

Abdellatif Laâbi

The Waste

Published in Souffles 7-8 (1967)
translated into English by Kate Hugh McStevenson

Original French version can be downloaded under <https://monoskop.org/Souffles>

On releasing history

The history of Moroccan art has been, for more than a half century, a European specialty, a monopoly of Western science.

It is irrelevant to enter into the controversy that sees recent attempts by Moroccan nationals to reconsider our art as nothing but artificial curiosity born from reading foreign analyses and criticism. Any interest that we can bring to our art, no matter how late (and the reasons for the delay are obvious...) is due neither to a fascination with folklore nor to the bourgeois mimicry of foreigners' taste for it. If the European specialist or mere collector has awakened in us an interest in our own art, it does not follow that our curiosity stops at competition in the treasure hunt or with a chauvinistic admiration for our artistic traditions. Rather, knowledge and appreciation of this heritage fall within the scope of the desire for total recovery, essential to our restructuring.

But in the cultural field as elsewhere, action is still not up to us. The escalation in scientific interest from abroad continues in other forms than it had before independence (1). It continues, indifferent to our immobility, to our need to take the initiative and to our thirst for responsibility.

Not everyone feels this with the same urgency. Most restrict themselves to what has been acquired, whatever their origins. Not everyone feels the dramatic foundation of this escalation whereby we lose, time after time, the opportunity to see with our own eyes and in a pristine state this or that aspect of our culture, the joy of discovering for ourselves this document, that "fossil".

Our intransigence will please no one (2), neither our own nor the "disinterested researchers" in human values and the anthropology of universalism. For the latter, our discomfort is mere jealousy, an expression of impotence, or the rise of fanaticism (3). Nevermind. Here are the facts.

We have had many occasions to insist that we are passing today through a most dynamic phase, both ideologically and culturally. Whatever conditions or limitations are imposed on action and research, awareness (admittedly limited, but any awareness so begins) is now taking shape in Morocco. This awareness has been called forth to launch the present generation (4) in a decisive effort of clearing away and reconsideration. Now is the time for us to shake off the torpor of colonial trauma and face our history. But when we try to begin this confrontation, we are faced with a

most problematical legacy: the colonial social sciences. The colonial phenomenon was, indeed, a serious disturbance in our history (5).

Here, we must immediately make a clarification. In recent years, in certain intellectual circles, both national and Western, there has appeared a kind of weariness, even mistrust, about denouncing colonization. To use the terms of a Moroccan writer (6), I believe that if “the West has stuck to our skin”, we will also, from now on, stick to the skin of the West. Until the West has made a thorough cleaning, has pulled itself from the mud of universality in which it bogged us down by generalization, we will remain a thorn of bad conscience, inexorably planted in it. And we will never tire of stalking the West’s missteps and prevarication as the West has, for centuries, stalked our naivety, barbarism and fatalism. We must clarify ideas, even if they are expressed in violence.

To return to this confrontation with our own history, we find that whenever we look at an area of our culture, we encounter the West and its scholars. Faced with such erudition, such determination to uncover every detail, such mastery for broad syntheses, we sometimes lose courage, so limited seems our own capacity for research.

We cannot escape the history that the West has shaped for us. It is a vast raw material, a nursery of data. But it is also a construction of provocation, a mousetrap for objectivity. Colonial, even postcolonial, science throws up a constant challenge for us. It is an intervention riddled with ambiguity.

What bothers us is not so much that it should exist, but that it has already mapped out for us our entire past and present, has structured our universe. Colonial science discovered, collected and categorized our history and culture, according to its own needs. It has thrown up dividing walls and knocked out openings; it has set the hypotheses. One work becomes a “classic” of the Almohad period, another a manual of Moroccan art, etc. Colonial science has also faked, slandered and destroyed.

We can neither go around colonial science nor reject it. Nor, can we accept it. We are condemned to digest it and, from there, to sort through it.

It is in this obligation where lies the disturbance mentioned above. The self-examination we have begun, and which will continue for a long time, is a sacrificial phase, so much wasted energy. It is an exciting phase, it is necessary, authentic, anything you like, but it is still a waste. It is a long disturbance, a heavy ransom to be paid. But we must do it. Not to wash ourselves clean nor to slander the eternal imperialist West source-of-all-our-troubles, but for our own health, lucidity and for the truth of all humanity.

Franz Fanon wanted to “release man” (the wretched of the earth, the oppressed). Our task now is to ***release the History of oppressed mankind.***

The escalation of science

The escalation in foreign scientific research in Morocco did not begin in 1912. We can detect its beginnings from the first efforts of colonial penetration and the affirmation of European influence in Morocco. But the escalation became especially clear after the conquest of Algeria, which announced, for our country, the era of direct threat and, for the colonizer, the perfect moment to develop a thought-out plan for colonization.

One could say, then, that scientific exploration came long before direct colonization. In any case, it largely prepared the terrain for colonization and outlined its strategy. But it was only after the establishment of the Protectorate that colonial ideology at the socio-cultural level, according to “native realities”, would be structured and become one of the pillars of colonization. It was especially in the context of the Institute of Advanced Moroccan Studies, founded in 1920, and its publication *Hesoéris* that the frenzy of research and the most spectacular cultural excavation would be deployed. L.T.H.E.M., sponsored by Lyautey (7), the supreme theorist of the Moroccan Protectorate, would give itself the immediate task of a “scientific exploration of Morocco”, i.e., a series of language studies (development of an atlas of the Arab and Berber dialects), hagiographies (an atlas of the zawiyas and places of pilgrimage and worship) (8), and historical research (recreation of a collection of archives). The Institute also planned to establish a Moroccan bibliography. But the research did not stop there: they encompassed all areas of human and other sciences, including geography, ethnology, as well as studies of “indigenous psychology” which, for G. Hardy would be immediately more effective than the “analysis of the Muslim soul”.

“Nowhere else,” adds this same Hardy, “do we find fewer sealed compartments: academics, officials, judges, administrators, settlers, engineers, etc., all the professions, all mental types, are represented within our Institute; even that valiant race, lightweight only in appearance – the aviator, participates in our common toil between flights and makes us see familiar horizons from a new angle” (9).

Vocations would develop within this organization, with remarkable theorists: literature (Basset, Laoust, Justinard), geography (Célérier, P. de Cénival, Raynal), history (Michaux-Bellaire, Castries, Terrasse), music (Chottin), linguistics (Biarnay, Lévi-Provencal, Laoust), the arts (P. Ricard, Herber, Marçais, Terrasse), etc. (10).

All in all, this science was a “second wave of assault”, less “heroic” than that of the troopers, but a “hidden and patient conquest”, in the words of G. Hardy, who added, in a speech at the 5th IHEM Congress in 1925:

“In the colonies, as elsewhere, nothing can be founded on action alone, action that develops day by day and refuses to steep itself methodically in the sources of intelligence and research. It is childish and worthy of a character from comic-opera to proclaim “Let us act, let us act” until we have clarified the path of action, determined the goals and studied the means. One can, without being a prophet, predict with certainty that any head of colonial government, who, in the name of practicality and decisiveness, treats geologists as mere collectors of stones and linguists as maniacal grammarians, will accomplish little and leave the country defenceless against the risks to its physical and moral life” (11).

With the view of scientific conquest in Morocco thus defined, it is possible to review the different disciplines and show each one's motivations for the work carried out and also its contribution to colonization (12). But this would be a long study, far beyond the scope of this introductory approach. Without going into a textual thematic criticism, we will keep for now to the process and the overall impact of colonial ideology, around three axes: *Assimilation*, *Berberphilia* and *Conservatism*.

But before addressing this triptych, we should draw attention to a fundamental constant of colonial strategy: the notion of opportunity. Indeed, a comparative chronology of scientific research and politico-military events reveals many significant coincidences. Extensive research may perhaps demonstrate the paradoxically "prophetic" character of colonial scientific curiosity, in advance of political and social events. One could, for example, note the 5th IHEM Congress held in 1925, whose aim was to establish the state of knowledge about the Rif. Later events brought a brutal response to this objective curiosity: not long after the Congress, the French army intervened definitively in the Rif War, forcing the surrender of Abdelkrim.

In the same way, the immense scientific focus on berberphilia cleverly prepared the promulgation of the Berber Dahir in 1930.

A final example: the work on "geographical conditions of the pacification of the Central Atlas" indicates how a scientific discipline can be a fertile aid to colonization. Jean Célérier, in a column about the book by Gai Guillaume (13), wrote: "The breakdown of the great dissident bloc of the central Atlas into isolated 'spots' whose successive reduction fixes the stages of pacification *was guided by physical geography*" (14). Thus, "political preparation", as Lyautey called it, and the teaching of geographical research contributed to ending the last pocket of resistance controlled by Moha or Hammou.

We wish to conclude nothing based on these examples. But this notion of opportunity is far from being simple intuition. In itself, it could serve as a common thread in a series of corrective research and confrontation. It already shows one of the falsehoods and duplicity underlying colonial humanities.

Assimilation

Colonial science was under the will of reasoned control on all psychological, religious and cultural manifestations of Moroccan society, on the economic, sociological and natural laws of the Moroccan community. For the specialists, it was not about a people or a country for whom authentic institutions and cultural and scientific heritage must be provided, but a "hostile environment" whose penetration and domestication would require knowledge - thorough, complete and oriented towards pragmatism and efficiency. Study, then, was oriented, consciously or unconsciously, towards reconciliation with this hostile environment, not so much to understand it, but for *assimilation*.

Assimilation is a comfortable path for colonial ideology. It is based, obviously, on a sense of superiority and self-centeredness, ideas that have been widely broken down and denounced, but which have survived colonization and even decolonization. If as many intellectuals in the Third World as in the West have decried and washed themselves of it, Western social structure and culture still remain inevitably ethnocentric and imbued with a sense more or less steeped in superiority.

Assimilation policy was manifest in all domains where it was possible to demonstrate, biologically or culturally, that the indigenous people (i.e., the Berbers since, according to colonial ideology, the Arab is an intruder, a temporary conqueror like others, a dominator imposing social hierarchy inconsistent with local democracy, an official culture imported in psychic and mental conflict with the indigenous culture) (15), was a brother race, but a fallen one, straggling behind, a “laggard” as E.F. Gautier put it (16).

Colonization, then, was conceived as a mission of salvation, in keeping with the logic of history and with the “normalization” of history as its goal. Any historical discontinuity and paradoxical structures in the country to be colonized sentenced it irrevocably to foreign intervention.

The specialists were also bent on finding in Morocco, a Latin past, European leanings and a Western vocation. For the past, regarding art, the orientation of archaeological research clearly shows compliance with this view. The pre-Islamic, Punic-Roman legacy (which was, despite all efforts, rather disappointing in Morocco) mobilized energies for a long time. On the other hand, the few traces of Christian buildings or sites have always put the researcher into a state of feverish attention. Research on the monuments and art of indigenous people themselves has never occurred without a mania to find parallels, influences and extrapolations. Whenever Latin engineering or Christianity have touched a field, they have been brandished as references of victory.

This policy of assimilation would find fertile ground in Berberphilia.

Berberphilia

Berberphilia was primarily a cover for specific political goals: pacification and unification of the Protectorate could only be justified if the absence of a Moroccan nation could be demonstrated.

In his travels in Morocco even before the Protectorate, Edmond Doutté (17) made the distinction between the Arab, fanatical and hostile, and the Berber farmer or shepherd of affable, peaceful temperament. “Who will remember,” he wrote, “that below the ambitious lords and fanatical agitators, is the honest mass of the Berber people who, to grow and work, ask only a little order and justice.” And, in a note written long after these trips, Doutté adds, prophetically: “Since these lines were written, events have answered the question: it is not to the weakness of the Sultan, nor to the reckless adventure of a current master, nor to the audacity of a usurper that Fortune has entrusted the care of Morocco’s heavy destiny, but to the genius of France.”

This most precocious distinction will serve as a guideline to a range of scientific curiosity and be pushed to extremes. Thus it became possible to distinguish the Arab – warlike, conqueror, Eastern -- from the Berber --colonized, eternal -- still waiting for the organizing genius from abroad to gain new ways of going forward. European colonization could only be legitimate, given the failure of Morocco’s conquerors to maintain order and bring prosperity and progress.

Colonial studies of the Berber world were conducted from a point of view that disrupted any objectivity and led, for the most part, to the conclusion that the Arab transplant was bankrupt: Morocco was Arab to but an infinitely limited degree and only superficially Muslim, considering the survival of pagan beliefs and rites, conflicting social organization and economic activities, ethnic origins and different cultural expressions, etc.

The study of the Berber language was not a sincere attempt to rescue it from oblivion or to upgrade a culture, language and civilization as part of a national and universal heritage, but a political option in the service of pacification and, later, colonization itself.

But colonial ideology made a major mistake when it attacked Moroccan institutions because, in so doing, it sparked the beginnings of the modern national movement.

Colonial conservatism

Another path of this ideology was *the conservatism of the colonial project*. Colonization in Morocco did not really experience the excesses recorded in other countries where there was mass destruction of local institutions. In 1912, the Wild West was certainly still possible, but not in the American style. Lyautey was in this area a bold innovator, a genius, but not in the sense understood by his admiring contemporaries. The conservatism he advocated was a new stage in colonial ideology. In 1912, extermination could not be as extensive as it was in the 16th-17th centuries or, more recently, in 1830. The development of means of communication and international relations had sensitized European public opinion, and the Western powers had for long been in merciless competition that made each of them more cautious in his actions than in the past. But Lyautey conservatism was still not dictated by the “love” of indigenous institutions. Lyautey was a mystic, but a mystic of colonization. His mysticism is that of strategy. The conservatism he patronized at the political and socio-cultural level was an instrument of anesthesia, not a gesture of respect or admiration. Colonial rule could not better take hold than in a sclerotic milieu, caught firmly in feudal and aristocratic structures. Indeed, it was among certain feudal leaders and heads of brotherhoods that colonial rule found its first interlocutors and even its informants regarding research (18).

Colonization, which presented itself as the salvation and liberation of the colonized, merely served to encourage cultural stagnation; worse, it bastardized and sometimes destroyed the areas where the colonized people still freely expressed itself.

Cultural banditry

The looting of colonized countries was not limited to natural and human resources. It also affected cultural heritage. In Morocco, as elsewhere, this crime was “legal” without violence. Virgin and abundant material was there; one simply helped oneself. Directors, officers of Indigenous Affairs, civilian controllers, collectors and scholars acquired artworks in the same way that the settlers acquired homesteads. The theft of the artistic heritage was done under the same conditions as the theft of land. It is no coincidence that the history of Moroccan art has been put together with objects from private collections. The Protectorate Administration certainly endowed the country with “museums”, but in visiting these antiquated bazaars today, one realizes that the material gathered there is far from being a collection of information that could help research or even ordinary objective knowledge.

This aspect of colonization has not been denounced enough. Indeed, who has denounced it in the Third World in any continuous way? If it is agreed that Africa and Asia were systematically stripped of their artistic treasures, no one dares today demand their restitution. No government, no organization, no political party has programmed such a demand in its program. It is one of the paradoxes of decolonization. Yet, it is a fact that some of the major European museums received massive quantities of stolen goods. Their universality and reputations are, therefore, based on a long history of plunder at the expense of the peoples of the Third World who have been deprived of a heritage that appears, in this current phase of decolonization, necessary for self-recovery.

Colonial ideology and Moroccan Art

Moroccan art was for colonial scholars a true “treasure chest”. Of all the cultural disciplines these scholars addressed, none stunned them and at the same time embarrassed them as much as Art. Moroccan literature (especially Berber literature) was considered by many of them as poor, “lacking the creative spirit who knew how to use it: the Poet”, “the creative imagination” (19). Moroccan art, on the contrary, dazzled many and tore from them genuine elegies of admiration.

The richness, the multiplicity of artistic fields impressed researchers early on. Art in Morocco could neither be denied nor hidden. It imposed itself both in the historical monuments and in all aspects and ornaments of everyday life. Literature also had its zealous and faithful (Justinard), even conquering sometimes, but was always studied with relative **equanimity**. In other words, the literature collected and translated by colonial scholars never amounted, in their eyes, to anything that could compete with their own literature, either in terms of production or value. Moroccan literature was studied mostly for socio-ethnographic and linguistic purposes.

Art, however, offered an incredible inventory of forms and visual expressions that must certainly have shocked the specialists who approached it. They found themselves in front of a most unexpected artistic repository, foiling at the aesthetic and consumption levels both their conventional wisdom and habits of appreciation. Arab-Muslim art, as rural/urban folk art, was a challenge to Western academism, to its principles of production and consumption. In addition, it threatened the Western researcher’s peace of mind (20): for the first time, if he wanted to be thorough in his

reasoning, he would have been forced to contradict himself and to abort the entire system. To accept the idea that Moroccan art could be placed at the same level as Western art meant admitting that the people from which it is came could be lifted into the ranks of creative peoples. There was the rub. Multiple solutions to this dilemma would be found.

Nevertheless, the extent of studies of art undertaken during the Protectorate should not confuse us. In this area as in others, the goal was not to appreciate the subject, nor even to reveal it to the general public. This aspect of colonial research is little known. We realize indeed that on one hand, the research was made in isolation, addressed to a very small audience of specialists who informed each other somehow about the findings of their respective fields. On the other hand, the studies that are still today considered masterful and useful as a base were mostly descriptive, rarely interpretative or exhaustive. This is why the bibliography of Moroccan art consists mainly of catalogues and inventories of collections

(e.g., carpets, jewelry, doors, madrasas, granaries and citadels, ceramics, lace, etc.). In the rare syntheses carried out (e.g., that by G. Marçais), only the historical and social aspects are studied relatively in detail; the symbolic, visual or visual aspects received very little commentary.

In terms of methodology, the study of Moroccan art was, therefore, the work of scholars concerned much more about inventory and classification than analysis and aesthetic criticism.

But whenever the research escaped the descriptive drought and approached art appreciation, it clearly revealed its artistic prejudices and dogmatic orientation that, even in an area as “neutral” as art, could reflect colonial ideology. This is the case of the book by H. Terrasse, “*Les Arts décoratifs au Maroc*”(21), that it would not be arbitrary to choose as the “model” for these studies.

This book, presented by the author as “a basic grammar, a brief anthology of Moroccan art”, could -- by its arbitrary choices, by its artistic “mentality”, by the ideology that it covers or overlaps, finally, by the assertions that were later used as the basis for reflection and appreciation -- today generate an entire program of self-examination (22).

Terrasse’s book is divided into two main parts: “Berber Arts and the Moorish tradition”. By this division, the author intends to mark one of the permanent aspects of art in Morocco. But apparently Terrasse does not accentuate this division to the point of pushing to break through it. Sometimes he even timidly searches places of intersection, but without insisting. In fact, the whole book is built on this duality, whereby Berber art comes out relatively glorified. “To the subtleties and easy wealth” of Moorish art, Berber art offers vigorous simplicity, majesty, balance, a sense of mass and flexibility of composition. “Everywhere, it shows that rare quality: the disdain of easy effects,” adds the author.

But what Terrasse says of Berber art, which is true, appears in a different light when compared to statements about Moorish art. One has the impression that his exegesis serves only to belittle the other art. And when Terrasse considers the latter, an amazing rage comes through the text, his objective anthology turns into something

like propaganda. We will group our remarks on this subject around three aspects: training, execution (the artist) and expression.

Terrasse says first that Arab-Muslim art in Morocco was purely imitative and imported. Moreover, he believes that as Muslim Spain declined, Arab-Muslim art was unable to renew or take other forms of expression. These ideas clearly remind us of the theory that Arab civilization never took original shape in the country and was at most an artificial and cumbersome graft.

In the same vein, this art, for Terrasse, never expressed the concerns or deep feelings of the Moroccan people, since it was imposed by oppressive dynasties and castes that raised monuments to their own glory, without even thinking to continue the work of their predecessors. For this reason, this art has remained “spasmodic, discontinuous”. Arab-Muslim art, therefore, has not been the work of an entire people and does not represent its history or creative genius. It is an impersonal and selfish art. Terrasse writes: “In dark times, no one even cares to maintain the monuments from times of glory. Never has a new dynasty continued the work of its predecessors and adversaries; sometimes it even demolishes them. Our French cathedrals are often the work of several centuries; if the effort that produced them was uneven, it was always continued or resumed. When we pass through them, we sense there the work of the innumerable dead, famous or obscure, united in a common thought and held by a common effort. Works of an entire people, in them we love all of our past. In Morocco, above the crowd that is almost not a nation, easy to assemble but difficult to maintain, made hard by poverty and incapable of prolonged effort, have occasionally risen men of great ambition. The whole country has stirred to achieve their dreams, too often selfish, rarely coming from deep and truly human thought.”

But the inertia of this art is not solely due to the pride and inhumanity of dynasties; it also comes from the mentality of the artist. The automation and repetition of frozen forms comes from artists who are mere “craftsmen”, whose intellectual or spiritual activity rarely exceeds that of labourers (23).

“In Morocco, becoming an artist,” writes Terrasse, “is not to obey a compelling vocation and give birth in oneself of a creative force: it is simply to learn a trade, to assimilate the secrets of technique... There is no distinction between form and matter, inspiration and execution. Such a conception of artistic education seems paradoxical, even unreal, yet it represents the constant and universal facts in this country.”

The author finally takes up the forms of expression of Arab-Muslim art, especially “decorative art” that seems to Terrasse to have been originally a technical stopgap due to a lack of boldness and invention by the Andalusian architects who, unlike their Christian counterparts, did not know how to use the opportunities of the vaulted ceiling, and who, thus, avoided any struggle against the material.

Terrasse condemns decorative art (geometric, epigraphic and floral decoration) according to the most backward conventional prejudices and academic canons. The background triumphs for him in this art where there is no “concern for material realism... and which has broken all links with nature.” Speaking of floral decoration,

he writes: “Nothing that reminds one of a flower, a real leaf: nothing that passes on the thrill of life to this conventional world.”

To this lifelessness is added, according to Terrasse, a total lack of organizing or reflective thought. Arab-Muslim Art did not refuse only the representation of life (due, he says, to “old fears of magical origin, to obscure texts interpreted in an increasingly narrow way”- a hasty and erroneous thesis), this art has also neglected the symbol and confined itself to purely formal research: “it remained purely a décor* empty of ideas... a splendid uniform, luxury clothing... It translates only ideas and aesthetic feelings. It is a poem of abstract lines that expresses merely its own beauty.”

Art, then, detached from any human reality, art *out of touch*, to use current language.

The epigraphic décor then gets the same harsh treatment. Far from reflecting active mystical thought, Islamic epigraphy only reflects, according to Terrasse, “the monotony of rudimentary liturgy”.

Finally, its geometric decor, where one might be tempted to decipher metaphysical anxiety, some dizziness of knowledge, the expression of dreams undefined, is but a closed system of interlacing motifs that “turn round and repeat themselves indefinitely”.

We know that the current trends and evolution of contemporary aesthetics denounce all these convictions; it is difficult not to attribute them to bias (24). Terrasse’s book, in fact, ends with paternalistic and bucolic tones that announce a full program of intervention and distortion. Because, if understood according to the schemes we have described, how would Moroccan art not have been distorted by its new “protectors”? The scientific escalation, in any case, served only to prepare enormous documentary material that it projected as a tangle of false leads.

Conclusion

Rethinking the colonial science of humanities cannot matter if it remains a simple objection to colonial ideology. This work will be ineffective if it remains, in terms of history, as but an attempt at verification or rehabilitation, if it does not lead to final clarification and an objective take on our current realities. Today, it is less about resolving historical issues than it is about seeing our present clearly. However, working on the past is necessary for us to understand the present. The history of formerly colonized peoples does not benefit from the progressive harmony of colonizing countries. The history of the latter is, to some degree *constructive*, it has developed along with authentic realities according to internal socio-economic laws. Our history, in contrast, has been traumatized; it has experienced with the colonial period a time of discontinuity that blurred its intrinsic logic. Therefore, any interim assessment of our realities, any scenario, needs to go through the consideration of the different accidents that have afflicted our history with multiple ambiguities.

It is in this sense that we have written this introduction (25).

FOOTNOTES

- (1) See “Realities and Dilemmas of National Culture (II), Souffles 62”, 67th quarter, for development of this issue.
- (2) My aim in writing is neither to please nor to have others agree with me.
- (3) “Fanatic” is the colonial historian’s favorite word to describe the Moroccan, especially “the Arab”.
- (4) The generation of our elders truly betrayed us in Morocco, which was not the case in Algeria, for example.
- (5) That colonization made us advance in time by bringing us suddenly into the industrial era and modern life is another matter entirely.
- (6) From a recent book on “contemporary Arab ideology”. (Laâbi does not name him in the article.)
- (7) A significant number of research works of this time were dedicated to Lyautey.
- (8) The political role of such an investigation is obvious.
- (9) Speech of G. Hardy, Director of Public Instruction. Proceedings of the 2nd IHEM Congress, *Hespéris*, 1921, 4th quarter.
- (10) We give these names only as examples.
- (11) *Hespéris*, 1925, Volume V.
- (12) The author of this article has already begun this work, envisaged as a thorough re-examination of the colonial social sciences in Morocco. The author will also focus on the historical evolution of colonial ideology, which will obviously bring nuance to the data of this article.
- (13) In *Hespéris*, 1948 3rd-4th quarters.
- (14) My emphasis.
- (15) See, inter alia, “Arabes et Berbères” by General E. Brémond. Payot, Paris 1950; “La Berbérie, l’Islam et la France”, by Eugene Guernier, Ed. of the French Union, Paris 1950.
- (16) “Le passé de l’Afrique du Nord”. Payot, Paris 1952.
- (17) E. Doutté, "En Tribu." Geuthner, 1914. Travel between 1901-1907.
- (18) Abdelhaï Kettani was a valuable source for the specialists.

(19) Henri Basset: “La littérature des berbères” (Carbonel, Algiers, 1920).

(20) Most of these researchers were conservative, not in step with the artistic revolutions taking place at that time in Europe. Terrasse does not hide his scepticism vis-à-vis the “fertile chaos of modern art”.

(21) H. Terrasse and J. Hainaut - Les Arts décoratifs au Maroc – Henri Laurens Publisher. Paris. 1925. We speak here of H. Terrasse as the author. We believe that J. Hainaut’s participation was essentially in the graphic area.

(22) In this preliminary phase of research and reflection on our heritage, it is very difficult to tackle the major classical theories proclaimed by colonial writers about our art. Although intuition plays a large role in making any challenge, we should bring a scientific approach to the beginning of any serious work, and over the long term. On other hand, the preliminary clean-up work is not possible if we wait for 100 archaeologists, sociologists and art specialists to be trained. And if it is not always possible to make decisive comparisons, we can, however, already operate a number of verifications and corrections at the socio-historical and ideological levels; we can at least begin to liberate our artistic material and its history from the narrowness that has always distorted their communication, and bring them to new assessment.

(23) Terrasse here follows a classification of Ibn Khaldun. If one lists all the misleading quotes that were extorted from Ibn Khaldun, he becomes a champion of colonial ideology.

(24) The reader is referred to the sections on the “plastic tradition” in the questionnaires of Chebaa and Melehi for confrontation.

(25) Realities and dilemmas of national culture (III).