad para un fin común. *Al-Andalus Magreb* **13:** 43-68.

—— 2010. Classifying an Oxymoron. On Black-Boxes, Materiality and Identity in the Scientific Representation of the Mediterranean. In *Material Connections in the Ancient Mediterranean. Mobility, Materiality and Identity*, (eds.) P. van Dommelen & A. B. Knapp, London: Routledge, 19-37.

Cañete, C. & Vives Ferrándiz, J. 2011. 'Almost the Same': dynamic domination and hybrid contexts in Iron Age Lixus (Larache, Morocco). *World Archaeology* **43(1):** 124-143.

Cánovas del Castillo, A. (dir.) 1890-1894. *Historia general de España escrita por individuos de número de la Real Academia de la Historia, bajo la dirección del Sr. Antonio Cánovas del Castillo* Madrid: El progreso editorial.

Carrier, J. G. (ed.) 1995. *Occidentalism: Images of the West*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Chakrabarty, D. 2000. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial thought and historical difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Chateaubriand, F.-R. 2006 [1848]. *Memorias de ultratumba*. Barcelona: Acantilado.

Chevalier, L. 1958. *Classes laborieuses et classes dangereuses à* Paris *pendant la première moitié du* XIX*ᵉ* siècle. Paris: Plon.

Ciardi, M. 2002. *Atlantide. Una controversia scientifica da Colombo a Darwin*. Roma: Carocci.

Cohn, B. S. 1996. *Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge: the British in India*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Costa, J. 1886. Río de oro en la antigüedad. *Revista de Geografía Comercial* **25:** 10-36.

—— 1895. *Estudios Ibéricos*. Madrid: Tipografía de San Francisco de Sales.

—— 1901. *Oligarquía y caciquismo como la forma actual de gobierno en España: Urgencia y modo de cambiarla*. Madrid: Establecimiento Tipográfico de Fortanet.

Costa, S. 2006. Desprovincializando a sociologia: a contribuição pós-colonial. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais* **60:** 117-134.

De Felipe, H. 2009. Estudios sobre bereberes en la historiografía española. Arabismo y africanismo. In *Al-Andalus/España. Historiografías en contraste Siglos XVII-XXI*, (ed.) M. Marín, Madrid: Casa de Velázquez, 105-106.

Díaz-Andreu, M. 2007. *A World History of Nineteenth-Century Archaeology: Nationalism, Colonialism, and the Past*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Edwards, W. F. 1841 [1829]. *Des caractères physiologiques des races humaines considérés dans leurs rapports avec l'histoire*. Paris: Dondey-Dupré.

Elias, N. 2009 [1939]. *El proceso de la civilización. Investigaciones sociogenéticas y psicogenéticas*. Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Evans, A. D. 2010. *Anthropology at war: World War I and the Science of Race in Germany*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fernández, V. M. 2001. La idea de África en el origen de la prehistoria española: una perspectiva postcolonial. *Complutum* **12:** 167-184.

Ferrié, J. N. 1993. La naissance de l'aire culturelle méditerranéenne dans l'anthropologie physique de l'Afrique du Nord. *Cahiers d'Études Africaines* **129:** 139-151.

Ferrié, J. N. & Boëtsch, G. 1990. Du berbère aux yeux clairs à la race eurafricaine: la Méditerranée des anthropologues physiques. *Annuaire de l'Afrique du Nord* **28:** 191-208.

Ferrière, H. 2009. Bory de Saint-Vincent. L'évolution d'un voyageur naturaliste. Paris: Éditions Syllepse.

Ferro, M. 2005 [2003]. El colonialismo, reverso de la colonización. In *El libro negro del colonialismo, siglos XVI-XXI: del exterminio al arrepentimiento*, (dir.) M. Ferro, Madrid: La esfera de libros, 11-47.

Festa, L. & Carey, D. 2009. Some Answers to the Question: What is Postcolonial Enlightenment? In *Postcolonial Enlightenment*, (eds.) D. Carey & L. Festa, New York: Oxford University Press, 1-33.

Fischer-Tiné, H. & Gehrmann S. 2009. Introduction: Empires, Boundaries and the production of Difference. In *Empires and Boundaries: Rethinking Race, Class, and Gender in Colonial Settings*, (eds.) H. Fischer-Tiné & S. Gehrmann, New York: Routledge, 1-22.

Fouillée, A. 1899. Le peuple espagnol. *Revue de Deux Mondes,* **155:** 481-510.

Gaonkar, D. P. 2001. On Alternative Modernities. In *Alternative Modernities*, (ed.) D. P. Gaonkar, Durham: Duke University Press, 1-23.

Given, M. 2004. *The Archaeology of the Colonised*. London: Routledge.

González-Ruibal, A. 2008. Postpolitical colonialism. *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* **21(2):** 285-288.

––– 2010. Colonialism and European Archaeology. In *Handbook of Postcolonial Archaeology*, (eds.) J. Lydon & U. Rizvi, Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press, 37-47

Goode, J. 2009. *Impurity of Blood. Defining Race in Spain 1870-1930.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Guha, R. 1983. *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

––– 1997. *Dominance without hegemony: History and power in colonial India*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Hobsbawm, E. J. 1971. *Las revoluciones burguesas*. Madrid: Guadarrama.

Hoyt, D. L. 2001. The reanimation of the primitive: Fin-de-siècle ethnographic discourse in Western Europe. *History of Science,* **39(3):** 331- 354.

Johnson, C. & Coleman, A. 2012. The Internal Other: Exploring the dialectical relationship between regional exclusion and the construction of National Identity. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, **102(4):** 863-880.

Keller, R. C. 2007. Taking Science to the Colonies: Psychiatric Innovation in France and North Africa. In *Psychiatry and Empire*, (eds.) S. Mahone & M. Vaughan, Hampshire: Palgrave McMillan, 17-40.

Kuper, A. 2001 [1999]. *Cultura: La versión de los antropólogos*. Barcelona: Paidós.

Laroui, A. 1970. *L'Histoire du Maghreb: Un essai de synthèse*. Paris: Maspero.

––– 2001 [1992]. *Esquisses historiques*. Casablanca: Centre de Culture Arabe.

Lauzun, P. 1908. *Correspondance de Bory de Saint Vincent*. Paris: Maison d'édition et imprimerie moderne.

Le Cour Grandmaison, O. 2005. *Coloniser. Exterminer. Sur la guerre et l'État colonial*. Paris: Fayard.

Lepetit, B. 1998. Missions scientifiques et expéditions militaires: remarques sur leurs modalités d'articulation. In *L'invention scientifique de la méditerranée: Egypte, Morée*, Algérie, (dirs.) M.-N. Bourguet *et al*., Paris: Editions de l'EHESS, 97-116.

Liebmann, M. 2008. Introduction: The Intersections of Archaeology and Postcolonial Studies. In *Archaeology and the Postcolonial Critique*, (eds.) M. Liebmann& U. Rizvi, Lanham: Altamira Press, 1-20.

Lombroso, C. 1871. *L'uomo Bianco e l'uomo di colore*. Padua: F. Sacchetto.

––– 1895. *L'homme criminel*. vol. 1. Paris: Félix Alcan.

Lorcin, P. 1995. *Imperial Identities: Stereotyping, prejudice and race in colonial Algeria*. New York: I.B. Tauris Publishers.

Mahé, A. 2001. *Histoire de la Grande Kabylie, XIXe-XXe siècles: anthropologie historique du lien social dans les communautés villageoises*. Alger: Bouchène.

Mayhew, H. 1851. *London Labour and the London Poor; Cyclopaedia of the conditions and earnings of those that will work, those that cannot work, and those that will not work*, vol. 1. London: George Woodfall.

Mellino, M. 2012. *Cittadinanze postcoloniali. Appartenenze, razza e razzismo in Europa e in Italia*. Roma: Carocci.

Morayta y Sagrario, M. 1886. *Historia General de España desde los tiempos antehistóricos hasta nuestros días.* Madrid: Felipe González Rojas.

Mouffe, C. 2005. *On the Political*. New York: Routledge.

Murphy, D. 2007. Materialist Formulations. In *The Routledge Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, (ed.) J. Mcleod , New York: Routledge, 181-189.

Nordman, D. 1996. *Profils du Maghreb. Frontières, figures et territoires (XVIIIe-XXe siècle)*. Rabat: Publications de la Faculté des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines.

Ortega y Gasset, J. 1985 [1924]. *Las Atlántidas y del Imperio Romano (y otros ensayos de historiología)*. Madrid: Alianza.

Ortiz, C. 1987. *Luis de Hoyos Sainz y la antropología española.* Madrid: CSIC.

Parry, B. 2004. *Postcolonial Studies: A materialist critique*. London: Routledge.

Pick, D. 1989. *Faces of Degeneration: A European Disorder, c.1848–c.1918*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pouillon, F. 2015. Orientalism, Dead or Alive? A French History. In *After Orientalism. Critical Perspectives on Western Agency and Eastern Re-appropiations*, (eds.) F. Pouillon & J.-C. Vatin, Leiden: Brill, 3-17.

Prakash, G. 1995. Introduction: After Colonialism. In *After Colonialism: Imperial Histories and Postcolonial Displacements*, (ed.) G. Prakash, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 3-17.

Pruner-Bey 1865. L'anthropologie en Espagne. *Bulletins de la Société d'anthropologie de Paris*, 8th June 1865, 361-370.

Rabinow, P. 1989. *French Modern Norms and Forms of the Social Environment*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Rafter, N. 2008. *The Criminal Brain: Understanding Biological Theories of Crime*. New York: New York University Press.

Romieux, P. 1934. *Les carnets de Bory de Saint-Vincent (1813 à 1815)*. Montauban: Imprimerie de G. Forestié.

Rowlands, M. 1995. A question of complexity. In *Domination and Resistance*, (eds.) D. Miller, M. Rowlands & C. Tilley, New York: Routledge, 28-39.

—— 1998. The archaeology of colonialism. In *Social transformations in archaeology. Global and local perspectives*, (eds.) K. Kristiansen & M. Rowlands, New York: Routledge, 327-333.

Sahli, M. 1965. *Décoloniser l'histoire: introduction à l'histoire du Maghreb*. Paris: F. Maspero.

Said, E. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage books.

Saint-Simon, C.-H. & Thierry, A. 2008 [1814]. De la réorganisation de la société européenne. In *Le saint-simonisme, l'Europe et la Méditerranée*, (ed.) P. Musso, Houilles: Manucius, 23-70.

Sales y Ferré, M. 1883. *Historia Universal. Edad Prehistórica y Periodo Oriental.* Madrid: Victoriano Suárez.

Salillas, R. 1892. Manada de locos. *El Liberal,* 8th February 1892.

Seth, S. 2009. Historical Sociology and Postcolonial Theory: Two Strategies for Challenging Eurocentrism. *International Political Sociology* **3(3):** 334-338.

Spivak, G. C. 1999. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. London: Harvard University Press.

Stoler, A. L. 1989. Rethinking Colonial Categories: European Communities and the Boundaries of Rule. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* **31(1):** 134-161.

—— 2009. *Along the archival grain: epistemic anxieties and colonial common sense*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Stoler, A. L. & Strassler, K. 2000. Castings for the colonial: Memory Work in 'New Order' Java. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* **42(1):** 4-48.

Temime, É. 2002. *Un rêve méditerranéen: Des saint-simoniens aux intellectuels des années trente*. Arles: Actes du Sud.

Thomson, A. 1987. *Barbary and enlightenment: European attitudes towards the Maghreb in the 18th Century*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

—— 1998. Bory de Saint-Vincent et l'anthropologie de la Méditerranée. In (dirs..) *L'invention scientifique de la méditerranée: Egypte, Morée, Algérie*, M.-N. Bourguet *et al.*, Paris: Editions de l'EHESS, 273-287

Tubino, F. M. 1869. España en el norte escandinavo. *Boletín-revista de la Universidad de Madrid,* **2(1):** 19-28.

——— 1876. Los aborígenes ibéricos o los bereberes en la Península. *Revista de antropología* **2:** 65-190.

Van Dommelen, P. 2006. Colonial Matters. Material Culture and Postcolonial Theory in Colonial Situations. In *Handbook of material culture*, (eds.) C. Tilley, W. Keane, S. Küchler, M. Rowlands & P. Spyer, London: Sage Publications, 104-124.

Vega, M. J. 2003. *Imperios de papel: Introducción a la crítica postcolonial*. Barcelona: Crítica.

Vidal-Naquet, P. 2006 [2005]. *La Atlántida: Pequeña historia de un mito platónico*. Madrid: Akal.

Wagner, P. 2008. *Modernity as Experience and Interpretation*. Cambridge: Polity.

Wood, J. C. 2004. *Violence and Crime in Nineteenth-Century England: The Shadow of our Refinement.* New York: Routledge.

Young, R. J. C. 1995. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race.* New York: Routledge.

Žižek, S. 2007. *En defensa de la intolerancia*. Mexico: Sequitur.