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The Algerian War in the French Education System: a Case Study of the Transmission of Memory

This thesis examines memory and its transmission through a case study of the Algerian war of national independence in terminale history classes in France. It argues that while these classes may, in relative terms, be an important vector of “memory” for the young, in absolute terms very little information is transmitted. Indeed, as currently taught, the history of the Algerian war is increasingly partial, fragmentary and selective. This is clearly shown through a study of both written and oral sources, including particularly textbooks and extensive interviews with pupils, teachers and historians.

Various theories of memory are referred to in order to explain this position, as are a number of practical considerations. It is argued that, at the national/collective level, the past still to a large extent determines the present desire to live together. History classes continue to play an important role in this process (despite significant changes in social formations). More specifically, the complex relationship between individual and collective constructions of the past is examined by discussing the experiences of both teachers and pupils. Particular attention is given here to the way in which a collective “French” memory is transmitted to children of immigrant origin. The way the war is taught serves both to reflect and to determine its wider social commemoration, and history lessons thus contribute to the generational transformation of this memory that may now be observed.

The thesis concludes that it is more accurate to talk now of an almost total French “ignorance” of the Algerian war, rather than of the psychological “repression” conventionally associated with the conflict. Moreover, the continued existence of competing accounts of the war on the part of mutually hostile interest groups serves further to limit its discussion, as does the weakness of other vectors of memory. The stakes of the Algerian “memory-war” are still high, as selective comparisons with the Vichy experience reveal. It seems ultimately that the Algerian war is examined sufficiently to avoid the emergence of significant resentment from any quarter, but not adequately to permit any genuine questioning of what remains a little known period of the French past.
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BRIEF CHRONOLOGY OF THE ALGERIAN WAR

1945
May 8 Nationalist demonstrations and insurrection in Sétif. The police fire shots into the crowd. Muslims massacre Europeans. Colonial troops retaliate leading to thousands of deaths. VE Day in Europe while de Gaulle is head of government.

1947
August A reform creates two electoral colleges in Algeria.

1954
November 1 Beginning of the Algerian war. Series of attacks across Algeria organised by the Front de Libération Nationale (F.L.N.) despite small number of men and weapons.

December Messali Hadj creates the Mouvement National Algérien (M.N.A.), which is a rival of the F.L.N., and replaces his Mouvement pour le Triomphe des Libertés Démocratiques (M.T.L.D.).

1955
May Decision to recall people who had already done their military service (rappelés), who were sent to Algeria.
August 20-21 Uprising in Philippeville leads to savage repression.

1956
February 6 Guy Mollet, French Prime Minister at the head of the Republican Front, is bombarded with tomatoes in Algiers during an official visit.

March "Pouvoirs spéciaux" voted while Mollet head of government, which led to conscription and recall of reservists. Number of soldiers in Algeria to double to 400,000.

May 18 Nineteen French conscripts are killed and mutilated near Palestro.

September F.L.N. bombs coffee shops in Algiers frequented by young pieds-noirs.
October 22  Plane containing Ahmed Ben Bella, Mohammed Khider, Mohammed Boudiaf, Hocine Ait Ahmed and Mostefa Lacheraf (leaders of the F.L.N.) is forced to land in Algiers by the French airforce. The plane was flying from Rabat to Tunis so its passengers were hijacked.

1957

January- September  Battle of Algiers during which General Massu, at the head of the Tenth Division of Parachutists, fought against terrorist attacks in the city. Widespread use of torture, which had been used in Algeria since before the war and also took place in France during the war.

May 29  F.L.N. fighters massacre all the men in a village called Mélouza, which was pro-M.N.A.

1958

February 8  Sakhiet-Sidi-Youssef, a village in Tunisia, is bombarded by the French air force. Sixty-nine people killed, including many children; over a hundred injured.

May 13  “Comité de salut public” established in Algiers. Army takes power. Call for the return of de Gaulle from General Massu. Settlers also call for his return.

June 1  De Gaulle becomes Prime Minister.

June 4  De Gaulle speech “Je vous ai compris” in Algeria.

1959

September 16  De Gaulle in a speech declares Algerians’ right to “autodétermination”.

1960

January 24-31  “Semaine des barricades” in Algiers. Settlers rebel against de Gaulle.

September 5- October 1  Trial in Paris of the “réseau Jeanson” who were “porteurs de valise” i.e. French people who resisted the Algerian war by helping the F.L.N.

September 5  De Gaulle speaks of an “Algérie algérienne”.

vi
September 6  
Publication of the “Manifeste des 121”, which was a petition signed to state people’s right to disobey and incite conscripts to desert.

1961
April 10  
First attacks claimed by O.A.S., a group founded by defenders of French Algeria in the European community and the army. It used violence in this first period to oppose de Gaulle’s Algerian policy.

April 21-22  
“Putsch des généraux”. Challe, Jouhaud, Zeller and Salan attempt to seize power in Algiers. Ultimately this is a failure.

October 17  
Demonstration in Paris against curfew on “Français musulmans”. Severe repression by French police. Numerous deaths.

1962
February 8  
Anti-O.A.S. demonstration in Paris. Eight deaths at the tube station Charonne after violent charges by the police.

March 19  
Accords d’Evian come into effect. Cease-fire.

March 26  
Deaths at the Rue d’Isly in Algiers when a demonstration by pieds-noirs is fired upon by army. Over fifty people killed and more than one hundred injured.

March-April  
Numerous attacks by O.A.S. A second period of “politique de la terre brûlée” in which this group destroyed what they had previously tried to defend. Massive exodus of pieds-noirs. Massacre of harkis.

July 1  
Algerian Independence.
INTRODUCTION

THE ALGERIAN WAR: HISTORY, MEMORY AND PEDAGOGY
Introduction

The Algerian War: History, Memory and Pedagogy

1.1. The Field of Study

This thesis examines the way the Algerian war (1954-1962) is taught in terminale history classes in French secondary schools. It therefore examines memory and its transmission. Memory here is a metaphor, in much the same way as the term "collective memory" is, and the use of this term will be justified throughout the thesis. Memory as a subject of academic interest has shot to prominence in recent years as much scholarly work has been conducted on various countries' "memories" of different events in their past, notably conflicts. Transmission means that this thesis does not study in depth the memories of individual actors or groups who participated in the Algerian war of what they lived through. Rather the thesis examines the transmission of such memories to generations that did not live through the conflict. Due to the age of participants in the two main recent periods of turbulent French history — Vichy (1940-1944) and the Algerian war — transmission of memory is an important subject at present. Transmission of memories can take place through various "vectors of memory" as described by the French historian Henry Rousso in Le Syndrome de Vichy. Reference to this work is made below. Schools are one way this transmission takes place, indeed a very important one, especially in France, as this thesis will show. Rousso describes school history programmes as "le mode de transmission sociale par excellence" of memory. This thesis therefore examines social memory.

When we use the term memory what we are referring to basically is what we remember. This is of interest in terms of individuals, groups and societies since it is linked to our beliefs and our identity. It is inherently linked to our past, which determines in part the present and the future. Memories are used in the present so we can very usefully question what we remember, how, when, where, with whom and why. In a later section of this Introduction more reflection will be given to the subject of memory, through much reference to work on social and collective memory in general.

2 Ibid., p. 253.
including that in particular of Maurice Halbwachs. What is meant by vector of memory is the use Rousso makes of this term:

La mémoire nationale, celle qui s'inscrit dans un patrimoine commun, se forme après réception de multiples signaux. On appelle ici vecteur tout ce qui propose une reconstruction volontaire de l'événement, à des fins sociales. Qu'elle soit consciente ou non, qu'elle délivre un message explicite ou implicite, les nombreuses représentations de l'événement participent toutes à la définition d'une mémoire collective. 3

Such vectors include films, literature, the media, and commemoration. They all transmit information on events and shape the way we conceive the past. This thesis will study history classes as one particular vector of memory which plays a role in shaping our view of the past and therefore collective memory. A last point to note here is that we will see below important differences in terminology between memory, forgetting and "occultation" or "repression". We can begin to reflect on the exact meaning of these terms immediately. What is meant by occultation is the act of trying to silence reference to a subject. If a historical event is occulted action is taken, by the state, for example, to make it extremely difficult to discuss, to remember. Such subjects tend to become taboo. An example of this can be censorship, the use of which aims to prevent the transmission of knowledge on a given subject. Another includes keeping archives secret and hindering the work of historians. Repression is more individual, although it could also be taken to describe a group, and means that individuals try not to remember an event. This might be due to shame or trauma. Sigmund Freud pioneered work in this area. It is difficult not to remember as elements of the present bring back such memories and make forgetting impossible. More reflection will be made throughout this thesis on this terminology, notably in the first literature review given below.

This is necessary since the Algerian war is studied as it was a recent, important event whose memory has been described by other work as repressed or occulted. It was a long, hard war that ended less than forty years ago. It ended over one hundred and thirty years of French colonial presence in Algeria, which consisted of three French départements. Indeed Algeria was a French département before Savoie was. This partly explains why the Algerian war was so divisive and brought down the French Fourth Republic and was only ended four years after the return to power of General de Gaulle at the high price of abandoning Algeria despite an extremely hard-earned military victory — one obtained by the use of torture and other "counter-revolutionary" methods, largely developed and used by the French. The war polarised many into radically opposed groups. Two examples of such groups include pieds-noirs (European settlers) and harkis (Muslim soldiers who fought for the French), both of whom had to

3 Ibid., p. 251.
flee Algeria in a massive exodus at the end of the war to avoid being massacred, which was the dramatic fate of many who were unable to leave, especially harkis.

Many French people were involved in the Algerian war since the contingent (conscripts) were sent to fight in Algeria. Most families in France now still have members who fought in Algeria. The war mobilised vast resources and clearly marked a whole generation. Most of the actors in the war are still alive which means that the stakes of the war are still high. This is especially true since there is a legacy to the colonial period in the form of immigration, which itself has profoundly changed France, and French identity. The thesis makes reference to work on “post-modern” France in order to try to link the way the Algerian war is taught to key issues in contemporary French society such as the place of ethnic minorities and the Republic. Indeed many commentators argue that the anti-Arab feeling that can be detected in France at present stems to a large extent from the trauma of the Algerian war. The thesis therefore argues that the memory of the Algerian conflict is important to an understanding of contemporary France.

This thesis studies education in so far as it examines the place of a subject in history classes. It develops the idea of an “educational chain”. This can be defined as a chain — in the sense of a series of horizontal and vertical links — that connects on the one hand the state and on the other pupils. We can therefore identify different actors and different levels or arenas all of which are important in teaching. Examples of this are the government and the Ministry of Education for decisions on whether or not to change the programme; and classroom practice, where teachers and pupils interact and actual teaching takes place. It is significant since it allows us to differentiate between what is supposed to be taught and what is actually taught. This can be important on a subject which we know has been occulted by the French authorities. It can also significantly increase our information on the way the Algerian war is taught which in turn greatly helps us to develop a rich understanding of why this may be the case. This is achieved in this thesis by the substantial use of material gathered in interviews with teachers and pupils in Lyons. Such an approach had not been used before and therefore accounts for much of the originality and interest of the project. Interviews were also conducted with two key-players, both highly important since they have played a significant role in writing contemporary French history (as authors, editors, directors of research and members of institutions) and teaching that history as Inspecteurs (functionaries), designers of programmes or editors of textbooks. Negotiating access to these historians, teachers and pupils is difficult but essential.

More generally we can note here that the project focuses on the terminale year, at the end of which pupils sit the baccalauréat. Terminale is the final year of secondary school. The baccalauréat is of crucial personal and communal significance in France. The annual examinations, in terms of their content and as a social event, are widely commented on in the media. Passing the baccalauréat allows pupils to go to university.
and crowns their time in secondary education. The examination itself is very symbolic. It is a central institution of the Republic, one which despite its practical disadvantages (e.g. cost and inefficiency) the French are not prepared yet to replace. Vincent Descombes, in his book *Le Même et l'autre*, describing the teaching of philosophy, refers to the *baccaulaureat* as “cette incarnation de l'idéal égalitaire”. The French education system can also be noted to be characterised by a very centralised organisation, which is very different from the British system. We will see practical details of this throughout the thesis.

Memory changes over time, hence the importance of studying it. Examples of this concerning the French collective memory of the Algerian war include the partial “opening” of French society in the early 1990s to the conflict, after decades of the subject being taboo. This development will be described below in depth and included significant advances in historical work on the Algerian war, activity linked to the thirtieth anniversary of the war and important films. Many other recent events could be described here to show the way the present forges memories. Indeed we will see throughout this thesis examples of this, two of which occurred in the year 2000. The French singer Enrico Macias attempted to stage a concert in Algeria, and the film *Là-bas, mon pays* directed by Alexandre Arcady was screened. Both of these constitute small developments in the collective memory of pieds-noirs, since Macias and Arcady are of pied-noir origin. Developments in the collective memory of conscripts can be seen in the way in which a stamp was issued in 1997 by the French post office to pay homage to those who fought in Algeria, and in the increase in the number of “rues du 19 mars 1962” in recent years. The F.N.A.C.A. (“Fédération Nationale des Anciens Combattants d’Algérie, Maroc et Tunisie”), a veterans’ association, has pursued this memorial policy of naming streets after the date the cease-fire between the French government and the F.L.N. (“Front de Libération Nationale”: Algerian nationalists who fought against the French in Algeria) came into effect. However other associations have opposed these moves, since many people died after this date in Algeria as a consequence of the war.

Other important developments have occurred in recent years and concern what might be called “an official memory” of the Algerian war. These are important since much of the work to date has insisted on the importance of the absence of official recognition of the war and what happened during it. Two particular developments are described below to illustrate the changing nature of the memory of the conflict and the need to study the 1990s, thus beginning to write the recent history of the memory of the Algerian war. The first change is the way in which since 1997 there has been a certain official recognition of a state of “war” in Algeria between 1954 and 1962. Indeed the Algerian

---

war was for a very long time referred to as “the war without a name”, which was also the title of a book by an American historian on the war in Algeria. Bertrand Tavernier also named his ground-breaking film on the memory of conscripts La Guerre sans nom, which was first screened in 1992. French authorities at the time referred to “pacification” or “opérations de maintien de l’ordre”. This increased recognition has most visibly culminated in a plaque being laid on the Arc de Triomphe which bore the name “la guerre d’Algérie”. The second change has been increased recognition of the events in Paris of October 17, 1961, when significant numbers of French Muslims were killed by French police during a demonstration. This was publicised notably during Maurice Papon’s trial in Bordeaux and his unsuccessful attempt to sue Jean-Luc Einaudi. Maurice Papon was tried for “crimes against humanity” for his role as a Vichy functionary, but was also the head of police (“préfet de police”) in Paris in the early 1960s, after having pursued his career in the colonies. Jean-Luc Einaudi is a journalist/historian who wrote a book in which he examined the massacre of October 17, 1961, and criticised the role of Papon in this event.

This introduction is divided into five sections. The first gives details of two particular important recent developments in the French collective memory of the Algerian war. The second section provides two literature reviews in an attempt to begin to justify the need for my particular subject of study. The first of these examines previous work on the memory of the Algerian war and the second gives details of other work on the way the conflict is taught in France. Both of these will highlight the need for further work on the memory of the Algerian war and will help us to situate this thesis in relation to other work on the question. The third section of this introduction examines the historiography of the war. It therefore begins to set the theoretical scene for the particular case study of memorial transmission and empirical work conducted in Lyons. The fourth section includes some theoretical reflections on memory, which are very important, since they will be drawn upon to try to explain why the war in Algeria is taught the way it is. They will give us different understandings of memory which will help us question the role of schools and history lessons in (French) society. The final section explains the corpus, methodology and contribution of this project.

1.2. Developments at the End of the 1990s in the French Collective Memory of the Algerian War

---

1.2.1. Nomenclature: Naming the Algerian War

On February 28, 1999, a plaque was laid on the Arc de Triomphe which read “Aux morts pour la France lors de la guerre d’Algérie et des combats en Tunisie et au Maroc, 1952-1962”. On October 16, 1998, a similar plaque had been laid at Notre Dame de Lorette which read “Ici repose un soldat inconnu mort pour la France lors de la guerre d’Algérie”. In both cases the crucial point to note is the use of the term “guerre d’Algérie” on key national public monuments. The Algerian war is therefore ceasing to be “une guerre sans nom” and the use of the word “war” is a very important development. Most important of all for this commentator is the aspect of recognition and acknowledgement of a certain state of events which are crucial for mourning and ultimately for, eventually, accepting the past. As a leading article noted in *La Voix du Combattant*, a publication of the French veterans’ association the U.N.C. (“l’Union Nationale des Combattants”):

Cette cérémonie marque la reconnaissance tangible et officielle de l’appellation de GUERRE à ce que précédemment, on qualifiait d’événements ou d’opérations. [...] Ainsi l’intensité des combats est enfin reconnue, la fiction qu’une Nation ne peut se faire la guerre à elle-même parce que l’Algérie était départements français donc du ressort de la politique intérieure, tombe.7

The key words here are “reconnaissance” and “officielle” highlighting the importance of official recognition which could facilitate the acceptance of what happened in the Algerian war. Also important is the way in which this has been a process, started in September 1997 when Jean-Pierre Masseret, “Secrétaire d’Etat aux Anciens Combattants”, first gave a speech in which he in public verbally used the term “la guerre d’Algérie”8. This process ran through to June 10, 1999, when the French Parliament passed a law making official the use of the term “guerre d’Algérie” in legal texts.

What has led to this development? It would seem that Jean-Pierre Masseret played an essential role in this process and that logically, given that he represents veterans, that veterans’ associations (through lobbying) were to some extent responsible for the momentum required to achieve this move. Masseret became a member of the Socialist-led government in 1997 which partly explains the timing of these moves but, an important point to note in my opinion is the way in which veterans seem to be wielding more and more influence demographically, socially and politically. Perhaps this is due principally to the way in which veterans were about to or were beginning to take retirement at the end of the 1990s, giving them more opportunity to invest time and

---

7Leading article in *La Voix du Combattant*, no. 1644, April 1999, pp. 6-7.
8He gave the speech in Pavie in the Gers département of France.
energy in the activities of veterans’ associations. Previous studies have also shown the way in which as people grow older they may, towards the end of their lives, want to come to terms with, and transmit, memories that they previously repressed.\(^9\) Distance between the event being remembered and the present may also facilitate remembering. All of these factors explain the greater official recognition which currently exists in France and can also be expected to weigh heavily in future developments concerning the memory of the Algerian war.

However questions remain as to what real effect such moves will have, especially given that they have occurred nearly forty years after the end of the war. This means that for forty years the war was indeed “une guerre sans nom” and introduces the idea of past inability to name the war as hindering present and future memories of it, even if from 1999 onwards the war will be properly named officially. To what extent can past deficiencies now be compensated for? However it could be argued that acknowledging a state of war in principle will facilitate acknowledging many other elements of the war in Algeria, such as torture. The question of transmission of memory here seems essential. Arguably the crucial issue concerning the memory of the war is the extent to which such developments in one sphere will be diffused throughout the whole of French society. Did French people in significant number seize the importance of this change when it was (briefly) announced on television on the news or was it just certain groups that celebrated? Was it just the generation that actively took part in the Algerian war that were concerned by this historic change or were younger generations also aware of its importance? And whatever the answer to the last question, what role has the teaching of the war played in that process of transmission? By examining the transmission of the memory of the Algerian war through the education system this thesis aims to address this question in particular.

1.2.2. October 17, 1961

Another development in the memory of the Algerian war relates to what happened in Paris on October 17, 1961. For nearly thirty years this was a taboo subject; the only significant time it was debated in public (at least in print) before 1991 perhaps being the publication of Didier Daeninckx’s police novel *Meurtres pour Mémoire* in 1984\(^{10}\). That process started in 1984, and culminated in 1999 during a trial in which Maurice Papon was trying to sue the journalist/historian Jean-Luc Einaudi for defamation. During the trial a French judge, who is by definition a state representative, acknowledged that there was a “massacre” in Paris that night. Papon tried to sue Einaudi because the latter wrote in an article in *Le Monde* that it was Papon who “ordered” the “massacre”. A key point


in that process between 1984 and 1999 again consisted of the early 1990s, as the French historian Guy Pervillé noted:

Pour la première fois, à l’occasion de son trentième anniversaire, la commémoration de la manifestation et de la répression du 17 octobre 1961 à Paris a réussi à percer le mur d’ignorance et d’indifférence des médias.11

Indeed, it was in 1991 that Einaudi published his book La Bataille de Paris and that year also that Mehdi Lalaoui and Agnès Denis presented their film Le Silence du fleuve at a film festival held at the “Institut du Monde arabe” in October 1991. Both the book and the film examined what happened in Paris on October 17, 1961 — a peaceful march at the time of negotiations between de Gaulle and the F.L.N., organised by the French section of the F.L.N. to protest against a curfew imposed on “Français musulmans” in Paris, which was ferociously suppressed by the French authorities leading to it being described by certain historians as a “pogrom”.

The events of that night have certainly been one of the most occulted events of the Algerian war, again with no recognition by the state of what happened leading the historian Benjamin Stora to describe this as a “massacre non-reconnu”. Two other examples given by Stora of such massacres are what happened at the subway station Charonne in Paris in February 1962 and the deaths in “la rue d’Isly” in Algiers in March 196212. Elements that explain such a cover-up and subsequent suppression of truth include the way that perhaps over a hundred (estimations varying from certainly tens to perhaps hundreds) “Français musulmans” were killed that night by the French police, certainly including people being beaten to death or thrown in the Seine river. That the events took place in Paris, in 1961, while Papon was chief of police in the city and involved the French police have all also facilitated and encouraged a cover-up; as has the fact that de Gaulle was in power at that time.

Another important point in this process occurred in 1997 at the trial in Bordeaux which examined Papon’s activities during Vichy and found him guilty of crimes against humanity. It was at that point that the next significant breakthrough came after the early 1990s opening. A journalist in Le Point noted that the Algerian war was like Pandora’s box and said: “Trente-cinq ans après la signature des accords d’Evian, la guerre d’Algérie s’est invitée sans prévenir à la barre du procès Papon.”13 This again shows how unexpectedly for most French people the Algerian war reappears in the present. Elsewhere in her article she talked of the Algerian war being a nightmare, another
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murky chapter of modern French history, and highlighted the way the Papon trial was reopening the wounds caused by the Algerian conflict. It was therefore during the original Papon trial that the events of October 17, 1961, were discussed in court. That led to significant press coverage and also caused the French government (through Catherine Trautmann and Jean-Pierre Chevènement) to begin moves to grant easier access to archives. However battles over archives may continue as to which archives are open, to whom, when and so on. Such issues can clearly be seen in Claude Liauzu’s article in Cahiers d’histoire immédiate in 1999 in which he speaks of “archives réservées” to describe the fact that only certain historians have had access to certain archives\(^\text{14}\). Furthermore it is highly unlikely that it be possible now through consulting archives to state with much more precision what happened that night due to deliberate omissions in what documents were kept. Nonetheless the debates in the courtrooms, the press coverage and the reactions of the government all constitute progress in a slow move away from the event being occulted and taboo.

The importance of these two developments in the official memory of the Algerian war mentioned above can be gauged by setting them against a statement by Stora in 1994:

A la différence de Vichy, il n’existe absolument aucune reconnaissance d’une quelconque culpabilité, parce qu’il est impensable de reconnaître que la France ait conduit une guerre contre une fraction d’elle-même, puisque l’Algérie était la France! Tout en connaissant la torture, elle ne la reconnaît pas officiellement. Il faut faire la distinction entre connaissance et reconnaissance. Dans l’espace public commémoratif, il n’y a rien : le 17 octobre 1961 n’est pas la rafle du Vél’ d’Hiv’\(^\text{15}\).

Having identified that the memory of the Algerian war is evolving over the years, as is to be expected, and is very much a concern in the present, let us now turn to two literature reviews which will help us to situate this thesis in relation to other work on the memory of the Algerian war.

1.3. Literature Reviews

1.3.1. Literature Review: The Memory of the Algerian War

---


A reasonable amount of work has already been done on the memory of the Algerian war. The main contribution to this came at the end of the 1980s and can be found in the book *La Guerre d'Algérie et les Français*, which published the papers given at a Conference; although other scholars such as Benjamin Stora have also contributed enormously to our understanding of this subject. This work shows us that a first important step in understanding the memory of the Algerian war consists of differentiating between forgetting and occulting memories. Robert Frank has shown that for the Algerian war:

Ce n'est pas de l'oubli, puisque oublier, c'est, sur un sujet donné, vider la mémoire de ses souvenirs; or la mémoire française est pleine de l'Algérie, mais de souvenirs qu'elle a longtemps enfouis, cachés, contenus. Il ne faut pas confondre oubli et occultation. Les souvenirs occultés peuvent resurgir violemment à la surface, lorsque l'actualité déchire un coin du voile. 

The Algerian war, at least at the end of the 1980s, was not therefore forgotten; its memory was repressed. Why are memories repressed and not truly forgotten? For Frank the present would seem to be crucial, hence his use of the image of a veil being torn or lifted by events in the present which bring back memories and render forgetting impossible. In other words the present unveils elements of the past that one would rather forget. Jean-Pierre Rioux can also help us here. Writing in the same volume as Frank, he argued that because there were many sequels of the Algerian war to be found in contemporary French society, there could not be memory. The present that was bringing back repressed memories (Frank), or hindering the creation of memory through the continuing existence of sequels and stakes of the war (Rioux) took the form of terrorism, events in Algeria, the independence of New Caledonia, the rise of the French National Front, debates on immigration in general and on identity in particular (Rioux). There would seem to be a two-way process. On the one hand the Algerian war historically speaking dictates parts of the present in terms of its sequels; on the other hand parts of the present affect the memory of the war by rendering it impossible to forget. In both cases, the Algerian war and its memory are of key importance in understanding contemporary French society. As an editorialist in *Le Monde* stated:

Un tel passé ne peut que peser sur les rapports de l’ancienne puissance coloniale avec l’Algérie indépendante certes, mais aussi avec les Français d’origine algérienne qui, par choix ou par contrainte, ont décidé de vivre dans l’Hexagone.
Stora supports this view and argues that the Algerian war is being repeated in the present. When talking of the way in which there was a contradiction between words and actions in colonial Algeria:

[...] (dans la France de nos jours) on proclame l'assimilation et l'intégration en droit, et dans les faits c'est le différentialisme qui est mis en œuvre, parce que les Arabes, les musulmans en général, sont trop différents pour pouvoir être intégrés. On assiste à un transfert de la problématique algérienne sur le territoire métropolitain. Ce qui existait sur le territoire algérien au temps des colonies se retrouve posé un siècle ou cinquante ans plus tard à l'intérieur de l'Hexagone, ici en France. 20

He also agrees that in the present concerning the memory of the Algerian war “l’enjeu est énorme”. 21 Memories of the Algerian war have therefore been repressed but are ultimately, for Frank, impossible to repress totally or definitively — there has been an “amnésie très partielle et non durable”. 22 The Algerian conflict’s memory has been repressed whereas the war in Indo-China is truly forgotten as it almost never reappears in the present and is almost completely absent. Much of this work would therefore seem to be inspired by historians working within what might be called the Freudian tradition. The authors argue that repression is bad for French society as it leads to a repetition in the present of old divisions; it prevents a serene memory from existing and perpetuates the injury caused by painful memories; and indeed the present will always bring back repressed memories so it is futile to try and avoid facing such memories.

Why have such memories been repressed? The Algerian war is repressed because it was a very painful and divisive event in French history. It is often referred to as “une plaie” (a wound) or “une cicatrice” (a scar) indicating injury. A central question concerning the Algerian war has been “le deuil” (mourning) also indicating loss and death. Stora is perhaps the best person to indicate why the nature of the war itself has shaped its memory. In La Gangrène et l'oubli, published in 1991, he showed how the occultation since 1962 of what happened in Algeria stems directly from a denial to admit a state of war between 1954 and 1962. Rather than “guerre d'Algérie” one talked at the time of “opérations de maintien de l'ordre” or “événements”. Algeria was claimed to be three French départements and therefore an internal question, with “hors-la-loi” leading a “rébellion” rather than fighting a war. All indicating why the Algerian war is often now referred to as “une guerre sans nom”. Rioux also insists on the importance of nomenclature by citing Halbwachs’s 23 three “cadres sociaux de la
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20 Op. cit., p. 229. “(Dans la France de nos jours)” added by me to clarify the context of the quotation.
21 Ibid., p. 240.
mémoire”, one of which is language. The other two are space and time, also problematic, as Rioux points out:

Pas de mots pour le dire, pas d’images, ou si peu, pour le revivre, pas de dates pour le circonscrire et signaler son importance dans le cours des temps; pas de hauts lieux, pas de héros indiscutés, pas de batailles à localisation symbolique, pas d’ennemis clairements identifiés de bout en bout : on comprend que ce conflit n’ait pas été commémorable.\footnote{RIOUX, J-P, “La flamme et les bûchers”, in RIOUX J-P (ed.), \textit{La Guerre d’Algérie et les Français}, Paris, Fayard, 1990, p. 502.}

Stora also insists on the elements of the Algerian war that people do not want to remember or cannot bring themselves to remember because they are not proud of what happened in Algeria. The history of the Algerian conflict is one of massacres, the use of internment camps, mass rounding up of populations, treason, indifference, abandonment, executions, terrorism, torture and so on. The Algerian war is quite rightly referred to as “une sale guerre”. A long list of acts can be drawn up that people do not want to remember because they are painful and shameful and therefore have immense difficulty accepting, talking about or facing up to. For Frank however the memory of the war in Algeria was not a taboo subject at the end of the 1980s, although it had been so for a long time. This strengthens the argument developed above that the memory of the Algerian war has been evolving slowly over recent years.

The war was an incredibly divisive and violent conflict which has made it difficult to remember. A parallel can be drawn with the French memory of Vichy which has also proved notoriously difficulty for French society to face up to. Frank draws this parallel by showing how both wars contained defeat and “événements peu glorieux”. However for Frank there are positive aspects to the French experience of Vichy — essentially the Resistance and the Free French Forces — which can be remembered, whereas as concerns Algeria there is nothing positive to commemorate or remember. Furthermore, in the Algerian war there is a certain “replaying” of World War Two in so far as similar issues reoccur except that rather than it being the Germans who are “les bourreaux” (torturers.executioners) this time it is the French making the Algerian war far more difficult to remember than the Second World War. Crucial for an understanding of the French memory of the Algerian war is recognition that the war itself comprised “une guerre franco-algérienne”, “une guerre franco-française” and “une guerre algéro-algérienne”. This explains the immense division that the war created and that has shaped its memory. However, as Stora shows, difficult aspects to remember not only concern the war period but also the pre-war colonial period. Ultimately perhaps the hardest points to remember are truths that shatter the dominant French discourse on Republican values. For Stora:
Le problème algérien dans la société française est d’autant plus difficile à comprendre qu’il touche aux principes de la République (il s’agit de trois départements échappant à l’organisation républicaine de la société tout en étant partie prenante de cette organisation) et en même temps offre l’image d’une société du Sud sous domination. Telle est la contradiction principale, et l’indépendance va apparaître comme la seule façon de dénouer cette contradiction. A partir de là, comment en France, l’Algérie peut-elle être intégrée dans un patrimoine de mémoire ? Elle est perçue comme partie prenante du territoire français, donc de l’histoire de la Nation et de la République française, et en même temps elle n’est pas intégrée parce qu’elle est différente des principes d’organisation qui régissent la Nation et la République.²⁵

The fact that the Algerian war has been occulted and was a “guerre franco-française” has led to the existence of group memories (plural) rather than a collective/national memory (singular). The different protagonists, forming groups, have different memories: conscripts, professional soldiers, O.A.S. members (“Organisation Armée Secrète”: European activists who used violence to try to oppose de Gaulle and Algerian nationalists), the European settlers, metropolitan French people, harkis, immigrants and so on. All commentators writing at the end of the 1980s or the beginning of the 1990s agreed on this point. For Stora this was what he called “la solitude des porteurs de mémoire”. Indeed, Stora produced a documentary at the beginning of the 1990s entitled Les Années algériennes and, when explaining in an interview what he had hoped to accomplish by producing this documentary, Stora said he had wanted to “faire circuler la mémoire entre chacun des groupes qui ne se connaissent pas et qui ne veulent pas se parler”.²⁶

However most of the above work was written at the end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s, which was a key period in the memory of the Algerian war — eight to ten years after what Rioux called a “point d’orgue” (figuratively speaking a long interruption, therefore indicating a break with the previous twenty years) in the early 1980s, yet at the time of or at the beginning of what has been described by certain commentators as an “opening” in the memory of the war. The difficulty of writing at this moment can be seen in the work of the time. It was difficult for authors to describe with certainty whether mourning had started, was taking place (and if so since when) or was finished (and if so what was beyond mourning — memory?). Rioux often understandably used the adverb "perhaps". For example Rioux stated “Si un deuil est peut-être en cours” and “la mémoire a peut-être sa chance”. However, later in the same essay he asks the question “Le travail de deuil aurait-il pris son cours?”.²⁶

²⁶Ibid., p. 233.
Furthermore, he concluded his essay by stating "De petits signes s'accumulent, dont on pourra dire demain s'ils furent prémonitoires." 27

The key question of where France had actually reached in the process of mourning the Algerian war was impossible to answer at that time. Authors also seemed to have great difficulty concluding their work. This reader at least detects differences between Charles-Robert Ageron’s general conclusion to the book *La Guerre d'Algérie et les Français* and the conclusions of each of the essays. I also find considerably different Ageron’s fairly positive conclusion to *La Guerre d'Algérie et les Français* (1991) and his relatively negative essay in *La Guerre d'Algérie dans l'enseignement en France et en Algérie* (1993) 28 in which he highlighted the continuing difficulties (indeed impossibility) of writing a scientific history of the Algerian war. In Stora’s work we can also detect hesitation in terms of what to conclude from his findings. For example, in *La Gangrène et l'oubli* (1991) it is clear that Stora saw very few, if any, signs of lessening of tensions concerning the Algerian war. However in an article in *Libération* published a year later he felt that a very long period of mourning was coming to an end due to a sudden rush of films on Indo-China and Algeria. He stated:

Par le volume, le rythme et la fréquence rapprochée des productions d'images consacrées à ces deux pays, qui habitent fortement l'imaginaire français, le temps du travail de deuil, très long, semble aujourd'hui fini. 29

However, six years later Stora, writing in *La Guerre d'Algérie et les Algériens* (1997), spoke of any easing of tensions being in fact a cruel illusion:

La guerre d'Algérie, (comme la guerre du Viêt-nam), avec le temps qui passe, tente d'apparaître progressivement comme survivance anachronique et les séparations d'antan vécues comme autant d'anomalies. Le temps actuel, celui de l’immédiateté et de l'accélération, accentue cette impression/illusion. Cette vitesse semble tout effacer de la mémoire des vivants. Cruelle illusion. Les murs et les barrières, qui sont toujours là, peuvent vite se reformer. Les reproches reviennent. 30

My interpretation of this statement is that at times commentators may think that the Algerian war is becoming less divisive and more consensual — notably by basing their conclusion on film production — yet old divisions that one may be led to believe belong to another era still in fact exist in the present. There is therefore an illusion in the present that the memory of the Algerian war is less problematic, fanned by the way
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in which society now changes more rapidly than before\(^{31}\). This for Stora is only an illusion as there is still much division in the present concerning the Algerian war. At least for this reader this example would seem to confirm the difficulty that he and others have had drawing conclusions about the memory of the Algerian war. This thesis is based on the belief that a longer-term view may help to draw conclusions concerning the memory of the Algerian war. Through writing in the year 2000, it aims to contribute to a greater understanding of this memory by adopting a longer-term view and trying to trace longer term trends in the memory of the Algerian conflict.

This approach is necessary since many things have changed since the beginning of the 1990s. Collective memory does of course change over time. Henry Rousso, in *Le Syndrome de Vichy*, commenting on the difference between memory and history, describes memory as being “un vécu, en perpétuelle évolution”.\(^{32}\) For Pierre Nora:

> Memory is life, borne by living societies founded in its name. It remains in permanent evolution, open to the dialectic of remembering and forgetting, unconscious of its successive deformations, vulnerable to manipulation and appropriation, susceptible to being long dormant and periodically revived.\(^{33}\)

To conclude this literature review, the main work on the French memory of the Algerian war shows us that remembering this war has been highly problematic for French society. It gives us a solid analysis of individual and group memories of the Algerian war in France. However it was written for the most part in the late 1980s and early 1990s so we now need to study the 1990s. This may make drawing conclusions on this subject easier. Again it is to be expected that the nature of the memory of the war is changing. We might also argue that much, although not all, of this work would seem to be based on theoretical reflections based on Freudian concepts, which emphasise how what is repressed and occulted must be brought out into the open, and perhaps neglect other explanations that see collective memory as a necessary glue for society, something constructed by the interaction of different groups, or inherently (in France) linked to the Republic; and in all instances very much linked to the present and our identity. This thesis will try to reflect more on these issues through the case study of transmission of memory in *terminale* history classes conducted in Lyons.

### 1.3.2 Literature Review: the Teaching of the Algerian War

---

\(^{31}\) Pierre Nora’s work has introduced the concept of the acceleration of history which he describes as: “An increasingly rapid slippage of the present into a historical past that is gone for good, a general perception that anything and everything may disappear. See NORA, P, “Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire”, *Representations*, no. 26, spring 1989, p. 7.


The main research on the place of the Algerian war in the French education system to date comes from the conference "Mémoire et enseignement de la guerre d’Algérie" (M.E.D.G.A.) held in Paris on March 13-14, 1992 (close to the thirtieth anniversary of the end of the Algerian war), organised by the "Institut du monde arabe" and the "Ligue de l’enseignement". It gave rise to different publications which take slightly different forms but all of which contain the same information. This information is best given in the book Mémoire et enseignement de la guerre d’Algerie : actes du colloque, 1993.34. The Conference was aimed at furthering a "réflexion commune" in Algeria and in France on the way the Algerian war is portrayed in the media and in the education system in order to "faire progresser la connaissance objective des faits parmi les jeunes générations"35.

Of particular relevance to my research were four papers given at the conference, all of which are linked to the terminale year. They were given by Danièle Djamila Amrane-Minne, Alexis Berchadsky, Madeleine Guyon et al. and Geneviève Pastor. Amrane-Minne examined "La guerre d’Algérie à travers les manuels français et algériens de classes terminales" in five pages. The paper examined French textbooks in terms of the presentation of the massacres of August 20, 1955, which she described as a "vision réductrice de l’histoire"36. Her paper examined both French and Algerian textbooks, and was therefore interesting to a large extent because it was comparative, which is not what my study attempts to be. Berchadsky discussed "La question de la torture à travers les manuels français de classes terminales" in nine pages37. Berchadsky examined five out of twelve of the 1989 textbooks’ coverage of torture, and argued that torture had a double presence in textbooks: in terms of the battle of Algiers and in terms of metropolitan protests. It was an interesting paper on this one particular question and for its study of 1989 textbooks which I have not been able to consult.

Guyon et al. gave a paper entitled "Trente ans après : la guerre d’Algérie à travers les manuels d’histoire des classes terminales", which was five pages long38. This commentator found the paper to be very, indeed too, critical. It was based on a study of the way in which five events from the war were presented in textbooks, showing that the less glorious aspects of the war were often ignored or at best only partially treated. Guyon et al. conducted a study of seven of the twelve textbooks published in 1989.

Their study only examined textbooks. This project, although it will examine textbooks, will attempt as far as possible to situate textbooks in relation to the rest of the educational chain (rather than simply criticising them in isolation). Guyon et al.’s paper lacked reflection on what textbooks are and what can be done in a textbook; therefore there was not enough thought given to wider questions of the place of textbooks in the educational chain, the place of the educational chain in the transmission of memory, the wider memory of the Algerian war and ultimately what the role of social memory is or may be.

Lastly, Pastor examined “L’enseignement de la guerre d’Algérie en classe de terminale. Instructions officielles et sujets au baccalauréat en France” in seven pages. This paper is certainly the most useful to my research. The paper studied examination questions in the period from June 1984 to 1991, through a predominantly quantitative study in which she qualifies the period as one of a “disappointment”. It is referred to in the following chapter of this thesis. The rest of the papers examined the way the Algerian war is taught in Algeria which this thesis does not address. They also examined different points in the education system where the Algerian war may be taught — e.g. at university level — which this thesis does not do. This thesis only examines the terminale year, for the baccalauréat général, in order to keep the project within manageable proportions. Furthermore, many of the papers, despite the title of the conference, did not study the way the Algerian war is taught. In fact the vast majority examined subjects such as “Les médias face à la guerre”, “Les étudiants français et algériens et la guerre d’Algérie”, “Les valeurs en question : justice et droit” and “Cinéma et littérature sur la guerre d’Algérie”. These are essentially historical questions since they examine the period of the Algerian war which this thesis does not do.

Also of interest is the opinion poll conducted by A. Coulon and the “Laboratoire de recherche ethnométhodologique” at the university Paris VIII “Connaissances et opinions des jeunes Français” on 1,234 French people aged 17-30 in December 1991, which in published form was twenty-two pages in length. I found this fascinating because lack of resources prevented my doing this type of survey for my project. There were slight problems in their work due to timing. For example at the time they conducted their survey, the impact of television was very strong as certain films were screened, which is rather exceptional and which probably influenced the interviewees’ answers. Furthermore, their opinion poll was not restricted only to terminale pupils either, since people in their twenties were interviewed. My project includes interviews of terminale pupils which are designed to be qualitative, since only a few pupils were interviewed, but this was done in depth i.e. a lot of questions in relatively long

interviews. Beyond the M.E.D.G.A. Conference we can also note work by Guy Pervillé and Paul Fournier on the place of the Algerian war in textbooks. They studied 1983 editions of textbooks which this thesis has not been able to do (except for one textbook published by Hatier). They were speaking at the “Agoras Méditerranéennes” and their findings were published in *Historiens et Géographes*. In this way, the main source of research on the way the Algerian war is taught is the M.E.D.G.A. Conference and we can say that most of the research previously conducted on this question focused on textbook content — perhaps due to their ease of access?

My thesis therefore includes references to this previous work. The fact that my project examines the teaching of the Algerian war until the year 2000 has allowed me to build on previous research in important ways. Firstly, this thesis adds another eight years to the research already conducted. That research covered the first nine years of the question. I have concentrated mainly on the 1990s and relied on this source for the 1980s e.g. essentially for examination questions and studies of the 1989 editions of textbooks. Secondly, this thesis takes a long-term view over seventeen years and therefore is able to conduct a diachronic study which has helped me to identify and compare different reforms, different periods and trends. The timing of the project especially allows us to take into consideration the 1998 reform which we will see throughout this thesis has significantly changed the way the Algerian war is taught. It also allows us to comment on the extent of the “opening” of French society to the Algerian war that is said to have taken place at the beginning of the 1990s.

My research in the same area has allowed me to go beyond the previous work by taking into account and avoiding some of the shortcomings that can be seen concerning the 1992 Conference. The first of these is the way the education section of the conference was not based solely on the *terminale* year and was therefore less detailed than my research project is. My four year Ph.D. project is based exclusively on the *terminale* year. As can be seen above, the work directly of interest to me amounts essentially to twenty-six pages. Secondly, in my opinion, there was a lack of reflection on the general memory of the Algerian war and other aspects of the question. The three main focuses of enquiry that were present at the conference concerned history programmes/examination questions (1 paper), textbooks (3 papers), and young people’s knowledge of the Algerian war (the survey). There are certain aspects of the teaching of the Algerian war that have not been examined (which this thesis studies during the 1980s as well as the 1990s). The first of these areas is the process of reform of history programmes in the 1980s and the 1990s and the motivation for such reforms. Another is the relationship between the different actors in the field of education involved in the teaching of the Algerian war. The thesis also aims to provide a more detailed analysis of
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the impact of education on young people’s knowledge of the Algerian war, especially in relation to other vectors of memory. To do so it will focus more on the classroom level and the educational chain. The link between the teaching of the Algerian war and the nation/the French Fifth Republic will be examined more, as will the link between the past, present and future. The whole study will also tie the way the Algerian war is taught to the general memory of this colonial war.

What the Conference lacked especially was any attempt at an explanation of why the Algerian war is taught the way it is. Furthermore, we can note criticism of individual papers e.g. Rioux mentioned in his preface that he found that certain of the paper’s content was unfairly critical. Indeed he went as far as to speak of “une véhémence qui semble parfois bien peu fondée”41. Stora, when describing the two conferences “La Guerre d’Algérie et les Français” and “La Guerre d’Algérie et l’enseignement en France et en Algérie” stated that “Ce second intitulé se réleva à la fois plus vaste... et plus intime.”42 In addition, as can be seen from the press at the time of the conference, it was criticised as not being neutral. Perville in the Annuaire de l’Afrique du Nord said that the Conference was interesting mainly for its comparative angle. Often, papers at the conference were given by partisan commentators — such as secondary school teachers and people marked by the Algerian war.

Lastly, we can note that the conference was not a study of the educational chain. My choice of Lyons as an example of the way in which the Algerian war is taught in France is an attempt to conduct more detailed research in this area than can currently be found, since it has allowed me to go further than simply examining textbooks, history programmes and examination questions. In particular, I have interviewed teachers, pupils and two historians and thus placed more emphasis on what is actually taught (and how and with what results) in schools as well as studying what is supposed to be taught. In this way the thesis has tried to examine what can be called the educational chain from the Department of Education’s decisions to the classroom. The basis of this aim is the belief that there is a difference between what is actually taught and what is supposed to be taught. This commentator felt that what is actually taught is dependant on local factors such as individual personalities or experiences and the end result of the complex interaction between governments, school principals, teachers, associations and pupils. Furthermore we will see the way in which what takes place in the classroom — notably through teacher and pupil (sociological) identity — in itself helps us to explain how the war is taught. What is meant here by this term is that teachers and pupils will be shown in some cases to have important links to the Algerian war. Examples of this are those of pied-noir or Maghrebian origin. These links constitute a part of their identity in terms of their personal history, family history, community belonging, knowledge or interest.

1.4. Historiography

There are several reasons for reflecting in this thesis on how the history of the Algerian war has been written. The first of these is that the project is centred on the teaching of the Algerian war in *terminale* in France — on the transmission of memory through the education system via *histoire-géographie* lessons. Therefore if we are interested in identifying what knowledge is transmitted it is important to reflect on what is known about the war in Algeria. Obviously, there may be a relationship between what history has been written (and how, when, by whom etc.) and what history is being taught concerning the Algerian war. It is important to be able to comment on the state of knowledge on the Algerian conflict when it began to be taught in *terminale* classes in France, as well as to trace the changes in historiography since 1983 right through to the present day, and thus also to be able to evaluate the current state of knowledge on this colonial war. As will be seen below, the French historian Charles-Robert Ageron has repeatedly questioned in recent years whether a "scientific" history of the Algerian war can actually be written. If he is right in thinking that this is still impossible, the question of how this subject can actually be taught begs to be asked. Furthermore, with an event such as the Algerian war, memory is a key concept. A lot of work has been done on the memory of the war, which has been described in this Introduction. The work has shown that its memory has proved highly problematic for French society. Another question to reflect on is therefore whether the writing of the history of the war has proved as difficult as its remembering has. Moreover, it is important to reflect on historiography as this can be linked to and affected by such a selective memory and official silences. Indeed, this thesis will argue that historiography is itself a memory of sorts. Nonetheless, there is clearly a difference between memory and history as notably Pierre Nora and Henry Rousso have examined.

For both of these historians memory is alive in society and something that is continually changing. There is a bond to the present as it is often present needs and concerns that determine what, when and how we remember. Memory is affective, sometimes associated with the sacred or faith, and often associated with groups. It is varied and can be manipulated, occulted or forgotten. Memory is said to be absolute. History however is a representation of the past which is critical and analytical, a scholarly reconstruction which tends to aim to be accepted beyond groups on a more
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universal level. History is said to be relative. *A priori*, nothing is taboo for an historian. However, in my opinion, history (or rather historiography) is effectively itself a memory of sorts as in practice, at times, although there is undoubtedly a difference between memory and history, the two often appear less distant than Nora and Rousso might have us believe. It is this writer’s opinion that on a subject such as the Algerian war the difference can be a lot less than their definitions of memory and history suggest — although it is true that when describing memory and history Rousso puts “a priori” before all of his comments. Rousso also explicitly states that it is difficult to imagine a universally accepted history of Vichy or the Algerian war. This is also the position of Ageron.

Such distinctions between memory and history strike me as debatable since our knowledge of history, for example, changes over time. This takes place as more and more history is written on a subject and as new work changes our opinion of old work. This section shows the way the historiography of the Algerian war has changed over the years. So, we can say it is not just memory that changes over time. We could also argue that the history that is actually written is to a large extent determined by the present in so far as we can identify academic trends, funding considerations, publication strategies and the like. Groups have played a role in what history is written (in many ways by writing that history themselves). History is written or it is not, as the case may be. An article published in *Le Monde* in 1992 spoke of “Des historiens encombrés” concerning the Algerian war to point to the way in which the historiography of the war was weak at that time.

More widely we can make reference to E.H.Carr here on the nature of history and historiography. In *What is History?* he shows the way opinions on history changed between the end of the Victorian era and the 1950s. Beliefs concerning history had by the 1950s become far less certain and less positive than they had previously been. Much more reflection on the difficulties of writing history was evident by the 1950s. These included more reflection on what a “fact” or “historical event” actually was and the way in which historians were inevitably very selective in what they chose as worthy to be included in the history they wrote. Sources were, for Carr, less reliable than previous historians had believed. He showed the way the present was important to our view of the past, for example, in terms of the language (and its precise meaning) we use and the attitudes we have. Historians are clearly part of society and are therefore to some degree influenced by issues in the present, which in turn can influence the way they view the past. Carr also reflected on how in history we can attribute historical change to individuals or to society. Many of these considerations consist of questioning whether we can say history is a “science”. In general Carr concluded by finding some middle
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ground between extreme positions. For example, he concluded that history was to some extent a science but not completely; that historical phenomena were due partly to men and partly to wider society. One example of his moderation was as follows:

Notre examen des rapports de l'historien avec les faits historiques nous trouve donc dans une situation apparemment précaire, naviguant précautionneusement entre le Scylla d'une théorie indéfendable de l'histoire en tant que compilation objective de faits, de la primauté absolue du fait sur l'interprétation, et le Charybde non moins indéfendable de l'histoire en tant que production subjective de l'esprit de l'historien, qui établit les faits historiques et les maîtrise par le processus de l'interprétation — entre deux visions de l'histoire, l'une ayant son centre de gravité dans le passé, l'autre, dans le présent. 46

Similar issues are discussed by David Lowenthal, whose book *The Past is a Foreign Country* 47 will be drawn on further in the section on “Theoretical Reflections on Memory”. In his study of the environment we live in and the objects we possess, he examines change and preservation and how this past is used in the present. He also shows how what is chosen from this past is very selective when applied to history:

Lowenthal reveals the irony of a historical analysis in which versions of the past are variable, contested and subject to varieties of interpretation, as compared with a popular consensus that represents the past as a timeless mirror to be looked at for accurate reflections of historical events. 48

In terms of this project, we can note that scholarly work — beyond its link to providing the material to teach in schools — is in its own right a form of transmission of memory as Henry Rousso mentions in his book *Le Syndrome de Vichy*. He calls this “la mémoire savante”. For Rousso:

Les vecteurs savants reconstruisent et enseignent l'intelligibilité des faits, en proposant et en formalisant différentes lectures possibles : le livre d'histoire est, à ce titre, un vecteur du souvenir, tributaire des mêmes fluctuations que les autres, en tout cas fort peu détaché de son objet. Il influe par ailleurs sur les manuels et les programmes scolaires, le mode de transmission sociale par excellence. 49

Furthermore, this thesis will show that the way the Algerian war is taught in *terminale* reflects descriptions of memory in so far as it is highly selective due to the choices made both by programme designers and teachers. It will describe what is taught as a memory of sorts. Lessons will be shown to be influenced by the present in terms of current affairs and the impact of wider society in the classroom. The influence of the

present however could also include current considerations such as *intégration* or *instruction civique*. The classes given are also affected by group concerns. It will attempt to show that the metaphor “memory” seems to fit aptly a description of the teaching of the Algerian war in *terminale*. Indeed the term “collective memory” is also itself a metaphor as Yosef Yerushalmi has said:

De même que ‘la vie d’un peuple’ est une métaphore biologique, de même ‘la mémoire d’un peuple’ est une métaphore psychologique — à moins qu’on aille faire du groupe un organisme doté d’une psyché collective dont les fonctions correspondraient strictement à celles de l’individu; en d’autres termes, qu’on choisisse de lire l’histoire avec Freud et d’assumer les conséquences d’un psycho-lamarckisme désormais totalement discrédité.50

A very useful source to study the historiography of the Algerian war is *l’Annuaire de l’Afrique du Nord*51. Until 1993 the French historian Guy Perville each year listed in it the publications on the Algerian war, which he commented on. Since 1993 this has been done by other scholars. Reference will therefore be made to this source, which will help us to have a very good indication of publications on the Algerian war. However Perville did not include articles on the Algerian war in his bibliographies (this section does not examine them either). It has not been possible either to consult *l’Annuaire* for the years 1998 or 1999 so the study stops in 1997. These two issues were not available in Lyons. Beyond this source certain articles periodically make reference to the historiography of the war. We can also take into consideration *thèses* (Ph.D.s), a list of which was compiled by Gilles Morin for the M.E.D.G.A. Conference in 1992 (‘Mémoire et Enseignement de la Guerre d’Algérie”). *Thèses* published since 1992 can be identified by consulting a CD-ROM entitled “téléthèses/docthèses”, which claims to include all theses published in France since 197252. Although these sources make it is possible to describe and comment on the historiography of the Algerian war, this section cannot study it exhaustively.

The section is organised chronologically — tracing scholarly work on the war from 1962 to the present day — in order to bring out the key periods in the writing of the history of the war and to trace year by year the evolution of our knowledge about the conflict.

### 1.4.1. 1962 - Late 1970s

---

51 Published annually by the C.N.R.S. (French “Centre National de Recherche Scientifique”).

1.4.1.1. 1962-1968

In this initial period Pervillé qualifies most, or even all of the publications as "témoignages pour la politique" (testimony with a political motive) since the authors of such books are writing to score political points. For Pervillé:


Such publications are therefore those written mainly by the losers in the war — notably people who supported "l’Algérie française" or the O.A.S. Such people often wrote in order to justify their actions and felt the need to write out of perhaps frustration or anger. This is perhaps rather paradoxical and goes against the received orthodoxy that the winners make the history. This could be due to the extent to which the winners wanted to turn the page and distance themselves from a "sale guerre" (dirty war). This term is employed principally due to the use of torture by the French army during the conflict. However other atrocities were committed during the war, by both sides. Of the three types of publication that are to characterise the historiography of the Algerian war — "témoignages" (testimonies), "enquêtes journalistiques" (studies using journalistic methods) and "études proprement scientifiques" (scientific work) — testimonies are the most numerous in this first period. They are not books written by Algerian authors since it is not until the end of the 1970s that such authors begin to write regularly on the Algerian war. Pervillé identifies three political leanings as characterising the authors who wrote on the Algerian war in the two decades after the war — those who defended French colonial presence in Algeria, supporters of Algerian independence and those in the middle who wrote to justify de Gaulle’s politics — the first group publish the most. Examples of "témoignages pour la politique" are the books written by Nicolle, Susini, Ortiz, Loesch and Soustelle\(^5\). Accounts and testimonies are to dominate the
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historiography of the Algerian war for many years. Droz and Lever in 1982 in their bibliography noted that:

Les acteurs français du drame algérien se sont montrés d'une grande prolixité, mais rares sont ceux qui ont échappé au besoin de l'autojustification.56

1.4.1.2. 1968-1972

Pervillé argues that the publications in this period move away from “témoignages pour la politique” towards “témoignages pour l'histoire” which are less polemical. For Pervillé:

De 1968 à 1972, l'historiographie de la guerre d'Algerie change de nature. Elle cesse d'être subordonnée à des buts politiques immédiats. Non que tout le monde soit capable d'en parler sans passion, loin de là. Les apologies collectives et personnelles sont toujours aussi nombreuses. Mais elles s'adressent désormais au jugement de la postériorité, ou à celui de l'Histoire. Leur ton est généralement plus détaché.57

“Témoignages pour l'histoire” are essentially memoirs such as those published by Cros, de Gaulle, Fouchet and Salan.58 These books are still often very partisan but are less controversial and more detached than those published before 1968. They are accounts of the actors’ experiences during the war, and are essentially the material used when some of the later history of the Algerian war was written. This period is also important since it is at this time that the first “récits journalistiques” and also “tentatives d'explication historique” are published. Pervillé accounts for such developments by pointing to the changing political climate: May 1968, O.A.S. amnesties, de Gaulle’s retirement from the political scene, the publication of de Gaulle’s Mémoires d’espoir, and de Gaulle’s death. In this way the Algerian war begins to cease to be an item of current affairs and to enter into the realm of history.

Here we can see very clearly the way changes in society have influenced the history that is written on the Algerian war. A parallel can be drawn with the way factors in society dictate in different ways how the Algerian war is taught, as will be seen throughout this thesis. The “récits journalistiques” include Yves Courrière’s La Guerre d’Algérie — which Droz/Lever described as: “Une somme qui tient plus du journalisme

que de l'histoire, mais qui repose sur une information orale de grande valeur“ – or Claude Paillat’s *Vingt ans qui déchirèrent la France* – described by Droz/Lever as “Du journalisme bien informé mais partisan” Nonetheless, testimonies continue to dominate French historiography of the Algerian war in this period. Despite the changing political climate, the memory of the Algerian war is far from consensual as can be seen from the events surrounding the publication of Massu’s *La vraie bataille d'Alger* (1971) and the screening of Pontecorvo’s film *La bataille d'Alger*. This film was first shown in 1970 in France in Coutances and then regularly shown in Paris in 1971, in a cinema whose windows were broken several times during this period.

1.4.1.3. 1972 - Late 1970s

This third period in the historiography of the Algerian war, as described by Pervillé, is similar to the previous period in so far as the three genres continue to be published (“témoignages pour l'histoire”, “enquêtes journalistiques” and “études historiques proprement scientifiques”) although the respective place of each becomes more balanced. But one change does occur in this period: Algerian authors also regularly publish work. For example, Commandant Azzedine’s *On nous appelait fellaghas* (1976). This is especially true for the year 1980: Commandant Azzedine’s *Et Alger ne brûla pas*; Ferhat Abbas’s *Autopsie d'une guerre — L'Aurore* and Mohammed Harbi’s *Le FLN Mirage et Réalité, des origines à la prise du pouvoir* (1945-1962).

A last point to note is the publication in English of work on the Algerian war: Horne’s *A Savage War of Peace* in 1977 (published in French in 1980) and Smith’s *The French Stake in Algeria* in 1978. These were not the first pieces of work in English on the Algerian war but taken together were a significant step in the general move away from testimonies to actual history writing. It is important to note that these authors were not French. We can perhaps go much further and argue that there has been a major Anglo-Saxon contribution over time from people like Dorothy Pickles and David Gordon before the 1970s and then people like John Talbott and David Schalk later on. This concerns not only written work but also television history in so far as Peter Batty’s documentary *La Guerre d'Algérie* was shown to French audiences before Stora et al.’s *Les Années algériennes*. A parallel can be drawn perhaps with the historiography of Vichy and the ground-breaking work of the American historian Robert Paxton whose work on Vichy preceded that of French historians. In both instances Anglo-Saxon
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historians have played a role in pointing to deficiencies in the history that had been written on these subjects which subsequently encouraged French historians to conduct more research.

1.4.2. The Early 1980s

The early 1980s are a key moment in the historiography of the Algerian war. Not only are books by Algerian authors published (Abbas, Azzedine and Harbi) but the first historical study of the Algerian war was published in French: Droz and Lever’s *Histoire de la guerre d’Algérie* in 1982. Of the Algerian authors Harbi perhaps contributes the most to the historiography of the Algerian war due to his two books *Le FLN, mirages et réalités* (1980) and *Les Archives de la Révolution algérienne* (1981). Droz and Lever described Harbi (1980) as “fondamental”. As concerns Droz and Lever’s *Histoire de la guerre d’Algérie*, Perville notes that:

> Le livre de Bernard Droz et d’Evelyne Lever est, en effet, la première étude d’ensemble de nature proprement historique, publiée en France par des Français.65

However it is important to note that this book was published in 1982 while the history of the Algerian war began to be taught in *terminale* classes in 1983. Furthermore the book was “une première synthèse” rather than “une vérité définitive”. Nevertheless it broke dramatically with the publications of the previous twenty years. As Droz and Lever noted:

> [...] pour beaucoup les passions restent vives et les protagonistes du drame s’emploient inlassablement depuis vingt ans à justifier leur choix. Si la sincérité de leur témoignage n’est pas en cause, il manque évidemment à l’objectivité nécessaire.66

Despite the importance of these books it is important to note that the historiography of the Algerian war was still, at this point, very poor. Perville, speaking in 1983 at “les Agoras Méditerranéennes” in Marseilles67, pointed to the absence of scientific debate on the war. Soulet, talking about “l’histoire immédiate” in general (rather than just research on the Algerian war), wrote that:

> Malgré cette indéniable poussée, la recherche apparaît, en ce début des années quatre-vingt, nettement insuffisante par rapport aux nouveaux besoins. Ce fut, en

effet, à cette époque que le gouvernement français décida de consacrer la totalité du programme des classes terminales à la période postérieure à 1939. La plupart des enseignants, non préparés à l'université pour traiter des questions ultra-contemporaines, eurent alors la désagréable impression que l'on mettait la charrue avant les boeufs, c'est-à-dire que l'on voulait faire enseigner une matière qui n'avait pas encore été l'objet d'une recherche suffisante.68

For the Algerian war, this situation was to continue until the end of the 1980s — the period when it was examined and discussed by scholars at international conferences. It is also during this period (late 1970s/early 1980s) that research on the war in universities (measured in terms of production of thèses) increased. Gilles Morin, at the M.E.D.G.A. Conference, lists theses written on the Algerian conflict which fulfilled the following criteria: “ces thèses portent clairement sur la période de la guerre d'Algérie, en totalité ou partiellement”. He gave figures up to 1992, and from 1992 to 1998 I have consulted a CD-ROM entitled “téléthèses/docthèses”. If we allocate the figures by year then we obtain the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Theses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is very difficult to compare the figures the CD-ROM figures with Morin's because of the subjective nature of what to include. Specifically and directly on the Algerian war I would say the figures above are correct but, if we look at the slightly wider picture, then for the period 1992 to 1998 about seventeen theses were presented — which, for example, examine the colonial system and the origins of the war. The figures then become:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Theses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figure of seventeen theses was obtained from the CD-ROM by searching for theses which examined colonisation, post-1945 history or military history and which included the key word “Algérie” (since with the key word “guerre d’Algérie” no theses were
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found). It is to be noted than neither in 1997 nor in 1998 were any theses found even though the CD-ROM was the December 1998 edition and claims to include all French theses published since 1972.

As can be seen from the table above, at the end of the 1970s/early 1980s the number of theses submitted increased and was relatively high until the end of the 1980s. It is interesting to note that students submitting theses at the end of the 1970s (if we assume that they were about 25 years old) would have been born about or after 1952 i.e. just before or during the Algerian war. Secondly, it would seem that about two thirds (forty-five of the sixty-five theses written before 1993) were written by students (judging by their names) who, or whose parents, came from the Maghreb. Thirdly, certain universities played a more important role in the production of research on the Algerian war than others: Paris 7, “l’Ecole de Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales” (E.H.E.S.S.), Paris 1, Grenoble 2 and Aix-Marseille 1 all produced at least five theses on the Algerian war. Surprisingly, the “Institut d’Etudes Politiques” in Paris (I.E.P.) only produced one. This may be due to the role of different lecturers in universities who are directors of research. Recent years have not seen much research on the Algerian war, as will be argued below. However, although the years 1988 and 1989 saw no theses submitted in France on the Algerian war, these years were very rich in terms of conferences on the war.

One book that certainly was groundbreaking in terms of research on the Algerian war was Haroun’s *La 7e wilaya, la guerre du FLN en France 1954-1962* published in 1986. It was described by Perville as the most important book on the Algerian war published that year since it was of a considerable size and it examined an area that had only previously been glimpsed at indirectly through work, for example, on the “porteurs de valise” (French people who in France helped the F.L.N.).

1.4.3. The Late 1980s/Early 1990s

The late 1980s and early 1990s are the second key period concerning significant advances in the historiography of the Algerian war — the first being the early 1980s. At the end of the 1980s a large international conference was held on the Algerian war, as were certain discussion groups at which academics debated the question (“tables rondes” in French). The “Institut d’histoire du temps présent” (I.H.T.P.), part of the C.N.R.S., created in the early 1980s to specialise in recent history, in December 1988 organised a conference entitled “La Guerre d’Algérie et les Français”, the findings of which were published by Fayard in 1990. This was the first time that such a conference had been held. The book included contributions by fifty-four authors and totalled about seven hundred pages on the Algerian war. It examined metropolitan public opinion and the war; the Republic and the war; the impact of the war on the French economy; the war and France’s international standing and, lastly, the memory of the Algerian war. It
did not examine the Algerian war itself — in terms of battles or events etc. — due to the lack of access to the necessary archives (very important as will be seen below).

The proceedings of the two round tables also organised by the I.H.T.P. that preceded this conference were published under the titles of *La Guerre d’Algérie et les intellectuels français* and *La Guerre d’Algérie et les chrétiens* (both published in *les Cahiers de l’IHTP* in 1988 and later by other publishers). For Pervillé "Il a prouvé qu’une histoire de la guerre d’Algérie était possible" and he rejoiced "il y a enfin du nouveau dans l’historiographie française de la guerre d’Algérie". This comment can be interpreted as meaning that before 1988 there was no evidence showing it was possible to write a scientific history of the war, thereby highlighting how little scholarly work on the question had been written before 1988 and also showing the significance of the 1988 conferences. Why was it in 1988 that such a sudden progression in scholarly writing took place? Obviously the role of the I.H.T.P. was central, as were certain historians.

At the end of 1989 Alain-Gérard Slama wrote an article in *Le Point* which also gives us an idea of publications at this time on the Algerian war. In this article he pointed to the fact that "En quelques années, le Sud a brutalement réinvesti les consciences" and identified twenty-five books published in the year 1989 on the war, which he qualified as a record. However he also stated that: "Or, dans la masse d’ouvrages consacrés au sujet depuis le début de l’année, ce qui est fort n’est pas neuf, et ce qui est neuf n’est pas fort." This article was however written just before the publication for the general public of the scholarly work mentioned above (which was original and of high quality). It might therefore underestimate the French contribution to writing on the Algerian war of the time. It does however show a certain "réveil" yet, beyond scholarly writing, one which was rather limited, or at least disappointed Slama. Why was there a new "opening of the old war wounds" that the title of his article makes reference to? Events in Algeria are often cited in explaining this "retour du refoulé" that other commentators such as Robert Frank have identified. When explaining what in the present was bringing back such memories since the late 1980s (whereas before it had perhaps been easier to repress such memories), Stora argues that:
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puis le tournant algérien de 1988. Voilà l’Algérie revenue doublement en force en France, dans la mémoire française.73

The fall-out from the late-1980s’ conferences continued in the early 1990s, especially as 1992 was the thirtieth anniversary of the end of the war. This period saw the film by Tavernier and Rotman La Guerre sans nom in cinemas; on French television Stora’s Les Années algériennes; in bookstores Stora’s La Gangrène et l’oubli, Histoire de l’Algérie coloniale, Ils venaient d’Algérie and Histoire de la guerre d’Algérie. Two conferences were held in Paris, one entitled “Mémoire et Enseignement de la Guerre d’Algérie” and the other “Les accords d’Evian”. There were also the anniversaries of the end of the war and the events of October 17, 1961; as well as the beginning of the opening of archives. There was such an “opening” around 1992 that Benjamin Stora wrote that the work of grieving seemed to be finished due to the amount of film production on the colonial period.74 Stora in his article in Libération (30 April-1 May 1992) also talked of “l’homme du Sud” who it would seem has allowed this opening to take place in two ways: firstly in his country of origin by letting film makers actually work in Algeria and secondly in France by the research, film-making or book-writing of people whose parents came from Algeria and who have provided a lot of the impetus for studying this period of French history (by doing it themselves).

As concerns the 1992 opening, the granting of access to archives after the legal thirty year delay is particularly interesting. If we think about the writing of the history of the Algerian war, and more generally what is called “l’histoire immédiate” or “l’histoire des temps présents” then it is important to reflect on the sources for this history. Since 1992 certain archives have been opened, previously inaccessible due to the legal requirement in France that public archives remain closed for thirty years. For example, on July 1, 1992, most of the military archives held in Vincennes were opened. In this way it is quite common after 1992 to read in l’Annuaire de l’Afrique du Nord comments such as “L’auteur retrace l’histoire de la guerre d’Algérie grâce à l’accès récent aux archives militaires françaises” or “Mobilisant l’ensemble des documents disponibles, y compris les archives récemment ouvertes, l’auteur fait la lumière sur [...]” or “Le travail de documentation, qui s’appuie sur des sources variées, a été facilité par l’ouverture progressive des archives au public”.75 However, we can note that archives are not yet completely (or even perhaps significantly) open. As an article in Le Monde in 1999 shows76, what has been published by the “Service historique de l’armée de terre” (S.H.A.T.) stops in 1954, since two volumes have been published: in 1990 the period

1943-1946, and in 1999 the period 1946-1954. The latter volume is entitled *La Guerre d’Algérie par les documents* and includes a little over one thousand pages. The article therefore announced that: “L’armée de terre ouvre ses archives militaires secrètes jusqu’en décembre 1954”77. Nothing has therefore yet been published by the S.H.A.T. on the crucial period of the war itself.

Anniversaries of the end of the Algerian war have always led to a sharp increase in the number of publications. For example Pervillé identifies ten works on the Algerian war in 1970, ten in 1971, seven in 1973 yet twenty-eight in 1972 for the tenth anniversary of the end of the war.78. 1982 was also a rich year in terms of publications and the 30th anniversary of the end of the war was no different. The 30th anniversary of the events of October 17, 1961, was the first time that this “massacre non-reconnu”, in the words of Stora, was examined in the media. This was perhaps in large part achieved by the publication of Einaudi’s book *La Bataille de Paris* and the film *Le Silence du fleuve*. The role of certain scholars is also important — at the beginning of the 1990s Stora stands out by the number of books he published and the T.V. programme he produced. He was perhaps one of the more visible historians of the Algerian war but was not the only person to be working on it around then as *La Guerre d’Algérie et les Français* (1990) and numerous other publications show.

1.4.4. Post-1992

Has the “opening”, in terms of significant progress, that took place concerning the writing of the history of the Algerian war at the end of the 1980s and beginning of the 1990s been continued since then? By continued, I mean have there been more publications in the years since 1992 than there were, for example, in the mid-1980s and, more importantly, what sort of work is being published — have there been many high quality original historical analyses of the Algerian war in recent years and have there been more international conferences? In my opinion, progress is still taking place but is back to the rather slow pace that characterises the historiography of the Algerian war (except for the acceleration seen at the end of the 1980s/early 1990s). Perhaps this is less due to the number of publications in France than to the quality of such work. Mauss-Copeaux, in her book on *Les Appelés en Algérie*, remarks that:

La mémoire de la guerre d’Algérie semblait définitivement libérée de la chape du silence qui le recouvrait. Cependant, ces initiatives provoquées en grande partie par la commémoration de l’anniversaire, n’ont pas fait disparaître le ‘syndrome algérien’.79

---

77 Ibid., p. 1.
Furthermore, we will see throughout this thesis the way in which this “opening” in the memory of the Algerian war was actually accompanied by a major reduction of the place of the conflict in the French terminale history programme. The question of the amount of original research on the war in recent years is a very important one. However this is one aspect of this section that is limited since I have not been able to systematically examine publications in 1998 or 1999. Also, Perville stopped contributing to l’Annuaire in the early 1990s and other contributors have replaced him which makes comparing post-1992 and pre-1992 difficult, again because of the question of which books to include. It would seem that in 1993 there were twenty-five publications on the Algerian war, eighteen in 1994, thirteen in 1995, twenty in 1996 and eight in 1997.

There were therefore numerous publications on the Algerian war; more importantly the vast majority (leaving aside the question of their relative worth) were what Perville would have called “études historiques proprement scientifiques”. It would appear therefore that the trend away from testimonies/memoirs towards scholarly research has continued since 1992. There have not however been many Ph.D. theses submitted in France on the Algerian war (as was seen above), nor have there been many conferences. To the best of my knowledge the only major conference in recent years which examined the Algerian war was “La Guerre d’Algérie et les Algériens” in March 1996, at which eight Algerian historians and eight French historians participated. Thus one may say that publications continue unabated and that the trend is towards the writing of history; but this writer finds that, echoing what Slama said in 1989, a lot of what is new and in French is neither particularly original nor strong. Nonetheless, certain publications in recent years have been fascinating and progress is being made albeit slowly.

Perhaps more problematic than the possible lack of strong original research is the argument that it is impossible at present to actually write the history of the war. This is a stance repeatedly taken by Charles-Robert Ageron. In 1992, in the proceedings of the M.E.D.G.A. Conference80, he published a contribution entitled “Une histoire de la guerre d’Algérie est-elle possible en 1992?” In this contribution he stated that “[...] il n’est pas encore possible de rédiger cette histoire.”81 Ageron justified this view by pointing to the fact that the Algerian war is still a sore point which generates a lot of passion despite the passing of time. He also shows the importance of written sources in history and thought that in 1992 the amount of written documents that had been made accessible to the public was insufficient. For him it is imperative to study written documents which are dated rather than to base history on oral sources which give a posteriori justifications. As he states:

81Ibid., p. 155.
Thirdly, he shows that on the Algerian side there are and have been too many obstacles to writing history. Only a part of the story had been discovered by 1992 with the publication of work by Harbi and Haroun. To highlight the difficulty of writing a history of the Algerian war Ageron chose to give the example of figures for deaths during the war — which is an area that has proved notoriously difficult to evaluate.

Also of concern, in my opinion, is that certain other areas of the history of the war have still not been written in many senses. Areas of discord, to take just a few examples, include what happened in Paris on October 17, 1961. Although historians tend to universally refute the “official version” given by the French authorities at the time, it is more difficult to say exactly what happened — to such an extent that Papon recently took the historian Jean-Luc Einaudi to court for defamation, as described earlier. The question of the extent of the use of torture is also an area of the war that is difficult to describe with precision. Many examples could be given, often concerning the less glorious, most occulted events in the war. It is obvious that in any war it is never easy to examine such questions and that the Algerian war is no different. Clearly, the memory of such parts of the war is still extremely difficult to face for different parts of French society which has made writing the history of elements of the war impossible until now.

In 1996 a “table ronde” was organised in Paris entitled “La Guerre d’Algérie et les Algériens 1954-1962” at which sixteen scholars spoke — eight French and eight Algerian. The proceedings of this meeting were published a year later. In the preface Ageron again addressed the subject of the difficulties of writing a history of the Algerian war. He was still arguing in favour of the need for a “scientific history” of the war. He was somewhat more positive in terms of the possibilities of writing a definitive history of the war due principally to the opening of archives which had already led to progress being made in the historiography of the war. However he finished on what was still a fairly negative note:

Parce que nous historiens français avons l’expérience des longs efforts qui furent nécessaires avant d’aboutir à un traitement impartial des guerres franco-allemandes,

---

nous savons que l'heure n'est pas venue où l'on pourrait écrire une histoire de la guerre d'Algérie qui serait acceptée par tous les Algériens et par tous les Français.\textsuperscript{84}

It is also possible to compare what Stora wrote in 1992 and in 1996. As was mentioned above, Stora writing in 1992 talked of a significant opening (in terms of images of the war) and spoke of a possible end to the long period of grieving since the war. However in 1996, he wrote that this was merely a cruel illusion.\textsuperscript{85}

To conclude this section, the historiography of the Algerian war has certainly developed over the last four decades. It is possible to identify key periods in the writing of the history of the Algerian war and key works published on it which have significantly enriched our knowledge of different aspects of the war. Notably there has been a trend to gradually move away from testimonies and memoirs towards scholarly writing on the Algerian conflict. However this has been a long and difficult process which is to date far from finished. There are still considerable areas of the war that we know little about and where it is impossible to identify what exactly happened. It is perhaps possible to say that the memory of the war still tends, in certain areas, to overshadow the history of the war. Perhaps most worrying is the current lack of research on the war, measurable in terms of conferences and Ph.D. theses in France. In terms of my thesis on the teaching of the Algerian war it is important to note the limited state of knowledge on the war when it began to be taught in \textit{terminale} classes in 1983. Furthermore we can note the advances in our state of knowledge since then and see whether such advances have been translated into changes in the type of knowledge which is transmitted in schools. The findings of this thesis would tend very much to show the opposite. Rather than advances in knowledge about the war leading to more aspects of the war being able to be taught, it would seem that less and less is being taught in history lessons in schools on this subject. Moreover, as shown here, the difficulty of writing the history of the Algerian war is accompanied by difficulty in teaching its history.

\subsection*{1.5. Theoretical Reflections on Memory}

My aim in writing this section on memory-related sources is to provide a synthesis of the literature that is available on memory, not just on French memory of Algeria, but on social or collective memory in general. It is therefore an attempt to provide a theoretical framework for my empirical research on the transmission of the memory of the

\textsuperscript{84}Ibid., p. 4.
Algerian war carried out in Lyons. This section should present the broad schools of thought that exist as concerns memory and it should also provide an idea of the ways in which focuses of enquiry have developed over time. In terms of the organisation of this section, we can begin by identifying the main disciplines which are linked to memory; then examine the findings and conclusions of work conducted on memory and forgetting; thirdly outline the crucial link between memory and nationhood; and lastly begin to study the relationship between education and memory.

The first point to be made is that the study of memory is interdisciplinary, which provides the opportunity to form a very rich theoretical understanding of this concept. The interdisciplinary nature of the work conducted on memory is well expressed in the following quotation by David Thelen in *The Journal of American History*:

> At one end of the spectrum are psychological issues of individual motivation and perception in the creation of memories. At the other end are linguistic and anthropological issues of how cultures establish traditions and myths from the past to guide the conduct of their members in the present. While history touches both ends of the spectrum, its concerns fall most comfortably on points between those ends. 86

The sources consulted for this thesis, which are given in the final bibliography, reflect this “spectrum” that David Thelen identifies. They could be divided into the following broad categories: Psychology/Psychoanalysis; History; Philosophy; and Cultural Studies/Literature. This division is designed solely to show the variety of research conducted, since it is difficult to divide the authors into such categories given that some of their work falls into more than one of the groups. It would therefore be fair to say that the sources are not only interdisciplinary but also multidisciplinary.

Having identified the variety of disciplines that are involved in the study of memory, let us now turn to the findings and the conclusions of these books and articles. The logical starting point is the work of Maurice Halbwachs which, as will become clearer below, can be linked to much contemporary research. Halbwachs invented the term “collective memory” and founded the discipline of the sociology of memory, which explains why his work is central to much of the research that has followed. His work is of interest since he examines both individual memory and collective memory in *La Mémoire collective* and *Les Cadres sociaux de la mémoire*. The title of this latter work is a good starting point to examine his findings. The two key words are “cadres” and “sociaux”, both of which need to be explained. “Cadres” are described for man as “les clous avec lesquels il fixe ses souvenirs”87 and as the organisers of our memory. They “enframe” our memory. They are language, time and space. These three “cadres” are

---

quoted by Jean-Pierre Rioux in his essay “La flamme et les bûchers” with regard to the memory of the Algerian war. Language in this respect consists of euphemisms like “une guerre sans nom”, “opérations de maintien de l’ordre” and “rébellion” which deny the existence of a war and therefore hinder its remembrance. Time is problematic for memory since there are problems dating events in the war. Space is equally lacking due to the absence of hauts lieux and since “L’Algérie demeure lointaine, peu ou mal montrée”.

These three “cadres” (although Halbwachs indicates the possibility of others) are very important in order to understand the factors that enable us to remember, but I feel that the insistence on “sociaux” is ultimately the most important of Halbwachs’ findings, since this is a belief that now divides the psychology community into two schools of thought. Halbwachs maintained that there is a social dimension to memory in part since people rely on the memory of others to provide confirmation of their own memories. It is also social since our individual memory is influenced by the group we belong to: “[...] se souvenir pour un individu c’est reconstruire son passé en partant des cadres sociaux présents de son groupe.” It is in society that we find the ways to remember. Those who effectively follow Halbwachs constitute the “social constructionist” school — members of which include Michael Billig, David Edwards and Derek Middleton. The other school of thought is the “cognitive” school (which was for a long time, and perhaps still is, the main focus of enquiry), which examines memory strictly in terms of the individual. It seems to me that the “social constructionist” school is becoming more and more influential and that this type of social approach is of fundamental importance to my research since this project is focused on transmission of memory from generation to generation via education. This kind of memory is therefore very social in nature. Indeed, a Halbwachian theory of memory, when taken at the collective level, can be seen to be one in which memory contributes to provide necessary unity in society. This view originally comes from Durkheim. We will see in this thesis concrete examples of this role of memory.

The basic premise of the “social constructionist” school is that it is necessary to view “remembering and forgetting as inherently social activities”, since remembering is seen as “une activité sociale, qui passe par le discours et qui se construit en relation avec d’autres individus”. Memory is constructed, not reproduced. The reason that “social constructionist” psychologists are grouped here with Maurice Halbwachs is the insistence on the “social” aspect of memory, but also due to the focus on speech which reminds us of the “cadre” of language identified by Maurice Halbwachs. Billig,
Middleton and Edwards explain in depth their interest in language by pointing to the fact that the difference between the memories of animals and humans is that the latter can remember events which they did not experience personally — via language. As will be seen later, this fact is very important as concerns memory and education. They argue that remembering is an "epistemological enterprise"$^{92}$, and they examine the interaction between people as a determining factor in memory. Their methodology therefore includes conversational and discourse analyses, and their corpus includes observing members of a family recall the Royal wedding of Prince Charles and Lady Diana. They conclude that: "Les souvenirs sont donc produits d'une manière déterminée par l'interaction actuelle au sein de la famille"$^{93}$. For this reason one might argue that their view of memory can loosely be associated with a kind of pluralist model of collective memory in which different groups, at the collective level, compete to influence memory in the same way members of a family interact and produce memories. We will see concrete examples of the influence of groups on memory in this thesis.

The last point for the moment concerning Maurice Halbwachs and the "social constructionist" school of psychology is their view of the present in the determination of memory. As Gérard Namer points out:

Le fil rouge qui parcourt son livre est que le souvenir est une reconstruction du passé à partir de la représentation qu'un groupe a de ses intérêts actuels.$^{94}$

In this way, adopting a social approach consists of refusing to view memory as "stocking" and "encoding" in an individual's head — as Halbwachs argued against Henri Bergson's description of a "une mémoire pure, individuelle, en images"$^{95}$ — by pointing to the present production and construction of memory. David Thelen resumes these views as follows:

The starting place for the construction of an individual recollection is a present need or circumstance [...]. Since an individual's starting points change as the person grows and changes, people reshape their recollections of the past to fit their present needs [...] and select from the present material that supports deeply held interpretations from the past.$^{96}$

This also applies to groups. Halbwachs argued, for example, that religious collective memory was a reconstruction of the past to satisfy present needs:

La mémoire collective religieuse est une reconstruction du passé en fonction des besoins du temps présent. Elle permet aux dogmatiques de percevoir le passé de façon rationnelle et aux mystiques de l’interpréter de façon affective.  

Halbwachs also shows class collective memory to be a response to present needs in so far as it acts as an ideology that justifies conflict with other groups. Before moving on to the sources which deal with “forgetting” as opposed to “remembering”, let us recap the findings of the research quoted thus far, and reflect on its value to my project. Firstly, there is the notion of “cadre” which provides us with three factors that can be examined in order to study memory. Secondly, the notion of a “social approach” vastly increases the scope of research away from the individual biological issues and computer-simulated models of the brain towards groups of people and their interaction (of particular importance to public memories and education). Thirdly, “the present” must be examined in terms of “a person’s motives or biases or mood or audience” rather than simply in terms of its distance from the event to be remembered. In order to build on these initial points, it is possible to examine the concept of remembering from a different angle: that of forgetting.

As a glance at my bibliography shows, there has been considerable academic interest in “l’oubli”: for example, the collection of essays Usages de l’oubli, the special issue of the review Communications dedicated to “La mémoire et l’oubli” and that of Le Genre Humain on “Politiques de l’oubli”. The reason that “memory” and “forgetting” can be treated in different sections of this paper is mentioned by Paul-Laurent Assoun in his essay on Sigmund Freud:

[...] le <souvenir> et l'<oublier> doivent être pensés dans leur cohérence (Zusammenhang), comme deux faces d’un même ‘phénomène’. Il s’agit de s’arracher à la conception de l’oubli comme simple privation de souvenir : il faut parvenir à une pensée complète de ce phénomène composite.

Sigmund Freud’s theories are also very useful for reflections on forgetting and the “subconscious”, albeit focused on the individual. He introduces the idea of refoulement which becomes of central importance to work on the memory of the Algerian war. Robert Frank insists on the question of refoulement and occultation by stating that the memory of the war is a “selective memory” and that the Algerian war is not a forgotten

war, unlike the war in Indo-China\textsuperscript{100}. Reading Frank's contribution in \textit{La Guerre d'Algérie et les Français}, perhaps we can identify a difference between \textit{occultation}, which seems to be an act (maybe by government authorities) to hide something, and \textit{refoulement}, which is possibly more a question of individual difficulty or refusal to remember. Freud speaks of forgetting as a "sort of security" and a "narrative failure" and, as Assoun states, concludes that:

L'oubli s'instaure ainsi dans l'après-coup d'un récit impossible : c'est en effet faute de pouvoir (se) raconter que le sujet choisit l'oubli. L'oubli n'est donc pas exactement le contraire du souvenir : c'est le destin d'un récit impossible du souvenir.\textsuperscript{101}

Freud also introduces the idea of the "work of grieving", which shows us how difficult remembering can be. This idea also implies that what is repressed should be brought out into the open. We will see in this thesis concrete examples of the way the memory of the Algerian war can be said to be repressed in so far as there is no dialogue on the subject, and since it is repressed one can argue it is problematic for French society. Freud argued that if what is repressed is not brought out into the open it is unconsciously repeated. Grieving can be seen to be a process of dialogue and not silence on a subject. This is a difficult process that involves suffering. It involves accepting death or loss of a person or a thing. If there is no "work of grieving" then there is repression. In this way after the "work of grieving" there can be memory.

A different approach to forgetting is given by Gianni Vattimo in his essay on Friedrich Nietzsche, some of the ideas of which are supported by the lecture of Ernest Renan "Qu'est-ce qu'une nation?" (1882) which is published in Homi Bhabha's \textit{Nation and Narration}. The arguments of both Nietzsche and Renan effectively introduce the third part of this section: the link between memory/forgetting and the nation. Vattimo examines Nietzsche's \textit{Second Untimely Meditation} (1874) which reflects on historiography and on the historicist movement which developed rapidly during the nineteenth century — thereby examining "l'utilité et le dommage de l'histoire pour la vie"\textsuperscript{102}. Nietzsche concludes that there is too much focus on history, which leads to forgetting becoming very difficult or impossible, which in turn rules out what he calls an "oubli créateur". In effect "l'homme du XIXe siècle souffre d'une maladie historique"\textsuperscript{103}. The relationship between life or society and forgetting is of fundamental importance to my research as is the link between historiography and memory. Ernest
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Renan can also be of use in understanding these relationships. Writing at the same epoch as Nietzsche (which is very instructive as concerns the intellectual climate at the end of the nineteenth century), his view concurs that forgetting is necessary:

Forgetting, I would even go so far as to say historical error, is a crucial factor in the creation of a nation, which is why progress in historical studies often constitutes a danger for [the principle of] nationality.\textsuperscript{104}

Renan’s argument reinforces the views of Nietzsche and also introduces the central idea of “nationality” and memory/forgetting which is examined in more depth below. Again we can see the way collective memory can be seen to be a sort of necessary glue for society. This can involve forgetting certain memories to create cohesion in the present. People develop a shared identity through shared memories. In this way collective memory can be argued to be essential to the integrity of a community. Before moving on to this crucial subject, we can once again summarise the main points, this time as concerns “l’oubli”. Firstly, Freud’s research shows us the importance of studying forgetting as more than simply not being able to remember. Secondly, Freud’s focus on the idea of refoulement (stemming in part from his insistence on the individual’s subconscious) provides a framework within which the difficulty to remember and what he calls “narrative failure” can be applied to the object of remembrance. It also introduces differences in terms of terminology between oubli and refoulement or occultation which have been developed by contemporary historians such as Robert Frank. Lastly, there is what may perhaps be called a “philosophical” school of thought which presents the argument of forgetting being necessary to a nation. Nietzsche and Renan were instrumental in the development of this idea, which has been examined more recently by Yosef Yerushalmi in \textit{Usages de l’oubli}. He focuses on the necessity of forgetting and summarises the problem by introducing the following questions, which he feels remain unanswerable at present:

\begin{quote}
[...] si nous avons besoin et de nous souvenir et d’oublier, où devons-nous tracer la frontière? Nietzsche nous est ici de quelque utilité. Dans quelle mesure avons-nous besoin de l’histoire? Et quelle sorte d’histoire? De quoi devrions-nous nous souvenir, que pouvons-nous nous autoriser à oublier?\textsuperscript{105}
\end{quote}

Let us now examine in more depth the link between memory and the nation. Having just examined the arguments of Nietzsche and Renan, the sources for this topic consist essentially of Benedict Anderson, Homi Bhabha, Eric Hobsbawm and David Lowenthal.


This is a vast area of study, but it would perhaps be logical to begin by outlining the historical perspective of the nation and the way in which relationships to the past have developed — which both Benedict Anderson and David Lowenthal examine in depth. To summarise Lowenthal’s findings, he traces what he calls the “modern impulse to preserve”\textsuperscript{106} back to the Renaissance, by underlining “the Renaissance perception of a classical antiquity sharply distinguishable from, and superior to, the recent past”\textsuperscript{107} which led to the appreciation and the emulation of classical times. Throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the rise of modern science brought with it rationalism which culminated in the Enlightenment and the removal of superstition through appeals to abstract reason, which considerably changed relationships to the past: destruction replaced appreciation. However, the nineteenth century saw the rise of historicism, which again had important consequences in terms of attitudes to the past. Lowenthal concludes that:

Not until the early nineteenth century did Europeans and Americans strongly identify themselves with their material heritage, and only within the past half-century have most countries come to promote preservation as a positive public programme.\textsuperscript{108}

Benedict Anderson adopts a similar approach, albeit based on nationalism and not on preservation, in terms of identifying a time-frame and factors which explain relatively new conceptions — these new concepts now refer to “the possibility of imagining the nation” rather than to historical preservation. As he states:

[...] nationalism has to be understood by aligning it not with self-consciously held political ideologies, but with the large cultural systems that preceded it, out of which — as well as against which — it came into being.\textsuperscript{109}

Anderson’s *Imagined Communities* provides a fascinating account of how it became possible to “imagine the nation”. For the purposes of this section, it is impossible to examine his argument in depth, rather we can focus on the parts of his work that are of central importance to memory. His work is important in so far as it draws attention to the fundamental changes of recent centuries which have modified human relationships to the past and to the nation. More importantly, he introduces the concept of an “imagined community” and explains what “belonging to a nation” consists of, which provides the link to memory/forgetting. Lastly, his work elucidates the complex question of the age of nations — as does research by Homi Bhabha and Eric Hobsbawm. Anderson expresses this idea as follows:

\textsuperscript{107}ibid., p. 10.
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If nation states are widely considered to be 'new' and 'historical', the nations to which they give political expression always loom out of an immemorial past and [...] glide into a limitless future.\textsuperscript{110}

To my mind, this link between the past (and therefore memory/forgetting) and the nation is of central importance to my research on the memory of the Algerian war. Homi Bhabha supports Anderson's argument by stating that "nations lose their origins in the myths of time"\textsuperscript{111} and Eric Hobsbawm bases his work on the link between tradition and the nation by formulating the concept of "invented traditions". "Traditions" are seen to be practices "which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition"\textsuperscript{112} which use the past to "structure" life, and they are "invented" since "continuity with the past is largely factitious"\textsuperscript{113}. The book \textit{The Invention of Tradition} includes several contributions which examine different uses of "invented traditions", but the section that is the most relevant to this project is that by Eric Hobsbawm (Mass-Producing Traditions: Europe, 1870-1914) and especially the example of the French Third Republic. This is a fascinating account of how the Third Republic was "maintained" and "safeguarded" by reference to the past, and more precisely to the French Revolution. Hobsbawm cites three major uses of invented traditions, which are: primary education, public ceremonies and public monuments. We will deal with his argument as concerns primary education below, since it clearly links memory and education. Public ceremonies were used to foster invariance by reference to the past and included Bastille Day (as of 1880):

\begin{quote}
It combined official and unofficial demonstrations and popular festivities — fireworks, dancing in the streets — in an annual assertion of France as the nation of 1789, in which every French man, woman and child could take part.\textsuperscript{114}
\end{quote}

In this way, a public ceremony was invented in 1880, nearly a hundred years after the Revolution, which strengthened the Third Republic and the nation against its adversaries (anarcho-syndicalists and the Right) by celebrating its origins. Other public ceremonies that performed the same role were world expositions, highlighting technical progress and the French Empire (perhaps the colonial exposition of 1931, albeit much later, would be the apogee of such expositions). However, public ceremonies were not the only "invented tradition", since they were accompanied by the mass production of public monuments:

\begin{enumerate}
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The major characteristic of French ‘statuomania’ was its democracy, anticipating that of the war memorials after 1914-18. It spread two kinds of monuments throughout the cities and rural communes of the country: the image of the Republic itself (in the form of Marianne which now became universally familiar), and the bearded civilian figures of whoever local patriotism chose to regard as its notable, past and present.\textsuperscript{115}

To these two main “inventions of tradition” (and the third, in the form of primary education, which will be examined later) of the early Third Republic can be added other forms of reference to the Revolution: the tricolour, the Republican monogram (R.F.), the Marseillaise and the Republican motto (liberty, equality, fraternity). All of these phenomena, when examined in depth, provide a striking example of how history can be used to strengthen a nation. At present, we can turn to the last part of this section which reinforces the link between memory and the nation by focusing on education and memory — indeed, the relationship between education, memory and the nation is clearly shown in the French Third Republic in so far as it is referred to as \textit{La République des Instituteurs}.

The reason that we need to examine the question of education in depth is that this Ph.D. project examines the place of the Algerian war in the French education system. In terms of the link between memory and education, five of the nineteen sources studied for this section make reference to this crucial question. Of the five sources that deal with the link between memory and education, let us begin with Yosef Yerushalmi who explains that memory effectively consists of the transmission of the past from generation to generation. In his fascinating essay on the Jewish people and memory, by selecting texts from the Torah, he states that Jewish people were “des recepteurs attentifs et de superbes transmetteurs”\textsuperscript{116} of memory, which is of crucial importance since:

[...]

One of the ways in which this transmission takes place is education. The collective memory of the Algerian war depends to some extent on the active transmission by

\textsuperscript{115}Ibid., p. 272.
\textsuperscript{117}Ibid., p. 11.
teachers of the curriculum and whether the past is received by younger generations. Indeed Yerushalmi describes Jewish transmission of memory as the transmission of the Torah, which he reminds us itself means “teaching”, “education” or “lesson” (in French he uses the word “enseignement”) taken in their widest meaning. Furthermore, the Torah was taught at Yabneh, an academy in Israel, and we can note that: “L’enseignement inclut une bonne partie d’histoire”. This however was not all history, only history that could be integrated into the value system of the halakhah, the Law/the Way (“Loi” in French); the rest was forgotten. As Yerushalmi states:

[...] halakhah, c’est donc le chemin sur lequel on marche, la Route, la Voie, le Tao, cet ensemble de rites et de croyances qui donne à un peuple le sens de son identité et de sa destination. Du passé ne sont transmis que les épisodes que l’on juge exemplaires ou édifiants pour la halakhah d’un peuple telle qu’elle est vécue au présent. Le reste de ‘l’histoire’ — risquons l’image — bascule dans le fosse.118

Michael Billig and Derek Edwards also insist on the importance of education to memory and explain the importance of the teacher in this process:

De même que les parents, les enseignants orientent la rhétorique de la mémoire des enfants, qui ne porte pas seulement sur l’utilisation d’un langage descriptif adapté mais aussi sur la manière de passer au crible et de distinguer ce qui est pertinent et possède une valeur explicative ou non. Les enfants apprennent des manières de décrire, de relater et d’oublier; ils apprennent à ignorer ce qui est considéré comme trivial [...].119

In terms of research on the teaching of the Algerian war in Lyons’ schools, this approach to the role of the teacher means that it is necessary to examine the dynamics of history lessons on the Algerian war, and more importantly, to identify what exactly is viewed as “important” and “pertinent”. The importance of the content of what is taught is also highlighted by Eric Hobsbawm as one of the three major innovations of the French Third Republic in terms of the invention of tradition (the other two have already been examined). He discusses the Ferry laws which instituted free, secular and compulsory primary education. We can note that Jules Ferry not only pursued an ambitious policy of state schooling, but also one of French colonial expansion. Hobsbawm argues that education was used to strengthen the Republic by its reference to the past, since primary education was:

[...] imbued with revolutionary and republican principles and content, and conducted by the secular equivalent of the priesthood — or perhaps given their poverty, the friars — the instituteurs. There is no doubt that this was a deliberate construction of

118 Ibid., p. 16.
the early Third Republic, and, given the proverbial centralization of French government, that the content of the manuals which were to turn not only peasants into Frenchmen but all Frenchmen into good Republicans, was not left to chance.120

There is therefore a clear link between memory, education and the nation/the Republic. Examining the same period, Pierre Nora makes reference to the book the Tour de la France par deux enfants and describes it as a lieu de mémoire. As he explains, it “trained the memory of millions of French boys and girls” as it was “an inventory of what one ought to know about France, an exercise in identification and a voyage of initiation”.121 Again, the content of what is taught is central to memory and identification with the nation, which, for my research, could provide a historical comparison between the Third Republic and the Fifth Republic and a methodological framework to research on the place of the Algerian war in the French education system by focusing attention on the content of textbooks and of the national curriculum.

Lastly, some very important issues concerning education are raised by David Thelen since he introduces the question of how memory could and should be taught. He argues against encouraging students to memorise certain names and facts since memories are not “objective representations” which are “passively stored”. Rather:

If we wanted a history curriculum that taught people how to use memories, we would focus on how memories are constructed [...]. We would encourage them (students) to learn how to challenge, adapt, and construct memories instead of accepting interpretations that others seek to impose on them, how to test appeals to the past instead of accepting them on faith and authority. We would explore the social and communal contexts in which memories are created, reshaped, and forgotten.122

In conclusion, this section has attempted to identify the main disciplines that can be studied in order to provide a theoretical framework to my research on the memory of the Algerian war. Nineteen sources have been consulted. They give a comprehensive theoretical framework since they enable us to identify different schools of thought which all provide valuable reflections on memory — the three “cadres” described by Halbwachs, the importance of the present in the determination of memory, a social approach to memory as opposed to that defended by “cognitive” psychologists, Freud’s theory of forgetting as a form of “security”, the difference between oubli and occultation or refoulement, historicist views versus Nietzsche’s concept of an “historical illness”, and lastly the key concepts of “invented traditions” and “imagined

communities”. Indeed three particular schools of thought can be identified as highly important concerning social memory: a Halbwachsian view of memory that sees the construction of collective memory as linked to cohesion in society; a Freudian view of memory in which what is repressed should be brought out into the open to avoid its repetition in the present; and lastly a pluralistic view of collective memory in which groups compete to influence memory. Reference will be made throughout the thesis to these three schools as the case study conducted in Lyons will give concrete examples of these theories, and the thesis will rely on such theories to try to explain why the Algerian war is taught the way it is. Having established the theoretical framework for this project, let us now turn in more detail to what this thesis will do, and how.

1.6. Corpus, Methodology and Contribution

1.6.1. Corpus

This thesis examines the transmission of memory through a case study of the way the Algerian war is taught in terminale history classes in state-secondary schools in contemporary France. It concentrates on the baccalauréat général and does not study the baccalauréat professionnel (professional A-levels) or the baccalauréat technologique (technological A-levels). This was done to keep the study within manageable proportions, but also reflected the importance of the terminale year, baccalauréat examination and voie générale. In fact, the voies professionnel and technologique are characterised by the lack of programme. The corpus of material studied includes written and oral sources that can help us to identify what is taught on the Algerian war and to understand why the Algerian conflict is taught the way it is. Amongst the written sources are textbooks and the Annales du baccalauréat (which list questions set at the baccalauréat examination). Secondary sources such as articles and books on a wide range of subjects are also used.

Primary oral sources include eighteen interviews conducted in Lyons with secondary school history teachers. These interviews were conducted between February 1998 and June 1999. Two sets of interview questions were used. Ten teachers were interviewed with the first set and eight with the second. Twelve pupils were also interviewed in 1999 in eight interviews. All the interview questions can be found in the appendices. Two historians were also interviewed. Serge Berstein was interviewed in Paris since he was co-chairman of the group that designed the 1998 programme and a long-time director of the textbook published by Hatier. He has therefore been a very important figure in the teaching of history in France for many years. Jean-Pierre Rioux was interviewed since he is “Inspecteur général de l’éducation nationale”. Both were
interviewed in Paris in February 2000. We must note the way both these people are eminent historians, specialists of the contemporary period in general and the Algerian war in particular.

The education programme and associated *Instructions officielles* are studied. Examination questions are analysed through the *Annales du baccalauréat*. Different editions of textbooks are examined, not because they emanate from the state but because they are effectively a “reading” of the programme and the questions set at the baccalauréat:

Malgré leur diversité, les manuels, parce qu’ils déclinent les notions à traiter sous une forme quasi impositive, finissent par acquérir une force prescriptive et à se substituer aux instructions officielles, en fournissant des instruments operationnels aux enseignants.123

This is important because the programme on its own is not very informative. It lists only the broad topics to be studied and no details of what elements within these topics are to be taught in class. Textbooks are one way of having a much clearer idea of the actual content of the programme. They interpret the programme and also take into consideration the examination questions set, which are a very powerful influence on textbook content and actual lesson content as both editors and teachers attempt to prepare the pupils for the key baccalauréat examination. Some of the 1983, 1989, 1995 and 1998 editions of textbooks are studied with emphasis put on the 1990s. These elements of the teaching of the Algerian war are presented in Chapter Two of the thesis entitled “The State-Prescribed Link in Teaching”. This is the first link in the educational chain. Chapter Two will show us what should be taught in class and will begin to discuss why this might be the case, by drawing on theoretical work on memory and on the interviews (especially those with the two historians in Paris).

Chapter Three of the thesis examines actual lesson content through what history teachers say they teach — and is therefore the first of the two chapters on “the classroom level” of the teaching of the Algerian war. It is based exclusively on interviews with teachers conducted between 1998 and 1999 in Lyons. These interviews were conducted to a large extent to ascertain whether there is a difference between what is supposed to be taught and what is actually taught. At the beginning of this Introduction we introduced the idea of an educational chain which can be seen to run from the Paris Ministries to, ultimately, the pupil. We have seen in this Introduction how the Algerian war has been occulted by French authorities which means we must question what is supposed to be taught, especially since we must reflect on the role in society of what is taught in schools in general and in history classes in particular.

By comparing what is supposed to be taught with what is actually taught we can comment on the extent to which what is transmitted in history classes, in a memory of sorts, is "imposed" — perhaps equated with a deliberate construction of a memory by the state or elites as a necessary glue for society — and to what extent this can be said to be more plural in nature, influenced by different groups. As we shall see in this thesis, the sociological background of both teachers and pupils in itself greatly helps us understand how the Algerian war is actually taught, and ultimately the difficulty of this task, which became possible only by conducting these interviews. Interviewing teachers allows us to comment on qualitative aspects of the teaching of the Algerian war and to identify what really is taught. It also helps us to understand why this is the case as we can see what motivates teachers to devote more or less time to the Algerian war in class. Chapter Four examines pupils principally through interviews conducted in Lyons in 1999. These two chapters represent a significant effort to go further than simply examining textbooks which is what previous work on the subject was often limited to. Information on the way the interviews were conducted is given below in section 1.6.2.

1.6.2. Methodology

Both written and oral sources have been used to examine the teaching of the Algerian war. The study can be said to be comparative, synchronic and diachronic. It uses both qualitative and quantitative approaches. The sources used are deliberately varied. Broadly speaking, the method is always the same: critically appraise each source individually, compare that source with similar sources (e.g. one teacher interview with the other teacher interviews) and then make comparison with other types of sources (e.g. other written and oral sources).

1.6.2.1. Written Sources: Textbooks

This part of the project is diachronic and comparative as it attempts to compare the changes in the content of textbooks over time — from 1983 until 1998 through various editions of textbooks. The 1983 textbooks are examined through secondary sources (work by French commentators\(^ {124}\) and one primary source: the book edited by Milza and Berstein and published by Hatier. The 1989 editions are studied in the same way, through secondary sources in the form of work by French commentators\(^ {125}\) and one primary source: the textbook published by Bordas. The 1995 editions were examined as


primary sources. Five editions were examined: those published by Belin, Breal, Hachette, Hatier and Nathan. The 1998 editions were also examined. Eight different editions were studied: those published by Belin, Bertrand-Lacoste, Bordas, Breal, Hachette, Hatier, Nathan and Magnard. It has therefore been possible to see the ways in which different editions published by the same publishing houses have over the years treated the war. Given the number of 1995 and 1998 editions examined, the study can also be said to be synchronic.

The analysis of textbooks is both quantitative (the number of words/pages of text/documents on the Algerian war) and qualitative (the content of the text/documents, what is not studied, what is studied, how it is studied; the place of the text/documents, where they are studied). This part of the study is supported up by secondary sources on the teaching of the Algerian war and more generally secondary sources on textbooks. The latter include articles on textbooks such as those published in reviews such as *Les Cahiers Pédagogiques*, *Vingtième Siècle* and *Historiens et Géographes*.

1.6.2.2. Written Sources: *Annales du Baccalauréat*

This aspect of the study is also diachronic, examining the questions set at the *baccalauréat* from 1984 to 2000. It is also quantitative (how many questions have been set on the Algerian war) and qualitative (what questions have been set; where). It relies on secondary sources for the period before 1991 and on primary sources (the *Annales du baccalauréat*, published yearly, in written and electronic form, which constitute a list of all of the questions set in different académies). The secondary sources used include a contribution at the conference *Mémoire et Enseignement de la guerre d’Algérie* which, as was developed above, is the main secondary source on the teaching of the Algerian war.

1.6.2.3. Oral sources: Teacher Interviews

In the academic year 1997-98 nine teachers were interviewed, and the following year another nine were interviewed. All interviews were conducted in Lyons and with teachers who teach in schools in or very near Lyons. They work in six lycées. Two of these stand out from the rest in so far as they have very good academic reputations. The *Lycée du Parc* is in the sixth arrondissement of Lyons, which is an upper-class area. Importantly of the eighteen hundred pupils at the school, twelve hundred are in classes préparatoires aux grandes écoles, which involves two years of very intense study and enables those who pass to go to France’s best universities. At the *Cité Scolaire Internationale* there are only six hundred pupils, some of whom do the terminale internationale, where pupils specialise at a young age in foreign languages (since classes in traditional French subjects, such as history or philosophy, are given in a
foreign language). Both of these factors make these two schools prestigious. The other lycées were fairly typical and homogenous, although one or two were located in the suburbs, which tend to be run-down areas in France.

All of the interviews took place either at the school or at the interviewees' houses. The vast majority were recorded. Most interviews took on average thirty-five minutes. Candidates were contacted essentially through word of mouth as each interview candidate effectively introduced me to others. In general I obtained the phone number and name of a prospective candidate from an existing candidate, I then phoned that person and arranged to meet for an interview. Two sets of questions were used — interview A and interview B questions, copies of which can be found in the appendices. Both had the same aim: to obtain information on how the Algerian war is actually taught, by talking to those who actually teach it. Interviews with teachers were therefore an essential part of the work in terms of "the classroom level" of the teaching of the war. The aim was to compare this with "the state-prescribed link". One way of doing this is to compare textbook content (by arguing that textbooks are effectively a detailed interpretation of the programme) with actual lesson content.

Interview A questions had five sections: the lessons, the pupils, the teachers, the textbooks and the programme. The aim of this first phase of the interviews was to ask fairly open direct questions to get a broad view of varied elements of the teaching of the Algerian war. As will be developed below, Interview B questions were mainly asked in phase two of the interviews and included far more closed questions designed to target more precisely the type of information obtained in phase one. The first phase was more of an exploratory phase. After phase one of the interviews, and the 1998 A.S.M.C.F. ("Association of Modern and Contemporary France") conference at which I gave a paper, the interview questions were changed. This reflected the fact that the questions were a general introduction to the question and had obtained certain information that I subsequently wanted to target in more depth. No more questions were put on the pupils because it was felt that it would be more productive to talk directly to the pupils since it is difficult for a teacher to answer such a question. Similarly, it was also felt that enough information had been gained on textbooks to omit this section. A separate study of textbooks added to the information gained from the first nine teacher interviews would suffice.

However, in order to allow the study to be comparative and to set the classroom level against the state-prescribed link more questions on content were needed — using closed questions — in order to compare textbook content and actual lesson content. The questions asked of teachers in phase two on the content of lessons were based on the content of textbooks: what is in most textbooks and what is not. To this were to be added the questions from Interview A questions on the lessons and the programme which were highly relevant to my area of study.
1.6.2.4. Oral Sources: Pupil Interviews

A dozen pupils were interviewed in four lycées (secondary schools) in Lyons in 1999. The questions asked can be found in the appendices. The pupils were recorded in interviews conducted in schools that lasted about forty-five minutes. The aim of the interviews with pupils was to have access to the “end-users” in what is described above as the educational chain. The interviews were aimed, firstly, at evaluating pupils’ knowledge of the Algerian war (what pupils actually know) in order to compare this with the state-prescribed link (what pupils were supposed to know). The chapter of this thesis on pupils is therefore the second on the classroom level. This type of information on pupils’ knowledge, given its limits, can be complemented by the information gained from existing opinion polls. Another aim of the interview questions was to allow me to compare sources. For example to compare written sources (textbooks, examinations, programmes, articles) and oral sources (teachers and pupils), and to compare oral sources (teachers) with other oral sources (pupils) — to check the veracity of information. Hence sections one and two of the questionnaires are the same for both pupils and teachers.

Interviews with pupils are also a source in their own right in so far as pupils can give information that no other sources can provide. The questions in section four of the interviews are aimed in this direction. They include questions directly on education in the form of questions on the use of textbooks and revision for the baccalauréat and also more generally on films, books and family influences. These questions were very important in so far as they allowed us to comment on different vectors of memory involved in the transmission of memories. In this way this thesis will attempt to gauge the weight and impact of the educational chain in the transmission of memories of the Algerian war among young people in contemporary France. The pupil sample is very small so the conclusions drawn from this source are necessarily limited, even if they are supported by other primary and secondary sources. Lastly, the questions posed are both open and closed. An example of an open question is: “Quelles sont les origines de la guerre d’Algérie?” An example of a closed question is: “Connaissez-vous ce que signifient les termes suivants?” with a list of events. There were no questions on their opinions e.g. what would you have done if you had been in the French army during the Algerian war.

1.6.2.5. Oral Sources: Historians/“Key Players”

Two historians were interviewed in Paris in February 2000. They were contacted through Dr. Martyn Cornick who now lectures at the University of Birmingham and lectured previously at Loughborough University. They were interviewed since they have played a very important role in the teaching of history in France. They have also played
important roles in writing contemporary French history. It was felt that only through talking to such people could certain questions be answered. They were Serge Berstein, historian, who was co-chairman of the group that designed the 1998 programme and former director of the textbook published by Hatier; and Jean-Pierre Rioux, historian, who is “Inspecteur général de l’Education nationale”, and therefore heavily involved in the teaching of history. The questions asked in the interviews concerned the examination questions that are set, the programme and textbooks.

1.6.3. Contribution

The thesis is therefore able to state what is taught in terminale history classes on the Algerian war. It notably examines the 1990s in detail which had not previously been studied. It also adopts a different methodology, as it represents the first time teachers or “key-players” have been interviewed. It is therefore able to reflect on who is teaching the Algerian war and what that implies for its place in class. This is reinforced by the interviews with pupils, which allow us to comment on who is being taught. Through the interviews with pupils an effort is made to gauge the weight and impact of the educational chain in the transmission of memories of the Algerian war among young people in contemporary France. The thesis can comment significantly on classroom practice. It can therefore also evaluate how the Algerian war is taught by making qualitative remarks. The thesis however goes much further than this and attempts to explain why this might be the case. It relies on a significant amount of theoretical work on memory to try to give, however incomplete, an explanation of this treatment of the Algerian war. Throughout the case study reference is made to these theories in order to explain what is taught. The thesis argues that the reasons for the place of the Algerian war in terminale are varied and multiform and that no single theory of memory suffices. Rather it is when all are considered that one can understand the way the Algerian war is taught, how this fits into the transmission of memory in contemporary France on that war and what this means and implies for the French collective memory of the Algerian war.
CHAPTER TWO

THE STATE-PRESCRIBED LINK IN TEACHING: THE PROGRAMME, EXAMINATION QUESTIONS AND TEXTBOOKS
The State-Prescribed Link in Teaching: The Programme, Examination Questions and Textbooks

2.1. Introduction

In the previous chapter of this thesis a general introductory tour to this research project was attempted which included a reflection on the corpus and methodology of the project, literature reviews of work in this area, a section on the historiography of the Algerian war and another on theoretical reflections on memory. This chapter is therefore the first of the three central chapters of the thesis. Each of these chapters examines a different link in the educational chain. The present chapter will study the programme, examination questions and textbooks. These constitute the "state-prescribed link in teaching" and therefore the first link in the educational chain. The programme is effectively the basis of what will be taught in class. It is decided by the "Groupe de Travail Disciplinaire" (G.T.D.), which is a small body composed of people involved in the teaching of history. It is a key body since it designs the programme. Programmes are central to the French education system. However what is taught is also heavily affected by examination questions as pupils and teachers prepare for the baccalauréat, which are set by the Inspections. The textbooks provide a "reading" of the programme since they in effect put the actual detailed content (in words, text and documents) to the titles of subjects to be studied that appear in the programme. This is what is supposed to be taught, reflecting the aims of the state: what young people should know about world history in general and France's history in particular.

The analysis below draws on information gained in two interviews conducted with Serge Berstein and Jean-Pierre Rioux which were conducted by the author in Paris in February 2000. Berstein is a historian, co-chairman of the history G.T.D. between 1993 and 1998 and editor of the Hatier textbook. Rioux is a historian and "Inspecteur général de l'éducation nationale". Both are eminent historians and have key positions in the French education system at the national level, but we can note Rioux also played an important role in the development in the historiography of the Algerian war, notably

---

1They are functionaries, usually teachers or historians, who also check on the practical reality of the decisions taken in Paris.
around 1988-1992. This chapter will also study the state-prescribed link in the teaching of the Algerian war through the study of the *Annales du baccalauréat*, *Instructions officielles*, textbooks and articles. In this chapter therefore the accent will be put on questions of national identity and social memory (including practical examples of the theoretical work discussed in the previous chapter) rather than more individual issues of identity and memory (see the following chapters for a discussion of these influences in terms of this vector of memory, especially group memories).

### 2.2. The Programme, the *Baccalauréat* and the Selection of Information

#### 2.2.1. The Programme

The programme is a very powerful determining force in actual lesson content. There is surprisingly little difference between the programme and what is actually taught, as will be shown in the next chapter. Teachers can devote more or less time to the Algerian war if they want, but there are significant constraints (the examination, time) that hinder this. Such shifts in emphasis are however fascinating and can tell us important things about the way the Algerian war is taught, as my research will show. We will see what sort of reasons can motivate individual teachers and pupils to take more interest in this subject than need be done to respect the programme. Nonetheless this thesis, given the way what takes place in the classroom generally corresponds closely to what is supposed to be taught, argues that the educational authorities (programme designers, *Inspections*, government) significantly influence and control what is taught. The programme especially dictates the context in which the Algerian war is studied and therefore what the war is used to show. This will be demonstrated in detail in the following two chapters. That said, the programme on its own is not very informative and it is important to reflect on the relationship between the programme, the questions set at the *baccalauréat*, the textbooks and the actual lessons given.

The programme which is published only gives the broad topics to be studied and no details of what elements within these topics are to be examined. The *Instructions officielles* and other accompanying documents give more indications but still not a clear idea of what will be taught. Textbooks are one way of having a much clearer idea of the actual content of the programme. They are effectively an interpretation of the programme and also take into consideration the examination questions set on the programme in order to offer a textbook that prepares the pupil for the *baccalauréat* examination. This chapter will therefore address the way the Algerian war is taught in part from the vantage point of textbooks. As will be argued below, the examination
questions set are a very powerful determining factor in textbook content and actual lesson content as both editors and teachers attempt to prepare the pupils for the examination.

Until September 1983 history programmes in terminale in France studied the period from 1914 to 1945 (and a broad study of post-war civilisations which was taught very little) and it is only since then that the programme has studied "Le monde de 1939 à nos jours", therefore including events such as the Algerian war, May 1968 and the Cold War. Two reforms to this programme have taken place since 1983, one was implemented in September 1989 and the other came into effect in September 1998. The 1983 and 1989 programmes were developed by the Inspection générale whereas the latest reform was designed by the Groupe de Travail Disciplinaire (G.T.D.) chaired by Serge Berstein and Dominique Borne and composed of 18 members (10 school teachers, 3 university lecturers and 5 members of various Inspections). The programme that came into effect in 1998 has three parts: "La Seconde Guerre mondiale", "Le monde de 1945 à nos jours" and "La France depuis 1945". The Second World War was not studied in terminale in the 1989 programme and has therefore been reintroduced in terminale. However the main change between 1983 and 1989/1998 is the nature of the programme — the type of history taught — as can be seen from the Instructions officielles that accompany the programmes. Concerning the 1983 programme, the Instructions officielles stated that: "Il faudra donner une place importante à la décolonisation, en mettant l'accent sur ses facteurs historiques, ses caractères, ses étapes". In 1989, however, Geneviève Pastor (speaking at the 1992 M.E.D.G.A. Conference) commented that:

Les instructions officielles, fort développées, ajoutent : 'Le récit des différents conflits n'est pas exigible. Il suffit de les localiser, d'en proposer un typologie et surtout de les situer dans le système international', précisant, par exemple, que l'étude événementielle de la guerre du Viêt-nam n'est pas nécessaire, mais que l'on doit être capable d'expliquer ses origines et sa place dans les <stratégies des grandes puissances>.

This trend has continued and indeed been accelerated in the 1998 programme as, according to Serge Berstein, the aim of the programme was for teachers to "modifier en profondeur les pratiques de l'enseignement de l'histoire pour faire que ce qui est enseigné soit, non plus une accumulation indigeste de faits, mais une vision problématique de l'évolution historique..." and thus to avoid the study of short periods

---

3Ibid., p. 424.
4BERSTEIN, S, BORNE, D, “L'enseignement de l'histoire au lycée”, Vingtième Siècle, no. 49,
in detail as: "Cela exclut, par exemple, qu’on étudie la crise de Cuba". Berstein in an interview with the author in Paris in February 2000 confirmed that this was the aim and the major innovation of the programme.

This has significantly changed how the Algerian war is taught. This change can be seen from numerous comments in interviews with teachers 1998-99, and will be developed further in the next chapter. This trend began in 1989 so, as concerns what information has been transmitted on the Algerian war through history classes in terminale, we can say that since this time not much information has been transmitted; indeed less and less. Berstein in the interview conducted by the author said that what was important in the programme was to focus on "grandes évolutions" and "qu'on ne se perde pas dans le détail événementiel". However he accepted that to describe these "grandes évolutions" to teenagers in terminale details would be necessary, but these should be "faits significatifs, événements importants qui veulent dire quelque chose pour l’évolution globale des sociétés". The 1998 programme is supposed to be one that teaches the significance of events. In this way the Algerian war is not studied in itself, including a study of the events of the war. Rather than being studied for its own sake, the conflict is, in this commentator’s opinion, itself an event in wider phenomena. It is the wider phenomena that are studied through reference, in part, to the Algerian war. In this way, while studying "Decolonisation" or the "French Fourth and Fifth Republics" teachers mention aspects of the Algerian war. For Berstein:

La guerre d’Algérie ne se suffisant pas à mon avis elle-même mais prenant sens ou dans le courant général de la décolonisation qui est prévu dans les programmes, ou dans l’histoire de la France qui est également prévue dans les programmes. (Berstein 2000)

While this commentator can accept how important it is for pupils to understand the significance of an event and to situate the event in wider movements, he is sure that this considerably reduces the information that is transmitted on the Algerian war and that this therefore means that the programme somewhat fails to meet other objectives that it has set itself or been set. These include the "objectif civique" and transmission of memory functions generally accepted as inherent in the teaching of history. In other words what is taught does not include memories of the Algerian war in what is transmitted across generations through this vector of memory. They also somewhat contradict what the programme designers have said elsewhere:

Pour chaque niveau, un sort particulier est réservé à l’histoire nationale. Celle-ci fait l’objet de sujets d’études propres qui supposent un degré de précision plus grand que

While in this quotation we can see the way French history is itself firmly anchored in European and world history, explicit mention is nonetheless made of the importance of national history and the way that French history is primordial for memory and pupils’ identity. Rioux also said in my interview with him that the way the Algerian war is taught is heavily influenced by the type of history that is to be taught when he said that in mainland France there will be in future (and already have been for some years) far fewer questions on the Algerian war since the aim is to set questions on “grands ensembles” not “questions ponctuelles”. That means questions on “Décolonisation” and “Evolution de la France depuis 1945” but not on Algeria or the “guerre d’Algérie proprement dite”. This will be confirmed throughout this thesis.

However we can note three questions since 1983 at the baccalauréat which were “commentaires de documents” (textual commentaries) rather than “dissertations” on the Algerian war. For Rioux the whole programme now is set up to give a “vision mondiale, très générale” and to study “grandes questions”, so it is not possible to do that for all questions bar the Algerian war, and there is no objective reason to do so. He thinks this poses a problem for certain teachers and those (e.g. some historians) who want to talk more of the Algerian conflict in France and think the conflict is occulted. But for him this place of the war in the programme is not an example of dissimulation where one denies what happened in Algeria and tries to forget this period, rather results from the desire to put the Algerian war in perspective in decolonisation as a whole. In his view it is not possible to isolate the Algerian conflict like that. This for him is not necessarily the best solution, he does not know what is, but it partly explains the place of the Algerian war. Rioux in the interview also mentioned how teachers and pupils can work outside class on this subject. He said:

Je n’observe pas moi de regain ou de développement d’un enseignement de la guerre d’Algérie en classe, par contre on observe aux alentours de la classe pas mal de manifestations, d’enquêtes, d’entretiens. (Rioux 2000)

He gave an example of a teacher in the Jura who had organised a significant oral survey capped by a meeting between pupils and different participants in the war. This thesis
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however argues that the Algerian war's place in the programme, and therefore in history classes, does not reflect its historical or memorial importance. The war in Algeria can be argued to have been a central event in recent French history. It was a long war (1954-1962) yet also a recent one as many of its participants are still alive. Algeria was three départements français and had been so for over one hundred and thirty years. At the end of a particularly hard war — in which over two million French soldiers fought (mobilised in the contingent), that Stora has qualified as “un des plus durs conflits de décolonisation de ce siècle” — one million European settlers (pieds-noirs) left Algeria and came to France. During the war, highly controversial methods were used to defend French Algeria (notably torture), sometimes by people who had opposed and been the victim of such methods in Vichy France, which gives an indication of the extent of the division the war created and its perceived importance. A high number of harkis (Muslim soldiers engaged in the French army) also had to flee Algeria. Those who did not, indeed could not, were often massacred.

The French lost about twenty-five thousand soldiers, to which can be added several hundred thousand Algerian fighters and perhaps sixteen thousand civilian victims. It was during the Algerian war, and to a large extent due to it, that the French Fourth Republic fell and de Gaulle came back to power. Nora argues that the end of the wars of decolonisation was one of the three moments at which the traditional (Third Republic) model of commemoration was damaged and ultimately destroyed. This shows the importance of the Algerian conflict to France. Ross argues that the Algerian war was central to the extremely rapid and profound French modernisation in the post-war period; yet these two narratives are separated in contemporary France. Stora and other French historians argue that the memory of the Algerian hostilities has been repressed and that this partly explains present-day phenomena such as anti-Arab racism, difficult Franco-Algerian international relations and the place of immigrants in French society. It can therefore be argued that the Algerian war should be studied in more depth in a programme that wants to privilege French national history, transmit memories to young people and help them to understand the society in which they live.

Unlike the Algerian war, the study of World War Two contrasts with other parts of the programme and can be referred to as an “exception”. Rioux for example mentioned that World War Two was really the only conflict of which veterans were invited into class. Indeed while the study of World War Two is also designed to be a “global study”

7 STORA, B, La Gangrène et l'Oubli. La mémoire de la guerre d'Algérie, Paris, La Découverte, 1991, p. 60.
8 The French authorities acknowledge one hundred and forty-one thousand victims in the Algerian forces and sixteen thousand four hundred civilian victims. The F.L.N. however has always claimed one million Algerian victims. Source: La Guerre d'Algérie, Commission G.A.J.E. of the F.N.A.C.A., 1989, p. 75.
it is a fairly detailed one given the way one year is studied for certain themes. This is not "histoire événementielle" since it is not a factual military history or a history of all the events during the war, but it is detailed and rich unlike the study of the Algerian war. This reflects choices and priorities, the memorability of the event, distance from the event, pressure groups, scholarly research, identity, other vectors of memory and so on. The study of the Second World War clearly overshadows the study of the Algerian war. Pupils in interviews emphasised how long they had spent on the study of the Second World War. The importance of this aspect of the programme can also be seen in textbooks: one hundred pages, in four chapters, in textbooks which have four hundred pages. It is a very detailed study in both the programme and the textbooks. This can be seen in the *Instructions officielles* for teachers for the second section of three that compose the study of World War Two entitled "L'Europe et la France dans la guerre" which was published in the *Bulletin officiel*, June 29, 1995:

À partir d'une carte de l'Europe en 1942, on analysera les formes de l'occupation, les collaborations, les résistances. On insistera sur l'univers concentrationnaire et l'extermination systématique des Juifs et des Tziganes. L'étude de la France ('drôle de guerre', défaite, régime de Vichy, Libération) permettra d'analyser la nature et le rôle du régime de Vichy, les différentes formes de collaboration, le rôle de la Résistance intérieure et de la France libre.11

Clearly when there is sufficient pressure to study a subject, even within a programme described as being "histoire globale", it is possible to study chosen aspects in detail in order to ensure that they are not forgotten but are transmitted to younger generations. Doesn't focusing on one year go against what the programme designers have stated elsewhere? i.e. in the quotation given above in which Berstein said teachers must change the way they teach to avoid a deluge of facts, and instead teach a problematic view of history, and thus avoid the study of short periods in detail as "Cela exclut, par exemple, qu'on étudie la crise de Cuba"12. This is why the study of World War Two is an exception and has a unique place in the programme as both Berstein and Rioux stated in their respective interviews. The wording of the *Bulletin officiel* quoted above has not been left to chance and is probably something that has been negotiated at length.

One of the three questions proposed to candidates (of which they had to choose one) at the June 1999 sitting of the *baccalauréat* in France was on the Second World War: "Comment caractériser le régime de Vichy?" What is more, at the June 2000 sitting of the *baccalauréat*, another question was set on Vichy. This time that question was one of only two questions proposed to pupils. Clearly this is an extremely high proportion of
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questions on Vichy set in this key national examination. This in itself shows us the importance of the baccalauréat, and more importantly that of history classes as a vector of memory. We will also see in following chapters the relatively high number of pupils who had been to a testimony given on an aspect of World War Two. It seems that concepts such as deportation or resistance allow the transmission of values in a way that would seem to be judged impossible concerning the Algerian war. Indeed French scholars such as Robert Frank have argued at length that the Algerian war is not "memorable". For Frank the Second World War gave rise to:

[...] des noms prestigieux dont peuvent être baptisés sans honte nos places, nos avenues, nos collèges et nos stations de métro. Mais de la guerre d'Algérie que reste-t-il, sinon des morts, faciles à honorer mais presque impossibles à commémorer?13

Compared to the Algerian war, the Second World War is more memorable and its memory is deemed necessary to transmit, in particular through history classes in French secondary schools. While it can be admitted that the Second World War is more important than the Algerian war and that the memory of the Second World War should be transmitted, it can be argued that the Algerian conflict is more important than two or three pages in four-hundred-page textbooks. However it seems clear that the Algerian war is not an event which can be used to transmit values deemed important by society in the present (especially Resistance).

The nature of the programme (a move towards global history) to some extent explains why the Algerian war is not studied on its own but rather in a wider study of decolonisation or the French Fourth and Fifth Republics. Nonetheless World War Two is studied in considerable depth on its own and an in depth study of the Algerian war could also be by themes and not "histoire événementielle". We must note the influence of certain historians and schools of history. Indeed Berstein's publications include works such as Histoire de l'Europe; Histoire de la France au XXe siècle; Démocraties, régimes autoritaires et totalitarisme dans le monde14. We know that Berstein and Borne tried in the 1998 programme to move away from teaching "histoire événementielle" towards "histoire globale". This can be linked to the beliefs that Berstein and Borne have of the way history should be written and taught, reflected in their work. The research cited above seems to me to be in itself global history. This situation may, albeit loosely, be compared to another analogous choice concerning programmes:

Au début de la IIIe République, la philosophie universitaire s’est trouvée investie d’une mission par l’État : enseigner aux élèves la légitimité des nouvelles institutions républicaines. Deux doctrines seront candidates à cette fonction : le positivisme sociologique de Durkheim et le rationalisme néo-kantien (issu de Renouvier et plus tard incarné par Brunschvicg). C’est ce dernier qui l’emporta finalement.  

Although this thesis does not argue that any particular doctrine is being taught to defend the current system in such a clear fashion as that described by Descombes, all history programmes to some extent fulfil this role. There may not have been as clearly defined contestants in the form of rival schools of history either, although Berstein and Borne’s criticism of “histoire événementielle” reminds us of the positions of the Annales school of history. Yet Berstein was not the only historian who could have been chosen and other programmes were proposed (e.g. that forwarded by Jean-Clément Martin in the early 1990s which was rejected by the then Education Minister Jack Lang). As Guy Herzlich stated in *Le Monde de l’Education*:

Profondément “politique”, l’histoire qu’on enseigne aux enfants présente, plus que tout autre discipline, l’image qu’un groupe social veut donner de lui-même et de l’univers.  

Furthermore, the history written — not just the history that is taught — can be profoundly political and linked to wider society. This is one of the arguments of Kristen Ross. She comments on the development of structuralism and the Annales school of history in post-war France. She believes that structuralism “was nothing more than the infusion of technocratic thought into the intellectual field.” This was linked to capitalist development as “structuralism served as an underlying ideology justifying the devaluation of humans under capitalist modernization.” Hence she links the goals of modernisation and the knowledge provided by the social sciences. She also highlights the influence of America in this process. In addition to structuralism, the epoch also saw the rise of the social sciences (especially sociology) to the detriment of philosophy and history; technocracy; the I.N.S.E.E. (“Institut National de la Statistique et des Études Économiques”) and the E.N.A (“École Nationale d’Administration”). The I.N.S.E.E. compiled economic statistics increasingly needed in a period of growing state-planning of the economy, while the E.N.A. educated new technocratic elites.
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18 Ibid., p. 177.
Concerning the Annales school of history, the period that Ross examines (mid-50s to mid-60s) is central in the change of history’s role in French society. Before the war the elite were educated at the “Ecole normale supérieure”, after the war at the “Ecole nationale d’Administration”. Ross talks of history’s attempts after the war “to retain its pre-war supremacy against the onslaught of the quantitative sciences.” She also says: “The very function of historical discourse as inter-relation between past and future becomes destabilized during this period.”

The reaction of the Annales school of history in the face of this erosion of its influence was to encompass structuralism and the social sciences so as not to be dominated by them:

By reorganizing history to be the study of the temporality of structures (the longue durée), Braudel incorporates Lévi-Strauss into a larger project under his — Braudel’s — direction. The social sciences come together in a “common market” with a shared project that has the longue durée at its conceptual center. And since it is still a question — however minimally — of durée, of temporal periodization, history can continue to reign supreme.

It embraced the other social sciences as could be seen in the change of title of the journal from Annales d’histoire économique et sociale to Annales: économies, sociétés, civilisations. This history avoided the present. Ross argues that this again was very convenient as this history of structures and slow change weakened the idea of abrupt change: Revolution. As she states:

After two world wars and a messy decolonization, events were to be distrusted. Longue durée provided a means of projecting powerlessness, a way of displacing causal agency onto something so vast in scale as to render human action trivial; longue durée enshrined the glacial.

This last point brings us back to the way the Algerian war is taught in terminale. Berstein and Borne in the 1998 programme tried to move away from histoire événementielle (the same history of events criticised by Braudel of the Annales school of history) to a more histoire globale. This has reduced the place of the Algerian war in textbooks and the time spent on this aspect of French history in class. If the Algerian conflict were to be studied autonomously, then other more varied aspects of the war would be covered. This is due to its place in the programme. It is also due to the nature of any pedagogical discourse. It is not however only the programme that dictates what kind of information will be taught but also the examination questions.

---
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2.2.2. The Baccalauréat

At the M.E.D.G.A. Conference in 1992, Geneviève Pastor gave a paper which studied examination questions in the period from June 1984 to 1991, which she qualified as one of an “espoir déçu” since in 1984, the first year that examination questions were set on “L’histoire des temps présents”, a question was set on the Algerian war in Rouen and for the rest of the 1980s this was never repeated. The question was a dissertation entitled “La guerre d’Algérie” with instructions to discuss the war’s development, to examine its origins, its implications in France and to locate it in the international context. The historian Michel Winock gave a possible model answer to the question in Libération. Winock is a leading historian of the Algerian war, but also of the Republic itself. In it he stated that for people of his generation the Algerian war was more memory than history. He mentioned many of the memories this name brought back and hinted at the boldness of setting such a question in 1984. He then described the place of the Algerian war in decolonisation, French history, Algerian history and other contexts. Clearly, one needs more knowledge of the Algerian war to answer this question than to answer other more general questions (e.g. “La Décolonisation française”) which need knowledge of other subjects (e.g. other decolonisations). However, in the dissertation question “La guerre d’Algérie” one focuses on the Algerian war and describes the war in part to place it in wider phenomena. The Algerian war is therefore central to the question rather than being an event in wider movements. This difference is shown in the model examination answers given in textbooks that are included in the appendices of this thesis.

Pastor, for the period 1984 to 1989, counts five questions directly on “la guerre d’Algérie”, seven on “décolonisation” and three on “nationalismes et indépendances” out of a total of about three hundred and fifty questions — i.e. in all of the académies including those abroad such as Morocco, Tunisia, Pondichéry, South America and North America. At that time there were numerous académies within France in each of which different questions were set which explains the high number of total questions set. She therefore concludes that four fifths of the questions on the Algerian war were set outside of France. If we add the two years after 1989 that she studied, one more question on Algeria was set in France — in Poitiers in 1990. The question set in Poitiers was a textual commentary entitled “Le problème algérien” based on de Gaulle’s speech on September 16, 1959. We can therefore note the initial setting of a question on the Algerian war and its subsequent disappearance, but must not forget a reappearance in 1990. We can state that in this first period of the teaching of the Algerian war (1983-1989) questions on it were very rare, but existed.

This trend has been upheld in the 1990s since, from 1991 to 1997 and for the June sessions, one question was set in France on the Algerian war out of a total of seventy-eight questions on all subjects. In 1993 a textual commentary question was set entitled “De Gaulle face au problème algérien” with four documents (radio speeches and press conferences from 1958 to 1961). However, between eight and ten questions on the Algerian war were set outside of France out of a total of one hundred and fourteen. Four questions were set in France on decolonisation in this same period, versus nine abroad. Another point which needs to be considered for the 1990s is the questions on the French Fourth and Fifth Republics in which the Algerian war can be partially studied. Six such questions were set in France between 1991 and 1997, most of which were “bilan” type questions i.e. analysing the positive and negative aspects of the Fourth Republic. In 1998 and 1999 no questions were set on the Algerian war. One question was set in 1998 on the Fourth Republic and three questions were set on decolonisation that year. In 1999 one question was set on decolonisation. Due to changes in the organisation of the examination I cannot state whether they were set in France or outside of France in these two years.

In June 2000 a question was set at the baccalauréat on the Algerian war. It was a textual commentary based on de Gaulle’s reaction to the April 1961 putsch by French army generals. This is rare due to the total number of questions we have noted on the Algerian war over the years. Also in 2000 there were only two national questions, whereas before there had been different questions in different académies, which in itself reduces the statistical likelihood of a question on the Algerian war. We will also see below and in subsequent chapters how the change in programme has led textbook editors to cut a lot of information on the Algerian war, and teachers to do far less in class on the conflict. It is therefore really rather paradoxical that a question on the Algerian war be set. The fact that Rioux explicitly mentioned in the interview how there would be even fewer questions on the Algerian war in future in examinations, yet that there was one question in June 2000, shows the importance of the setting of this question. Given Rioux’s analysis the question set at the 2000 baccalauréat is somewhat surprising. However the question was a textual commentary on de Gaulle, which is the kind of question that had been set before.

For the rest of the 1980s and 1990s therefore it is possible to say that the Algerian war has rarely been set on its own as an examination question, and the broad dissertation subject set in 1984 has not been repeated as the three questions set since then on the war were focused on de Gaulle (which again reflects the drive of the programme, as will be developed concerning teacher content in the next chapter) and were all textual commentaries. However the ratio of the number of questions set on decolonisation in relation to the total number of questions set in France and abroad is the same, therefore France is not under-represented in terms of questions on decolonisation. It is far more common for the Algerian war to be examined in wider
subjects such as decolonisation, the Fourth Republic or the Fifth Republic than on its own. This reflects the programme. As Berstein said in the interview:

La guerre d’Algérie n’apparaît quasiment jamais en tant que telle dans le programme. Le programme c’est la France de 1945 à nos jours. Donc là-dedans il y a forcément la guerre d’Algérie, bien entendu. Mais ça n’apparaît pas en tant que telle dans le programme. (Berstein 2000)

As will be seen throughout this thesis, this placing of the Algerian war determines what information on the conflict is used to explain wider phenomena and leads to an incomplete and small study of the war. This will be shown very clearly in the following two chapters. The fact that the war Algeria is studied in these wider chapters is therefore extremely important. During one interview, after having said that the study of the Algerian war could not be a detailed one, a teacher stated:

On essaie de faire un ensemble pour voir à la fois en quoi c’est un problème de décolonisation — ce qui est l’ensemble du chapitre concerné — et en même temps en quoi ça concerne la vie politique française aussi bien intérieure que internationale. (Teacher 5)

Another teacher stated: “La guerre d’Algérie n’est pas vraiment étudiée en elle-même, elle est étudiée plutôt dans les incidences sur la vie politique française.” (Teacher 1)

Indeed the terminale year is unlike other years due to the examination. Not only is the Algerian war merely to be examined partially but also far more questions are set on Algeria outside of metropolitan France and are more explicit. For example: “La France et le problème algérien”, “De Gaulle face au putsch des généraux”, “La France et les Français face à la guerre d’Algérie”, “Le problème algérien et son impact sur la vie politique de la IVe et de la Ve République”, “De Gaulle et la question algérienne”, or “Le mouvement national algérien”. The differences between questions on the Algerian war inside and outside metropolitan France was a subject discussed in the author’s interview with Rioux. According to him, differences in the programme in these areas can partly explain the differences in questions. The programme de terminale is the same in mainland France and “Départements d’Outre Mer” (Martinique, Reunion, Guadeloupe, Guyana etc.) but it is going to be adapted to the realities of these départements in the future; up to now it has been the same. In the “lycées français à l’étranger” the mainland France programme is taught. In “Territoires d’Outre Mer” (New-Caledonia, Polynesia) there are already fairly significant adaptations. In certain foreign countries the programme has already been adapted: Morocco and Tunisia.

So the explanation of why more questions are set on the Algerian war outside of France is twofold. Firstly, an adapted programme allows this type of question to be set more easily. Secondly, the “consignes françaises” (instructions from mainland France) concerning the choice of subjects for the baccalauréat and the way the programme is
taught in class are less respected outside of mainland France. This creates more freedom of choice, allowing more time for the subject in class, leading to more subjects on the Algerian war being set at the examination. It also reflects more interest in the subject i.e. even if the programme is the same. Therefore, interest in the question can seem to determine what is done in class on the Algerian war (here outside of mainland France). The people who choose these questions are in the places concerned (it is not people in the Paris Ministry who set the questions). They are groups of teachers and inspecteurs who meet and decide the questions. We have also noted in this chapter that in mainland France there are fewer questions on the Algerian war over time to a large extent due to changes in the nature of the programme: i.e. more insistence on longer periods and global phenomena to the detriment of short periods in detail.

To my mind, in France, the absence of questions which are directly about the Algerian war is very important since the Algerian war is taught in terminale in history at the end of which is the baccalauréat; therefore the main aim of teachers is to prepare the pupils for this key examination. As Dominique Borne, co-chairman of the history G.T.D. and the head of the Inspection, puts it:

Les sujets posés au baccalauréat dans les différentes académies trahissent la pratique réelle d'un programme dans les classes. Ces sujets établissent, en effet, une sorte de jurisprudence et orientent l'enseignement dispensé par les professeurs. 24

Furthermore, for commercial reasons, the content of textbooks is heavily influenced by the desire to offer a book which helps pupils to prepare for this examination, as can be seen from one aspect of textbooks which has certainly improved over the years which is their method sections. These are designed to help students prepare for the baccalauréat examination, in which can always be found plans and proposed models on questions on decolonisation, the Fourth or Fifth Republics and never directly on the Algerian war. This is important in understanding how the Algerian war's importance is minimised in class and therefore through classes. One interesting way that the importance of the placement of the Algerian war can be seen is in a survey published in Vingtième Siècle in 1985. This consisted of a survey of the teaching of the terminale programme. Teachers were asked questions via a written questionnaire that they returned to the review. We must note the very important difference between reactions to the study of the Algerian war on its own and those to (its study somewhere in) decolonisation. This point could also be made for the reactions to the Occupation (Vichy: top of the list) and World War Two. We can read:
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Quels sont, pour les élèves, les sujets chauds? D’abord, et ce n’est pas une surprise, la France, citée par près de la moitié des enseignants (l’Occupation à elle seule fait réagir près d’une classe sur cinq contre 8% seulement pour mai 68). La guerre d’Algérie, traitée de façon autonome, arrive en deuxième rang (dans près d’une classe sur trois)... Assez loin derrière, la seconde guerre mondiale (13%), la décolonisation et le Viêt-Nam (11%).

The term “les sujets chauds” (while being a somewhat vague term) means the type of subjects that gave rise to pupil reactions e.g. pupil indignation at an event. This survey also showed that what motivated the reactions of pupils was above all family history. This point will be developed in the “Pupil Link” chapter of this thesis.

2.3. Textbook Content: Details of What Is Supposed to be Taught

In addition to the programme and examination questions we can analyse textbooks in a diachronic study. It might be argued that textbooks do not belong in a chapter on the state-prescribed link in teaching since they are not written or published by the state, but by private publishing houses. However there are very good reasons to include a reflection on textbooks in this chapter. As Henri Gibelin has stated:

Il est donc utile de rappeler que les manuels sont le reflet des programmes définis par le ministère de l'Éducation nationale. En cela, ils jouent un rôle central. En effet, qui lit les programmes publiés dans le Bulletin Officiel? Les manuels comportent donc tous un exposé des connaissances à acquérir.

Textbooks have received a lot of scholarly attention. The years 1983, 1989 and 1998 all saw new programmes and therefore new textbook editions. The 1983 editions were studied by Guy Perville and Paul Fournier at the “Agoras Méditerranéennes”27. The 1989 editions were studied in various contributions at the M.E.D.G.A. Conference (by Madelaine Guyon et al., Alexis Berchadsky, and Danièle Djamila Amrane-Minne)28.

What differences can we note between the editions published in the 1980s and those published for use as of September 1998, when the new programme entered in use? For the purposes of this thesis I have studied eight of these textbooks. I have also consulted
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five textbooks published in 1995 when the programmes were originally going to be changed, one published in 1989 and another in 1983/4. These are listed in the bibliography. Most importantly of all, less and less is being included on the Algerian war (due to the programme) in textbooks. If we compare the number of words (text) on the Algerian conflict in 1995 and 1998 we can see that there is a very pronounced decrease. For example, the textbook published by Nathan had 1,600 words on the war in Algeria in 1995 and 1,000 in 1998. The textbook published by Hatier had 2,800 words in 1995 and 600 in 1998; the one published by Belin 1,050 words in 1995 and 500 words in 1998 and the Bordas 1,860 words in 1989 and 1,200 words in 1998. Only two textbooks therefore, those published by Hachette and Bréal, stay the same length on the Algerian war. Very importantly these two textbooks also have the same total number of pages in these years.

For the 1998 editions the average amount of words is 950 which is about one and a half pages of text to which can be added on average 11 documents (roughly two pages of documents). In 1995, the average was 1,500 words which was about two and a half pages of text to which were added on average 16 documents. There is therefore significantly less coverage, all the more so if we also take into consideration the findings of Pervillé and Fournier who in 1983 talked of an average of about nine or ten pages on the Algerian war, ranging from two to twenty pages. The Hatier, edited by Serge Berstein and Pierre Milza (which is highly instructive given the place of Berstein in the G.T.D.), has perhaps experienced the most pronounced changes between 1983 and 1998 as in 1983 there were 3,500 words on the Algerian war and in 1998 only 600 words.

The decrease in the number of words on the Algerian war in textbooks was a point discussed in the author’s interview with Berstein. He claimed that “c’est le cas de toutes les questions sans exception” and said that this was due to “allègements” (wanted by teachers). For him, it also reflects a change in the role of textbooks: in the past a manuel contained a lot of information, more recently they only contain a summary of information and pupils need the teacher to understand the textbook. Yet we can note that in 1983 the Hatier textbook had four hundred and forty-seven pages whereas in 1998 it had three hundred and twenty; which is roughly a third less. However in 1983 there were 3,500 words on the Algerian war and in 1998 only 600 words — a reduction of over eighty per cent. The Nathan textbook is the same length in 1995 and 1998 in total number of pages but also devotes less space to the Algerian war; and the same can be said of the Belin. The Bordas textbook however is different on the Algerian war and on the total number of pages. In 1995 it had four hundred and fifty pages and in 1998 three hundred and fifty pages. We can therefore conclude that in some instances the reduction in total number of pages (resulting from a desire to simplify the terminale programme) is probably to blame for less information on the Algerian war, but that this is not always the case. If it is not the case then the reason may lie more in the change in
the nature of the programme. It is clear that every time there is less space for the war then there is inevitably a lack of explanation, only mention made of points and fewer points mentioned.

Diachronically there are less details which can be illustrated through a good example of the same part of the Hatier textbook which has changed over time and which shows less detail (probably reflecting the change in nature of the programme and “allègements”), but also a more summarised text (reflecting “allègements” and the change in the nature of textbooks). In this textbook, although the same aspects of the war are studied in the 1983 and 1993 editions, the text provided is significantly less informative. For example, in the section present in both editions entitled “Les origines de la guerre d’Algérie” part of which examines the problems present in Algeria in 1954 we can read:

1983/4 edition

On trouve en Algérie une agriculture moderne aux mains des Européens, disposant de crédits, de machines et tournée vers l’exportation du vin, des céréales, des agrumes, des primeurs. L’industrie commence à s’implanter du fait des investissements des groupes financiers français.

Face à ce secteur moderne, l’économie musulmane apparaît archaïque: une agriculture routinière et peu productive; une absence d’emplois industriels condamnant au chômage ou à des emplois précaires la plus grande partie des citadins. La majorité des musulmans connaît la sujétion économique.29

1993 edition

... il existe une agriculture moderne, qui exporte ses produits, et une industrie naissante, mais elles sont aux mains des Européens, alors que les musulmans pratiquent une agriculture archaïque et routinière et connaissent le chômage ou les emplois précaires.30

In this way the textbooks in 1993/5 provide less information than was previously the case. This is something that I have been able to confirm in my interviews as when asked whether they have noticed an improvement in textbooks some teachers spoke of an “allègement” or an “appauvrissement” in terms of the content of manuels. This is not necessarily only the case for the Algerian war, but the Algerian conflict probably suffers more than certain other subjects since it has ceased to be a subject in its own right studied in terms of its events, and has become itself an event in much wider processes.

Other examples can be found to show that from 1995 to 1998 there is generally less information in the textbooks, and more importantly to show what is cut. If we take the

textbook published by Nathan, then between the 1995 and the 1998 editions it is the period after 1958 that is cut as this passes from 600 words in 1995 to only 130 words in 1998. Details of the violence of the war and the battle of Algiers and mention of Sakhiet-Sidi-Youssef and the lengthening of military service to twenty-seven months are also cut. The period of the war after de Gaulle’s return to power in the 1998 edition is therefore reduced to a brief mention of public opinion; the putsch; October 17, 1961; Charonne and the Evian peace accords which amounts to 130 words to replace what was previously one page of text. If we take the textbook published by Bordas (1989 and 1995 editions) then we find another example of the cutting of the last four years of the war, in addition to less on the origins of the war.

Therefore in general less information is available in the 1998 textbooks on the Algerian war. There is less text which is achieved by an (even) more synthesised wording devoid of explanations and details or development. It is not only a summary of what was in the previous edition but also omits events — the last four years of the war suffering in particular. Perhaps a good example of the way in which issues or events are mentioned yet not developed is that of torture. On average torture is described in one or two phrases i.e. perhaps thirty words and five of the textbooks also provide a document. The question of detail is a point which is not only relevant for textbooks’ coverage of the war but which was also brought up during several interviews as teachers often emphasised the lack of detail on the Algerian war (in actual lessons) by pointing to the spirit or nature of the programme. The question of detail will therefore be developed further in subsequent chapters as will the way torture is dealt with. An illustration of the general lack of detail in the programme was given by one interviewee who, when asked about the content of the lessons on the Algerian war, stated that:

L’esprit du programme c’est plutôt d’expliquer l’enchaînement des événements sans rentrer dans les détails eux-mêmes... Comment on passe d’un simple conflit local à la décolonisation/volonté d’indépendance. (Teacher 4)

In another interview, a teacher explained how the Algerian war could not be done in detail because of its place in the programme (in wider chapters) and the fact that examination questions were not set on this subject. We can also note the concept of the “utility” of what is done in class which will be developed in future chapters:

La guerre d’Algérie ne tombe pas à l’examen en tant que telle, donc il est déconseillé de s’y arrêter trop longtemps parce que c’est peu utile pour les élèves, donc ils me rapprocheraient de ne pas avoir assez traité les parties qui tombent plus souvent, comme par exemple les relations internationales ou bien l’histoire intérieure de la France. (Teacher 5)

In the 1998 editions of textbooks, in general, fewer documents are also presented but due to less text the ratio between the space for documents and that for text remains high.
or increases. Dossiers on the Algerian war are one principal way that the Algerian war is examined as six of the eight textbooks contain dossiers consisting of two pages of documents. This is very important. It is also a reason to discuss how the Algerian war is taught with teachers rather than simply relying on textbooks, since documents are difficult for pupils to study alone and teachers study documents in class. However the documents studied are often speeches given by de Gaulle and textbooks are not used a great deal in class. Textbooks can also be used by teachers to prepare their classes at home. They are however also used by pupils at home to check their notes taken in class and to prepare for tests. Already in 1983 scholars like Paul Fournier criticised the extensive use of documents which he qualified as “un paravent ou camouflage documentaire”:

... les auteurs s'abritent derrière des documents ou commentaires contradictoires souvent intéressants, mais toujours très nombreux, et livrés à peu près bruts.31

What are these documents accompanying the text or included in dossiers? As Louis Le Yaouanq said at the M.E.D.G.A. Conference concerning the 1989 editions of textbooks, the documents provided are very often the same: the “Manifeste/programme du F.L.N.”; a quotation of Mitterrand’s or Mendès France’s reactions to the November 1, 1954, uprising; an extract from Mitterrand’s book Le Coup d’Etat pemanent concerning de Gaulle’s return to power; a “bilan” of the war; quotations from de Gaulle; Effel’s caricature of May 13, 1958, published in L’Express; a photo of soldiers; O.A.S. tracts and a photograph of the putsch members all appear in at least three or four of the textbooks.

What is in the text? Often the origins of the war are given. For example the Magnard textbook mentions the different populations and inequality in Algeria, the 1947 reform, the creation of the F.L.N.; but does not present the nationalist movements before 1954. The Algerian war can be presented within decolonisation as an “indépendance arrachée”. Some detail of the initial insurrection is given (for example the textbook published by Nathan presents documents on the reaction of the French government and the “proclamation du F.L.N.”) as is the increased war effort after 1956 under Guy Mollet. May 1958 is examined in detail, in on average 200 words plus two or three documents (which represents an average of 20 per cent of the coverage of the Algerian war) after which there is often very little. Usually the last half of the war is seen through de Gaulle’s changes in policy and mention is made of the putsch, the O.A.S., the exodus or such events are only present in documents. For example in the Hatier textbook there is only one paragraph of text on de Gaulle, the “semaine des barricades”, the putsch, the

O.A.S. and three documents; and in the textbook published by Belin there is only one paragraph of text on de Gaulle’s policy change and documents on the O.A.S.

As will be seen in the following chapters teachers’ lessons also follow this model and examine the second and longest half of the war principally via de Gaulle and reactions to de Gaulle’s Algerian policy. This reflects the place of the Algerian conflict in wider chapters (the French Fourth and Fifth Republics) in the programme and baccalauréat questions. The Belin textbook is a good example of the focus in the textbooks on de Gaulle (see in the appendices four pages of photocopies from this textbook published in 1998). Two supplementary “Plans de composition” are included—one to answer the question “Le bilan politique de la IVe République est-il seulement négatif?” and the other “La présidence de de Gaulle, 1958-1969”. In both the place of the Algerian war is small in the answer, yet these are the questions that teachers and textbooks prepare pupils to answer. In the Belin the Algerian war is studied in three separate chapters: Decolonisation, Fourth Republic and Fifth Republic. The text from the Decolonisation and Fifth Republic chapters is included in the appendices in which it can clearly be seen that the information on the Algerian war essentially concerns de Gaulle and reactions to his policy (less than two hundred words in each chapter). The Bordas, Bréal, Hachette and Magnard textbooks are similar. In the latter interest in the Algerian war post-1958 is only in de Gaulle and the “règlement du conflit” and the oppositions to him (in the putsch, the “semaine des barricades” and the O.A.S.) then the exodus.

Textbooks’ treatment of the origins of the Algerian conflict is inherently linked to the fact that the war is not studied in its own right but in the wider chapters in the programme of Decolonisation and the Fourth (and sometimes Fifth) Republic(s). If we take the example of the textbook published by Belin32 (1998 edition), it is Chapter Fifteen which examines decolonisation. It is fifteen pages long in a textbook which has a little over three hundred and fifty pages. In the chapter there are two hundred words on the Algerian war and nine documents. However those two hundred words do not concern the origins of the war, rather they give a two-hundred-word summary of the war after November 1, 1954, two thirds of which insists on de Gaulle’s role in the conflict. The chapter compares different decolonisations (e.g. French versus British and pacific versus violent), which is obviously a vast topic that leaves little place for the Algerian war, which is shown in the composition plans taken from the BeIin and Bréal 1998 editions of textbooks included in the appendices.

The content of the chapter examines the origins of decolonisation in general by examining “La Crise du colonialisme”, “L’Éveil des nationalismes” and “L’Épreuve de la Seconde Guerre mondiale”. The only specific points on the Algerian war are mentioned on page two hundred and thirty-six of Sétif May 8, 1945 in a one-page

discussion of the general causes of all decolonisations; the fact that France was more reticent to let go of her colonies than other countries on page two hundred and thirty-eight; and the (non-commented) document the “Proclamation du Front de Libération Nationale” on page two hundred and forty-four. While there are small exceptions, this model seems to be very typical of all textbooks’ treatment of decolonisation, and of the origins of this movement and of the Algerian war. Indeed, if we compare an “average” textbook with a “good” textbook on the Algerian war, one difference can be how well the origins of the Algerian war are examined. In the Hachette\textsuperscript{33} five lines of text and one document help the pupil to understand the specificity of Algeria. Magnard on the origins of the war is not bad, either. It will be seen in the following chapters that this textbook content is very much reflected in teacher lessons and pupil knowledge.

What is almost never in the text? As mentioned before, there is a universal lack of any detail or explanation. Furthermore, there is almost never a description of the nature of the war or its military aspects, for example battles, quadrillage and regroupement, the role of terrorism, the violence, the role of the army. Nor is there any reflection on the Algerian side, for example on Algerian nationalism or the war between the F.L.N. and the M.N.A (“Mouvement National Algérien”: a rival Algerian nationalist movement to the F.L.N.). The contingent is never examined (except in the Bréal); nor is censorship or literature.

2.4. The “Stakes” of the Programme

Having identified that the Algerian war is somewhat marginalized in the state-prescribed link in teaching, let us now begin to reflect on why this might be the case. As was seen in the previous chapter, the Third Republic provides a historical model in which education was used to strengthen the nation (notably through the use of history; but also through philosophy). Although it is clear that the Third Republic’s use of education to strengthen the nation cannot be found to the same extent in the Fifth Republic, this role is still considered to be present as can be seen from numerous comments by observers of or participants in education. For example, Dominique Borne is “Doyen de l’Inspection Générale” (therefore the head Inspecteur, author of the 1989 programme) and co-chairman between the early 1990s and 1998 with Serge Berstein of the history G.T.D. (therefore co-author of the 1990s programmes). In the French historical review \textit{Vingtième Siècle}, he wrote that: “...même si la fonction de l’enseignement de l’histoire n’est plus tout à fait celle que lui assignaient les fondateurs
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de la République, la dimension civique, sous une autre forme, reste essentielle"34. Indeed, one of the four broad aims of the history programme is an “objectif civique”. As the authors of the 1998 history programme state: “...le rôle d’un programme d’histoire est capital pour l’insertion dans la cité, à travers la découverte de ce qui fonde une communauté humaine...”35.

Similarly the former president of the very influential French “Association des Professeurs d’Histoire et de Géographie” (A.P.H.G.), Jean Peyrot, in one of his editorials in the association’s review Historiens et Géographes wrote that: “L’enseignement de l’histoire est fondamentalement un enseignement pour insérer l’individu dans une Cité”36. In an editorial in 1983 he identified one of the functions of history as to “transmettre une mémoire collective revue et corrigée à chaque génération”; and stated that: “L’histoire et la géographie sont aussi instruments de cohésion sociale, mémoire d’un groupe qui prend conscience d’un destin commun sur un territoire commun”37. Jean-Pierre Rioux, “Inspecteur général de l’éducation nationale”, in the interview with the author in Paris in February 2000, mentioned “cohésion”, and the way it is lacking concerning the Algerian war, being an obstacle to its study:

Le problème de l’enseignement en France, comme ailleurs, est toujours: que dire à tout le monde? C’est pour ça que la mémoire nationale de la guerre d’Algérie n’étant qu’en cours de constitution, l’enseignement tente de s’accrocher à une sorte d’établissement le plus sûr possible, le plus honnête possible des faits et des grandes analyses, des grandes interprétations de la guerre d’Algérie mais n’entre pas... considère que les mémoires et leurs enjeux, et leurs conflits, et leurs cultes de mémoire aussi dans les communautés en question... est un sujet effectivement qui ne favorise pas une sorte de cohésion nationale minimum/minimale, et qu’en conséquence, ça ne peut pas être pour l’instant objet d’enseignement. (Rioux 2000)

Peyrot also wrote that: “L’enseignement de l’histoire a pour but de transformer les mémoires individuelles et collectives en une mémoire commune.”38 This is highly important. If we admit the above as the aims of the programme, these aims are not reconcilable with a detailed study of the Algerian war due to the fact that its memory is not a “collective national memory” rather still a series of “group memories”. We will see throughout this thesis that the study in terminale of the Algerian war is not a detailed study. If there is no “collective national memory” (as Rioux et al. argued at the

conference that gave rise to the book *La Guerre d’Algérie et les Français*\(^\text{39}\) then Peyrot’s “mémoire commune” is highly limited and as Rioux states (below) the school authorities do not (yet) want to significantly engage with “mémoires individuelles et collectives” of the Algerian war. This position is not the only one possible, but would seem to follow on somewhat from the French authorities’ attempts after both the Second World War and the Algerian war to “forget” recent division so as to “rebuild” the present (e.g. amnesties after the Algerian conflict); a position fairly similar to Renan’s\(^\text{40}\). Rioux has also mentioned in an article in *Télérama* the role of the teaching of the Algerian war in the lessening of tensions: he argued that it had contributed to “dépassioner l’enjeu de mémoire”\(^\text{41}\). This thesis argues that this has been achieved by avoiding a detailed study of the war in Algeria. The stakes are still high in terms of the memory of the Algerian war due to the way various communities still very much exist in French society — communities formed by the contingent, pieds-noirs, harkis, O.A.S. members, immigrants concerned by the war (including members or supporters of the F.L.N., M.N.A.) etc. These communities still have memories that they do not share with other groups, indeed memories that separate them from other groups.

One particularly interesting aspect of these stakes involves practical political power in France. One can speak of an “Algerian generation” in terms of politicians who are currently or have recently been at the head of the French state. The most obvious of these was François Mitterrand. He was a minister during the Algerian war. He is often quoted for his reactions to the November 1954 insurrection in Algeria, when he declared: “L’Algérie, c’est la France”. He was “Ministre de l’Intérieur” (Home Secretary) at the time. Another however is Jacques Chirac who was a soldier (conscript) in Algeria. Benjamin Stora in his book *Le Transfert d’une mémoire*\(^\text{42}\) titles the second chapter “Générations du Sud”. He explains that Chirac was twenty-three when he arrived in Algeria to lead thirty-two men between April 1956 and June 1957. He then returned to Algeria between July 1959 and March 1960 as a functionary. Stora described Chirac’s despair at de Gaulle’s abandon of Algeria and his affinity for those who defended “l’Algérie française” (defence of French presence in Algeria) positions.

A very interesting argument concerning Chirac’s relationship to the memory of the Algerian war was formulated in an article in *Le Monde*, in comment on Chirac’s inauguration of a monument in Paris in memory of the victims during the Algerian war in 1996. The editorialist argued that: “Il reviendra peut-être au successeur de Jacques Chirac, issu de la génération suivante, de faire la clarté sur les responsabilités des uns et
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This seems to be logical as we have seen the way Chirac, notably in a speech on July 16, 1995, took a ground-breaking stance on the memory of Vichy when he stated that the French state was clearly responsible during Vichy for deporting Jews. This was the most explicit declaration of French collective liability during Vichy (and much more explicit than Mitterrand had, or had not, formulated). It was perhaps only possible since it was "[...] une querelle qui n'était pas celle de sa génération, mais celle de la génération précédente, dont l'itinéraire personnel de François Mitterrand symbolisait les divisions et les ambiguïtés". Indeed Mitterrand would seem to have tried to delay the trial of Maurice Papon in order to avoid opening old wounds. Other politicians currently very evident on the national stage and involved in the Algerian war include Lionel Jospin, who was a student at the time and opposed the war; Michel Rocard; Bernard Stasi; Pierre Joxe; Jean-Pierre Chevénement and Jean-Marie Le Pen.

Rioux in the above-mentioned interview with the author also mentioned the Republic. This thesis argues that if we accept Peyrot's definition of history as "mémoire d'un groupe qui prend conscience d'un destin commun sur un territoire commun" this involves, as Renan argued, minimising community memories (such as those mentioned above). This is linked to identity and to national identity. As concerns ethnic minorities, this is also linked to *intégration* (but beyond this group it concerns all groups, here concerned by the Algerian war). The idea of "saying the same thing to all French children" is inherently linked to notions of the Republic. Given the importance of "l'école" in "la République" — indeed they are but one in what is referred to as *l'école de la République* — surely a detailed study of the Algerian war is impossible even nearly forty years after the end of the war. Indeed it may be impossible for a long time concerning a subject such as the Algerian conflict (which was so divisive and engendered groups and communities) in the French Republic, and those who look to the education system as a catalyst for changes in the wider memory of the war in Algeria may be wrong to do so since, concerning immigration:

"[...] l'école est parfois tentée par des politiques de reconnaissance, jusqu'au moment où elle se rétracte, incapable de trouver un moyen terme entre un républicanisme négateur des différences, et un droit à la différence qui ouvre la voie au communautarisme."\(^{45}\)

Michel Wieviorka is talking here of the school and ethnic minorities in general but his comments could be applied to the teaching of the Algerian war in particular. The idea of isolating the Algerian war in *terminale* could be likened to "politiques de reconnaissance" concerning immigration and the school whereas a view which favoured

---

44 Ibid., p. 18.
a "républicanisme négateur des différences" strikes me as analogous with not isolating the Algerian war and avoiding voluntarily trying to influence and change the memory of the conflict through history classes. A virtually identical point was made in an article published in *Le Débat* in 1981 that described changes in the way history is taught. It explained the reasons why the Third Republic “republican myth” could no longer be taught. Interestingly, the authors also argued that no new “myth” could replace this old one:

[...] la lutte des classes, le chômage, les inégalités sociales, l’émancipation des anciennes colonies, la présence massive d’enfants d’immigrés dans les écoles, l’imbriication des économies aux structures supranationales, toutes ces réalités nouvelles se coalisent pêle-mêle pour rendre caduque la vieille odyssée. Mieux, la constitution d’un nouvel imagier pétri de certitudes contemporaines apparaît impensable, car il se heurterait à une définition très contraignante et restrictive de la laïcité, conçue aujourd’hui comme une neutralité inodore et sans saveur. 46

Following this line of thought, one can argue that the principle of “laïcité” is used to defend the way the Algerian war is not taught in significantly more detail. French school authorities would seem to be in the camp of those who think that it is better to forget division rather than bring what has been “repressed” out into the open. Indeed that is not really the role of schools, the programme or textbooks. Berstein in the interview with the author stated:

Faire un manuel scolaire c’est non pas dire ce qu’on a envie de dire, mais dire d’abord ce qui est historiquement admis par l’ensemble de la communauté scientifique. [...] Et il y a ensuite un phénomène, surtout quand on en a fait pendant de longues années... on s’en rend bien compte, comment dirais-je, qui est un phénomène de respect de la société. Je veux dire qu’un certain nombre de choses qu’on ne peut inscrire au fond que si la société les accepte, et que il est absolument impossible dans un manuel scolaire de faire valoir un point de vue minoritaire, fût-il celui de l’un des auteurs; c’est le rôle des directeurs de collection de l’éviter parce qu’un manuel scolaire doit au fond délivrer une connaissance historique, je dirais même en ce qui concerne l’histoire un contenu civique, mais n’a pas pour objet de choquer une partie de la société. (Berstein 2000)

However, in my opinion, this position poses a problem concerning teaching about the Algerian war due to the division the war created — memories of which have been repressed according to much work on the question, leading to what Stora has called a “transfert de mémoire” in the present — and the continuing existence of conflictual group memories. It also concerns the nature of the war, with the trauma it caused. Again a parallel may be drawn between the Algerian war and World War Two given that the

study in *terminale* of Vichy tends to confront difficult topics such as collaboration, in this commentator’s opinion, in a more satisfactory fashion than the study of the Algerian conflict deals with its *histoire noire*. This might be explained in the following way.

Berstein in the interview mentioned the way over the years textbooks’ coverage of socialism in the (ex-)U.S.S.R. had changed. He explained this by progress in historical research but also progress in the “connaissance que la société entre temps a eue du phénomène”. This to my mind links in to the idea of shocking society and what can be said in a textbook. Perhaps it could be argued that French society, notably in the 1970s and 1980s, received a fairly significant amount of information on Vichy through various vectors of memory — such as the media, commemorations, trials, cinema, literature — and that this has allowed the study in *terminale* of Vichy to develop. Memories of the Algerian war have not however been transmitted through such vectors to any similar extent, which perhaps explains to some degree why the study in *terminale* of the Algerian war is still so incomplete (to some extent to avoid shocking society, addressing groups, or being biased). Berstein does however agree with Rousso when the latter refers to the way history classes are “le mode de transmission sociale par excellence” of memory. Such a treatment of the Algerian war is therefore very important concerning the memory of the war, and school authorities are aware of this. Also the historian Jean-Pierre Rioux, emphasising the importance of history classes in contemporary France, wrote in 1996:

> Jamais, surtout, le pari sur le rôle et la place de l’histoire dans la formation des jeunes n’a été si clairement exprimé. “Comprendre le monde contemporain et agir sur lui en personne libre et responsable, être présent et actif au sein de la cité, exigent la connaissance du monde dans la diversité et son évolution” : le texte officiel de 1996 aurait pu être signé par Seignobos. “Donner aux élèves une mémoire, [...] aider à constituer le patrimoine qui permet à chacun de trouver son identité” : Lavisse ne désavouerait pas. “Former à l’intelligence active” : il y aura toujours des “hussards noirs” de l’histoire, tant qu’il y aura des enfants qu’il faut aider à grandir en leur apprenant à ne pas oublier.  

The above quotations all show that history is still an essential component of identity — national and of groups and individuals — and that what makes people want to live together in the present is to some extent the past. Indeed, as will be argued below, this role of history may be shown in recent years to have developed i.e. since the end of the period of economic growth now known as the “Trente glorieuses” and the beginning of crisis with the accompanying “acceleration of history”. We partly judge the present community (and consequently act in that community) to which we belong in terms of

what we know about its past. That is what the programme designers are saying. Indeed Borne, in *Vingtième Siècle*, said that: “Le professeur, conservateur d’un patrimoine culturel, doit entretenir l’histoire de France comme on entretient les monuments du passé” and talked of “l’album de photos national> qui soude une communauté comme l’album familial donne l’épaisseur aux familles...”49. However, as later chapters in this thesis will show, in the classroom these comments translate as a very small, incomplete and selective study of the Algerian war and on this question we encounter very similar positions to those held by Renan on “l’erreur historique” and “forgetting” being necessary. Rioux in the interview with the author mentioned the way the education system did not want to inflame or aggravate memories:

> En l’état c’est cela, pour ne pas non plus je dirais, en isolant la guerre d’Algérie, pour ne pas envenimer je dirais des conflits de mémoire ou des conflits d’appartenance qui peuvent exister à son propos, qui peuvent exister sur la guerre d’Algérie bien sûr... Nous ne pensons pas qu’il soit sage d’entretenir ces mémoires à l’école parce qu’il faut donner à tous les jeunes Français un minimum et une vision d’ensemble. (Rioux 2000)

In this thesis it is argued that these aims of the teaching of history translate for the Algerian war into a minimising of the division and violence of the war because that is not what provides social cohesion or a desire to live together. Principally because the Algerian war still tangibly effects present day France. The Algerian conflict is at the end of the 1990s perhaps unlike World War Two/Vichy in so far as its memory still significantly hinders its study. While World War Two and Vichy may still be problematic for French society, much progress has been made, notably since the early 1970s. I think its study in *terminale* reflects this. Indeed Berstein in the interview with the author referred to the study of World War Two (in particular Vichy) as an exception or having a unique place in the programme. It is one of the only aspects of contemporary history that is studied separately. He justifies this through describing the Second World War as a “coupure chronologique importante”, leading to the “renversement de puissances” and creating a “nouvelle configuration” and lastly giving rise to “problèmes éthiques”. While I think that the Second World War is more important in world and French history than the Algerian war, I do not think the above reasons given to justify the exceptional place given to the study of the Second World War in *terminale* apply exclusively to that conflict. Indeed couldn’t the Algerian war be described in virtually the same way? If so, as I suspect, that opens up the possibility of another programme in which the Algerian war would have a different, more central place in the programme; were that what one wanted. At present, and so far, it is not. This may be due to the fact that the past (a knowledge of which is to a large extent

acquired by the study of history) is essential to present identity as can be seen from the following quotations. They were published in Historiens et Géographes at the end of the 1970s at a time of considerable debate on the history programme and taken from France-Soir:

L’enseignement de l’Histoire m’a appris à savoir ce que c’est que mon pays. C’est-à-dire ce que la France, et aussi, plus modestement, ce que c’est que le monde. (Mr. Maurice Couve de Murville, de Gaulle’s Foreign Affairs Minister)

Connaître l’histoire de son pays, l’histoire des autres pays, c’est se connaître soi-même. C’est un problème d’identité. C’est retrouver son identité et celle des autres. (Mr. Louis Mermaz, socialist M.P. for the Isère département)

Je dirais, pour moi, l’histoire fait partie de ma carte d’identité. (Mr. Jean-Louis Beaumont, Professor of medicine and M.P.)

One of the reasons the Algerian war has been difficult to remember is French shame at what was accomplished in Algeria in the name of the Republic. In my opinion, this hinders the study of the war since this thesis also argues that the past is still important to our present identity. It can be argued that in the face of the “acceleration of history” and economic crisis France’s relationship to the past has changed. This change can perhaps be seen to be the result of a new period of uncertainty dramatically breaking with the growth of “les Trente glorieuses” or alternatively as the culmination of the considerable changes (industrialisation, rural exodus, urbanisation) engendered by the growth. This statement is supported by Pierre Nora’s description of a “commemorative era” in Les Lieux de mémoire and numerous commentators description of France’s (although this is true in other countries, too) obsession with memory. Indeed, central to Nora’s whole argument is the way French society has changed in recent years, which has altered France’s relationship to the past. Nora attributes this to such factors as the immense changes in rural France, the decline in Catholicism, the death of de Gaulle (with the consequential decline in gaullist myths), the economic modernisation of France and its end, the decline in Marxism and the opening up of France to the rest of the world. Such phenomena have led to the decline of the traditional model of commemoration and a more local and fragmented collective memory.

Similarly, we saw above in the quotation from a 1981 edition of Le Débat societal factors which have profoundly changed education in France, namely class conflict, unemployment, social inequality, decolonization, immigration, and the development of a world market. Such analyses of “post-modern” France are further supported by the work of Kristen Ross. In her book Fast Cars, Clean Bodies she examines the period

---

50 The three quotations are from Historiens et Géographes, no. 278, May 1980, p. 554.
52 ROSS, K., Fast Cars, Clean Bodies: Decolonization and the Reordering of French Culture,
between the mid-1950s and the mid-1960s. She too emphasises the importance of the vast changes in France in this period. She describes France as passing from an agrarian, insular, empire-orientated, Catholic country to an urban, decolonized, Americanised, fully industrialised country. This modernisation of France is studied through the things it created, notably in the home and transport: automobiles, housing etc. She sees May 1968 as the event that brought to light all of the problems associated with this lurch into modernization. Such descriptions of the modernization of France, which give us a better understanding of post-modern France, can be linked to wider post-modern comment such as the work of Francis Fukuyama who has gone as far as to argue "the end of history". For him liberal democracy has triumphed and is being accepted all over the world. Empirically the argument is a fairly strong one at present. As he says:

Parmi les divers types de régime qui sont apparus au cours de l'histoire des hommes, depuis les monarchies et les aristocraties jusqu'aux théocraties et aux dictatures fascistes et communistes de notre siècle, la seule forme de gouvernement qui ait survécu intacte jusqu'à la fin du XXe siècle a été la démocratie libérale.

Of course, with this model capitalism has also triumphed. These phenomena such as the spread of a consumer culture, Americanisation, "globalisation", and the neo-liberal economic model have themselves significantly changed France, and therefore French identity. André Burguière, writing in Les Annales in 1979, said that: "Face à des temps incertains, difficiles, la France se réénracine". Henry Rousso, writing in 1987, also said:

Sans doute la crise économique a-t-elle entraîné un penchant nostalgique. Face à un avenir devenu incertain, le passé a pris soudain plus de relief; la prospective a laissé le champ libre à l'appréciation. Le très net regain d'intérêt à l'égard de l'histoire observé depuis quelques années en est une des manifestations.

Given the importance of the past to our present identity, and the role history classes still play in this process, the history programme is still important to society. Due to the importance of the history programme for society, it is a much fought over commodity and one which often changes. There is what can be called "a rhetorical basis" to decisions on the programme and examination questions. Social constructionist psychologists have shown that:

[...] even the catechisms and ceremonies of ritual commemoration are the product of conversation and argument, as people have discussed how an event might best be


commemorated, what precisely should be said and done and how it might be realized on each occasion. Billig (1987) makes the same point about the rhetorical basis for the formal rules of games such as cricket.56

This, if taken in the context of programme and examination question design, shows us the importance of negotiating and discussing content. There are surely many influences on the programme designers. In an article published in the French historical review *Vingtième Siècle*, Serge Berstein and Dominique Borne (joint-chairmen of the group that designed the 1998 programme) described some of the consultation process in the designing of a programme. This included discussion between different educational partners — trade unions and especially the A.P.H.G. but also directly with teachers in schools — yet also with various pressure groups. For them (talking especially in this instance about reactions to the programme):

Ces multiples réactions témoignent du fait que les programmes d’histoire sont devenus un enjeu de société et, à beaucoup d’égards, il convient de se féliciter de l’intérêt qu’ils suscitent. Toutefois, mises bout à bout, les diverses critiques, observations et contre-propositions aboutissent à un paysage d’une grande incohérence où figurent tout et son contraire.57

Similarly the quotation from Vincent Descombes given below shows to what extent the *terminale* philosophy programme is (or rather was) also a compromise between different groups. Indeed a parallel could be drawn between the ascension of certain philosophical schools in the Third Republic and that of historical schools recently, now in a way represented by Berstein. Studying the *terminale* history programme, it strikes me that a useful comparison could also be drawn between the pressure groups at work concerning the memory of World War Two and those that exist for the Algerian war. Clearly there is a significant difference between the memory of Vichy and the memory of the Algerian war. This comes to a large extent from wider society and is reflected in the *terminale* programme. For Vichy there have been trials, wide coverage in the media, films, books etc. which arguably leads to pressures on what should be taught in *terminale* favouring a study of World War Two/Vichy. Again this fact points us towards theories of memory that put the accent on pluralism. However the two views — one of pluralism and the other of imposition in collective memory — are linked since perhaps it could be said that the Algerian war has been occulted (to a large extent by the state) to such an extent that, despite its historical importance, it is not now defended in (wider) society as worthy of study. On the other hand, some would argue that French people as a whole have never attributed much importance to the Algerian war. This

---

might be shown through various opinion polls which regularly show the low importance
attributed to the Algerian war in relation to other events. Rioux made this point as
follows:

[...] comme le montrent tous les sondages effectués à des périodes différentes depuis
1962, la guerre d'Algérie n'a pas été pour les Français un événement majeur. Jamais
les sondés n'ont considéré qu'elle a engagé, au même titre que la Seconde Guerre
mondiale, l'identité, la responsabilité, les valeurs de la nation. Pourtant il n'y a
jamais eu en France de refoulement complet. Les associations ont toujours publié des
témoignages, mais ils n'avaient pas de lisibilité sociale aux yeux des autres
Français.\[^{58}\]

One can argue that the reason French people do not attribute importance to the Algerian
war is to a large extent the way the Algerian war has been occulted by French
authorities and repressed by its actors. One example of such an opinion poll might be
that published in *L'Histoire* in 1987 for its one hundredth edition. One question asked
was: "Quels sont, à vos yeux, les trois événements du XXe siècle, heureux ou
malheureux, qui furent les plus importants pour la France?" The question was a
completely open one since no suggestions were given to the pollees. The answers they
gave were the Second World War (39%), the First World War (30%), May 1968 (17%),
unemployment (11%), medical research (9%), the election of François Mitterrand in
May 1981 (9%), terrorism (9%), space travel (8%) and then the Algerian war (7%)\[^{59}\].

Although the memory of Vichy is still problematic for French society, it is perhaps
less problematic than previously and less problematic in many ways than the Algerian
war. The Algerian war is usually described as "refoulé" and "occulté" and it is therefore
difficult to imagine significant pressure from society in favour of a study of this war.
The opposite is more likely. That said, in the author's interview with Berstein he
mentioned one example of pressure on the authors of the programme and authors of
textbooks concerning the Algerian war. He said that he had received a letter from a
veterans' association which was "à demi menaçante". This letter stated that if the
textbook that he was editor of (Hatier) did not satisfy them they would exert pressure
via their (claimed 200,000 members) in *Conseils de parents d'élèves* (which are
committees of parents involved in certain aspects of the running of schools) to try to
stop these groups from buying the textbook. Such reactions may not be received
favourably by those who design the programme and write textbooks and may not be
deemed reasonable, and therefore not acted upon. As concerns World War Two/Vichy
however changes to the programme arouse wider debate than a narrow associative

\[^{58}\]RIOUX, J-P, "Trou de mémoire", interview conducted by Irene Berelowitch, published in *Télérama
hors série* entitled "L'Algérie. La Culture face à la terreur" in 1995, p. 90.

100, May 1987, p. 72.
population. On the one hand this shows that remembering World War Two is not unproblematic, but on the other hand it at least shows that it is discussed and pressure is there to study the war. One example of this was in 1988 when the programme was changed:

Pour alléger le contenu du cours de terminale et permettre l'étude détaillée de l'histoire mondiale des quarante dernières années, l'inspection générale a relégué la période 1939-1945 en fin de classe de première. [...] Des associations d'anciens combattants et de déportés, soutenues par des enseignants, dénoncent le risque d'un effacement de fait de cette période fondamentale dans les classes et sa disparition dans les épreuves du baccalauréat.60

It was due to such pressure put on the designers of the programme that the study of World War Two was reintroduced into terminale in 1998. It is however not simply due to the number of interventions but also their merit. The above example of the letter in favour of the way the contingent is portrayed in textbooks was not deemed reasonable or credible. However, in the author's interview with Berstein, he said that the history G.T.D. had received letters from people who had resisted and from some who had been deported. They pointed to the fact that due to the place of World War Two at the end of première it was not studied (due to teachers not finishing the programme) in a third of classes. This pressure was therefore effective to a large extent because it was adjudged reasonable and warranted. Berstein said that if the Second World War was not studied then that posed a problem of "connaissance historique" but "surtout" a "problème civique" because for him "c'est là que les problèmes de mémoire représentent les plus lourds enjeux". Interestingly he attaches more importance to the civic problem than that of knowledge — supporting the argument of this thesis that history lessons are still very important for socialisation and ultimately identity. Elsewhere in the interview he spoke of the way history classes can be seen to "modeler en quelque sorte la connaissance historique qu'ont les futurs citoyens des événements du passé" (Berstein 2000).

Also one might feel the need to say that the stakes of memory of the Algerian war are also very significant, yet the Algerian war does not benefit from this treatment. Perhaps there was also political pressure as "la mémoire officielle" of Vichy has perhaps changed over recent years. If the Algerian war does not receive the same amount of support as the study of World War Two arguably does (resulting in about a one-hundred-page study of the war in most of the 1998 editions of textbooks which are usually four hundred pages long) then there is a clear impact of the wider memory of the Algerian war on the way the war is taught. Furthermore, it might be argued that the Algerian war is less memorable than World War Two as Robert Frank did at the 1988 "La Guerre d'Algérie et les Français" conference. Part of the lack of pressure to study

the Algerian war may also be linked to associative divisions. As will be seen in the following chapter, veterans' associations since the Algerian war have not been able to find significant areas of agreement. There is therefore hostility between different associations, such as between the F.N.A.C.A. ("Fédération Nationale des Anciens Combattants d'Algérie, Maroc et Tunisie") and the U.N.C. ("Union Nationale des Combattants"). One very significant point of disagreement is how to commemorate the war: notably on March 19 or not.

So, on the one hand, the programme is at least perceived as changing society (as argued by Rousso and accepted by Berstein), but there is also an inverse link between changes in society and changes in the programme. An example of this is that it was in 1983 that post-World War Two history was first taught in French secondary schools. The causes of this significant change in the programme can be argued to be the late 1979/early 1980 debate in society which led to the inclusion of post-1945 history in the *terminale* programme. This debate included a lot of discussion in the media on the teaching of history (in the local and national press; newspapers, magazines and reviews), lobbying in the lower and upper chambers of Parliament, petitions etc. The causes of the vast national debate are important and need to be examined. It was brought about by the action of the A.P.H.G. which acted in 1979 as a reaction to the Haby reforms and particularly the proposal of making history optional in *terminale*. It is perhaps possible to talk of a long-term cause of the 1983 reform — numerous reforms from the beginning of the 1960s perceived as and/or actually reducing the place of history — and a detonator — in general, the Haby reforms, and in particular to the proposal of introducing "options" in *terminale* (history, like other subjects, would have become optional) which, in 1979, sparked off this huge campaign. This debate took place in a context of economic crisis, which on the one hand explains why history was demoted in the education system and on the other why the general public's interest in history significantly increased. France's relationship to the past was also modified considerably in the 1970s as myths about Vichy fell. The debate was also stimulated by significant changes in the world of research. The appearance of "la nouvelle histoire" was to have an impact on the teaching of history, as was the growing acceptance (and indeed institutionalisation) of contemporary history. The latter perhaps made the absence of post-1945 history difficult to justify. All of these factors contributed one way or another to the inclusion of post-1945 history, including the Algerian war, in the history programme which entered in use in *terminale* in 1983. These changes in society merited discussion because they also introduce wider considerations on our changing relationship to the past and the influence of the wider memory of the Algerian war on the educational chain. They show the way that what is taught via the programme is not fortuitous, but is rather a result of wider societal influences.

Two reforms to the programme have taken place since 1983, one was implemented in September 1989 and the other came into effect in September 1998. The interesting
point to note is the frequency of the reforms. As the author of an article in *Le Monde* commented: “L’histoire avancerait-elle si vite qu’il faudrait la remettre en chantier constamment pour les élèves?” 61 This shows how quickly our knowledge of contemporary history progresses (particularly on questions that were once taboo and occulted); and therefore at any time also how incomplete our knowledge of these periods and events is. This arguably also shows to what extent the history programme (in *terminale*) is a difficult compromise between different interest groups and a fought-over commodity. As Vincent Descombes argued for philosophy:

Selon la doctrine officielle, le Programme, chef-d’œuvre de cohérence et de rigueur, ferait l’objet d’un consensus unanime. En réalité, il est plutôt le résultat d’un compromis entre les différentes tendances existantes, et c’est pourquoi le Chef-d’œuvre si souvent célèbré fait périodiquement l’objet de remaniements importants. 62

Furthermore, the criticism and quarrels that the programme engender are also fascinating. All show the selective nature of the programme and how history is a memory of sorts: selective, influenced by the present, linked to groups and “used” etc. Indeed, one point that particularly struck me in the interview with Berstein was the way when he talked of treating the Algerian war in textbooks he often used the word “equitable”. He talked of respecting the historical reality. This consisted of respecting different points of view: he explicitly mentioned those of the Algerian nationalists who started and subsequently fought the war, and that of the French government of the time. He then talked of the way one can “distribuer très équitablement les éléments qui sont de nature à déplaire aux uns et à déplaire aux autres plus qu’à plaire aux uns et aux autres”.

Examples were given: saying that the French army tortured and that the F.L.N. used terror to secure the Algerian population’s support. He concluded that: “Le tout c’est un équilibre”. The impression he left on me was one of a very fine balancing act being done when one treats the Algerian war (in a textbook), very much reminding me of Descombe’s “compromise”.

Also interesting is the way “being equitable” sounds fine in theory but does not really take place in practice, at least in the programme taught since 1998. For example, we will see in future chapters the way pupils say they did not discuss torture in class. We will also see the way the massacre at Melouza, during which the F.L.N. wiped out a village that supported rival Algerian nationalists (M.N.A.), which is a good example of the terror used by the F.L.N. during the Algerian war, is not done in class. More generally other commentators have qualified the way the Algerian war is (or rather was)

61 Ibid., p. 32.
taught in terminale as very weak in its reflection on the Algerian side of the war. Guy Perville, at “Les Agoras Méditerranéennes” in 1983, spoke of “européocentrisme” to describe textbooks’ underestimation of the importance of cultural (e.g. languages and religions) problems during the colonial period. The concept of “assimilation”, according to which to be the equal of the French one had to adopt their culture, was not presented. The history of the F.L.N. was avoided. Paul Fournier, at the same conference, talked of “gallocentrisme”, including in terms of terminology as the terms “moudjahid” and “revolution” were not used. This suggests that the Algerian point of view has never been given as Perville and Fournier were talking about the programme taught between 1983 and 1989. I would argue that sufficient time on the Algerian war is a prerequisite for being able to give all of the different points of view Berstein mentions, and that time is not available to teachers since the programme is vast and the Algerian war is only a small part of wider chapters, and therefore not deemed important enough in its own right to be studied in such detail. Ultimately a detailed knowledge of the Algerian war is not what pupils should learn through their study of history in terminale.

2.5. Conclusion

This chapter of the thesis has argued that the Algerian war is not significantly present in the terminale history course — in the programme and examination questions, reflected in textbooks — and is becoming less and less present. This is in part since the programme in terminale is an integral part of the école in the République and these history lessons play an important role in creating cohesion in society by reference to the past; difficult or impossible on a subject such as the Algerian war due to the continuing presence in the classroom (and society) of different memories of the Algerian war (as will be shown in the next two chapters of this thesis concerning teachers and pupils). Another explanation of the partial small study of the war can be found in the overall memory of the Algerian war and the lack of a “collective national memory” and continuing existence of fragmented group and individual memories. Identity is central to this debate as is shown in much theoretical work on memory, which concerns all French children and in many ways the Algerian war cannot be, or at least is not, isolated and studied in depth in respect of the principles of the Republic: in favour of universalism and against communities and difference. The programme and examination questions are linked to the “official memory” of the Algerian war since it is the government that approves programmes, employs civil servants and is responsible for

education. This is especially problematic given that we are examining the way the Algerian war is taught. The "official memory" of the war has been crucial since the colonial period in shaping the memory of the war into something which has often been described as "occulted" or "repressed". Developments in the 1990s have occurred but should not be exaggerated.

We can also make reference here to the work of Kristin Ross who argues that a gaullist-led erasure of France's colonial past has taken place; keeping the two stories of modernisation and decolonisation separate, in which decolonisation is portrayed as ancient history as if "France's colonial history was nothing more than an 'exterior' experience that somehow came to an abrupt end, cleanly, in 1962. [...] colonialism itself was made to seem like a dusty archaism, as though it had not transpired in the twentieth century and in the personal histories of many people living today, as though it played only a tiny role in France's national history, and no role at all in its modern identity." Ross therefore argues that the Algerian war has been relegated to the periphery of French history when in fact it should be central, and suggests that the conflict's centrality can be re-established by overtly linking it to the processes of modernisation and the rise of consumer culture in France. Indeed her work helps us to better understand and identify what we can call a Gaullist-myth, centred on the return of de Gaulle with consequential turning of the page as a new, modern France is created. We have already identified the way the study of the Algerian war in terminale has been qualified as "eurocentric", which in itself might be linked to a wider narrative that sees the end of empire, like imperialism and colonialism themselves, as the product of great European men (here, de Gaulle) and European processes. Part of the difficulty of teaching the Algerian war can therefore be argued to be the way a detailed study of the Algerian war would attack myths that are deeply ingrained and still dominant in France today.

This position is somewhat supported by Pierre Bourdieu who in a paper given in 1995 spoke of "refoulement" concerning the Algerian war, notably of: colonisation, the colonial period, colonial repression and the war of liberation.65 Benjamin Stora has also spoken of a "transfer of memory" concerning the Algerian war, and thus explains present-day phenomena by the past (repressed, unresolved). However, rather than talking of occultation in this particular area, it would be more accurate in the terminale programme to talk of a partial unsatisfactory coverage of the war. This does not reflect the historical importance of the event but reflects rather the collective memory of the event. This is the case since the Algerian conflict cannot be studied in more depth due to factors such as the divisive and conflictual nature of individual and group memories.

of the war. Furthermore, the way the war is taught has been influenced by these memories of the war — and the absence of a national memory of the war — while itself being a vector of memory that influences wider society. It is a vector of memory in so far as it is in itself a memory of sorts and transmits memories.

If the Algerian war were completely absent, inevitable criticism would weaken the programme but if it were examined in detail the topic could still at the end of the 1990s be highly divisive due to “memories”. The Algerian war is studied in the programme because it has to be (it inevitably figures somewhere in a contemporary history programme), but its study is small, fragmented, highly selective and incomplete. It is somewhat avoided in schools, especially in the state-prescribed link. The Algerian war is therefore present but not significantly so. Also we must not neglect practical considerations such as wider historical trends that hinder the study of the Algerian war. These have been shown to be very important, especially in the 1989 and 1998 programmes. Also research/historical knowledge plays a role in this process. In the last chapter we examined the historiography of the war (but paradoxically while historical knowledge of the war significantly increased in the 1990s the study in terminale significantly decreased, as we can see in the analysis of textbooks). Ultimately choices are made and the Algerian war is not selected to be remembered as World War Two is. Furthermore, the programme and examination questions are influenced by wider society. What society/groups want remembered can be very important, and society is not to be shocked in manuels. This introduces the idea of a pluralistic view of collective memory in which groups compete. As will be seen in the following chapters, the programme very much determines what is taught (see “Teacher Link” chapter) and has therefore contributed to the change in memory of the Algerian war across the change in generation (see “Pupil Link” chapter).
CHAPTER THREE

THE TEACHER LINK
The Teacher Link

3.1. Introduction

This chapter draws on eighteen interviews conducted with history teachers in secondary schools in the Lyons area in the period from February 1998 to June 1999. The questions asked of the teachers can be found in the appendices and were commented on earlier in this thesis. Ten teachers were asked the A questions and the other eight the B questions. The interviews were conducted to a large extent in order to see whether there is a difference between what is supposed to be taught in terminale and what is actually taught. The chapter is designed to give us a detailed knowledge of what takes place in the classroom in terms of the teaching of the Algerian war. It therefore goes beyond simply analysing textbook content which was what previous work on the subject was often limited to. This gives us a clearer idea of what is taught and especially allows us to comment on how information is transmitted. All of these comments will be securely grounded in the theoretical work so as to try to give an idea, however incomplete, of why this is taught.

This chapter will examine what teachers actually teach in class on the Algerian war. It will argue that what is done in class is in between memory and history. It will begin to show that history classes in terminale are relatively an important vector of memory, but that in absolute terms not much information is transmitted. The chapter will show how this is the case by analysing what is taught. The specificity of history classes will also be shown by comparing the educational vector with associative vectors of memory. It will be argued that to understand why the Algerian war is taught the way it is, we need to take into account various theories of memory. This allows us to continue to see to what extent what is taught is imposed by elites (perhaps in something that resembles a Halbwachsian view of collective memory) — and to try and explain why — and to what extent what is taught, and therefore transmitted, is more pluralistic in nature. These issues are inherently linked to what the social role of memory is or might be.

In the previous chapter, the state-prescribed link in the teaching of the Algerian war was discussed. This involved examining the terminale history programme, baccalauréat examination questions and textbooks. The chapter concluded that less and less is supposed to be taught and that the Algerian war is not significantly present in the programme and examination questions. This is due to the place of the Second World War/Vichy and changing aims of the programme. Indeed the nature of the programme has greatly changed over the years. The place of the Algerian war in wider subjects (in
the programme and examination questions) very much dictates the kind of information
that is to be given on the Algerian conflict, at least in terms of textbook content. These
are deliberate choices. It was argued and shown in particular that the division caused by
the Algerian war still hinders a greater study of the war in terminale. So do Republican
principles. Below is a discussion of the practical implications of such choices and
stakes since this chapter on “the teacher link” in the educational chain will show how
such considerations in the state-prescribed link actually influence classroom dynamics
and content. It will also add another source to those studied thus far: teachers. The
chapter is divided into three main sections with associated sub-sections. The first two
sections illustrate different aspects of what is taught by discussing influences on
teachers, the impact of the change in programme, how the war is studied and in what
context this takes place. The third section complements the first two by situating the
Teaching of the Algerian war in wider society and helps us to understand in greater
detail both the teaching of the Algerian conflict and the wider memory of the war.

Before beginning, we can give some brief biographical information on the sample of
teachers. Eighteen teachers were interviewed. They teach history in terminale in six
lycées in or around Lyons in France. As concerns the age of the teachers, five of the
teachers were between 30-40 years old, nine of the teachers were between 40-50 years
old, and four of the teachers were over-50. Eight of the teachers were women and the
other ten were men. In terms of the série, of the twenty-four classes they gave history to,
nine were in L or ES (in which students specialise in Literature or Economics/Social
Sciences) and fifteen in S (Science). We can describe the sample as fairly well-qualified
due to the difference between having passed the “Certificat d’Aptitude Pédagogique à
l’Enseignement Secondaire” (C.A.P.E.S.) or the agrégation. The C.A.P.E.S. is obtained
after a year of study that comes after a degree and constitutes a qualification to teach in
secondary schools; somewhat the equivalent of a British Postgraduate Certificate in
Education (P.G.C.E.), although more academically centred. The agrégation is also a
year of study, but a higher level is needed to pass it, to teach at university-level as a
supply teacher or, if the candidate also has a Ph.D., full-time. Both are teaching
qualifications. Eleven of the teachers had the C.A.P.E.S. and the other seven had passed
the agrégation. This means that they are amongst the best qualified but the sample, due
to the reasonably high number of teachers with the C.A.P.E.S., is fairly representative.
The lycées were a mix of those located on the outskirts of Lyons and those that are more
central. They were all state-run lycées.

Concerning the personal history of the teachers we will see below in detail the
importance of pied-noir origin in the sample. Three of the teachers interviewed were
pied-noir or pied-noir origin: Teacher 6, Teacher 13 and Teacher 17. “Pied-noir” is a
term used in France to refer to people who lived in Algeria in the colonial period and
were European settlers. “Pied-noir” origin is someone whose parents were settlers and
who subsequently came to France at the end of the Algerian war (one in my sample).
None of the teachers interviewed were of Maghrebian origin. None had been conscripts. The two pied-noir teachers were close to retirement and had been on the forum in Algiers to listen to de Gaulle and had lived through the exodus from Algeria at the end of the war. We will see how this family involvement in the war would seem to lead to more interest in this subject in so far as these people were those who did the most in class on the Algerian conflict; in the “Pupil Link” chapter we will see how if pupils are of Algerian origin this again would seem to lead to more interest in the subject and very much colour the family transmission of memory and their knowledge of the war. We can also note, amongst the teachers, the very high number of people known by them who participated in the war which shows the importance of the shock wave on French society caused by the Algerian war. Of those asked, they all knew somebody closely involved in the war in Algeria (usually a conscript but sometimes a pied-noir): such as a cousin, a colleague, in-laws, an uncle, or the boyfriend of a sister. One of the older teachers had been a student during the war (Teacher 4), while others had been children at the time and mentioned memories (notably Teacher 2, Teacher 8 and Teacher 16).

We can also begin to reflect here on one particular facet of teacher identity: that of their role during the Algerian war. Their position was particularly ambivalent since on the one hand they were fonctionnaires and therefore representatives of the (colonial) French state, on the other hand they were active opponents of the war. As representatives of the state they became victims of F.L.N. attacks but, as opponents of the war, they played a role in resistance to the war and in denouncing the use of torture during the war. Vincent Descombes, when commenting on the way philosophy is and has been taught in France, remarked on the fact that teachers are fonctionnaires: “Que le professeur de philosophie, en France, soit un fonctionnaire de l’Etat explique que cet enseignement ait inévitablement des incidences politiques.”¹ Here Descombes is referring to a large extent to the Third Republic, which itself was highly dependent on schools and history (and philosophy) for its survival. We saw in the Introduction that Hobsbawm described French Third Republic primary school teachers as “the secular equivalent of the priesthood — or perhaps given their poverty, the friars — the instituteurs.”² Indeed the Third Republic was referred to as La République des Instituteurs. We must not forget either that while setting up an education system that strengthened and supported the Republic, Jules Ferry pursued a policy of colonial expansion. For these reasons during the Algerian war teachers were victims of F.L.N. attacks like the Monnerot couple or Camus’ Daru.

The resistance side to teacher identity can be seen in the way people who resisted the Algerian war had studied history and were sometimes teachers too. In Martin Evans’s

book *The Memory of Resistance* \(^3\), which examines French opposition to the Algerian war, we find examples of teachers and people who studied history who took part in this resistance. As we saw in the Introduction, Renan in his speech “What is a nation?” argued that history and memory could be dangerous for a nation. We will see below the way teachers fulfil both of these roles — representatives of the state and formulators of criticism — as they teach the Algerian war. For example, on the one hand they often do similar things in class (respecting the programme) whereas on the other they are able to do more depending on their interests. This can be more hours in class or inviting someone to give testimony, neither of which are dictated by the programme. Hence the importance when examining the way the Algerian war is taught of not simply commenting on the programme, examination questions and textbooks; but of also interviewing teachers (and pupils).

3.2. Teacher Choices and the Change in Programme

3.2.1. Teacher Choices

A useful starting point for this chapter could be a brief evaluation of the similarities and differences between what is supposed to be taught (taken as the programme, examination questions and textbooks; discussed in the previous chapter) and what is actually taught concerning the Algerian war. Overall it is true to say that there is relatively little difference between what is supposed to be taught and what is actually taught. Most teachers seem to do similar things in class in like manner and for similar amounts of time, and these lessons given by teachers clearly correspond to what is supposed to be taught. This allows us to talk, as concerns teaching (especially history, the Algerian war and in schools) of the state and/or elites effectively being able to instil its choices in pupils. We can explore the possibility of at least an attempt at some sort of a deliberate construction by the state of elements of a collective, national identity. However, while what is actually taught is overall what is supposed to be taught, it is also true that there is more in the programme than in some teachers’ lessons whereas for others there is less. Furthermore, a lot of teachers say that they do more than what they need do if they were to follow the programme. As will be seen below, this introduces the possibility (albeit inherently limited due to the dominant place of the programme, and the baccalauréat examination at the end of the year) of a more pluralistic idea of collective memory. In this model teachers as individuals or members of smaller groups

can influence a larger collective memory and themselves actively play a bigger or smaller role in its transmission than perhaps they are supposed to do as functionaries, therefore representatives of the state.

Indeed in reality there is a certain amount of choice on the part of the teacher as to what to teach. A lot of teachers in my sample insisted on this point when talking about how they decided what to teach. For one: “Ca me paraît important. C’est l’un de mes choix” (Teacher 17). She also said: “J’y passe le temps qu’il faut passer, je crois... parce que je crois que c’est important, donc plus que ce que me disent les programmes ou les inspecteurs.” For another: “En France l’enseignement est assez individualisé” (Teacher 1). Another said: “J’avoue que je prends parfois un peu de liberté avec les programmes parce qu’il y a des choses qui me paraissent importantes” (Teacher 11). Another teacher stated:

Bien entendu, pour la guerre d’Indochine et pour la guerre d’Algérie on est amené à faire peut-être un peu plus que le programme officiel prévoit pour des raisons un peu d’instruction civique, enfin de formation des élèves... à leur rappeler... enfin leur apprendre quelque chose qu’ils connaissent mal. (Teacher 4)

This choice can be especially where to study the war or how long to spend on the war. Often choosing one subject inevitably means sacrificing another. Teachers often talked of spending more time on the Algerian war being “to the detriment” of other subjects and certain teachers said that they would not have time to finish the programme due to the choices they had made (insisting on one part of the programme; not necessarily the Algerian war). For this reason, and others, my sample perhaps represents especially the teachers who do the most on the Algerian war. This may be due to the number of teachers interviewed who had done the prestigious agrégation examination, which suggests more motivation, more interest in and more knowledge of history. It may be true that the people who agreed to an interview were amongst the most interested in the Algerian war since if they did very little on this subject they might have declined the invitation to discuss it. Given that each teacher was contacted by word of mouth there may have been a “snowball effect” leading me in a certain direction i.e. towards people who took an interest in the Algerian war. However, of the eighteen people asked if they would agree to an interview none refused which suggests that I was able to gain access to people who did relatively little on the war as well as those who did a lot. This belief is upheld in the interview findings since certain teachers had done very little on the Algerian war.

In the group talking about the 1997-8 year the maximum time spent on the war was six hours, the minimum was thirty minutes and the average was two and a half hours. The reason why there is a large homogeneity (and influence of the state-prescribed link) is that most teachers hover very close to the average time spent (which does not rule out significant differences between minimum and maximum times). In the group talking
about the 1998-9 year the maximum time spent on the war was three hours, the
minimum was thirty minutes and the average was one and a half hours. Despite
teachers' insistence that it is they who decide what to teach, there is for most teachers’
classes surprisingly little difference between programme, textbook and classroom
contents in terms of the sort of information that is given (especially in terms of what is
taught rather than for how long or where). Nonetheless, there is scope for initiative on
the part of individual teachers, and, as my research shows, such shifts in emphasis can
tell us important things about the personal and societal factors which may influence the
application of ministerial directives within specific classrooms. Furthermore, such
factors that motivate teachers to do more on the Algerian war (or pupils to be more
interested in the subject) are in themselves ultimately taken into consideration in the
state-prescribed link, for example in terms of the desire not to aggravate conflictual
memories, as was shown in the previous chapter. Hence the interest of studying
classroom dynamics.

3.2.1.1. Pied-noir Influence

It is argued in this thesis that there is not sufficient wider societal pressure to study the
war in considerable depth which leads to what is imposed being a very partial
consideration of the Algerian war. While this may be the case, we have seen that
individual teachers have a certain degree of freedom to study the Algerian war in more
or less detail than the programme dictates. What makes teachers do significantly more?
Interestingly of the small sample of teachers that I interviewed the determining factor is
overwhelmingly being a pied-noir or of “pied-noir origin”. This is true for three of the
four teachers who did significantly more than their colleagues. One of these teachers
(Teacher 6) had lived in Mostaganem in Algeria. She claimed that her uncle had been
killed on November 1, 1954, and was therefore the first victim of the war. The
Monnerots are usually cited as the first victims of the war. My understanding of what
she said was that her uncle was not a Monnerot but was nonetheless the first victim of
the war. Her father had also been killed by the F.L.N. in 1957. Her family had a
vineyard in Algeria until Algerian independence in 1962. Another teacher was born in
Oranie and then lived in Algiers until 1962. They lived in Bab-El-Oued and had
therefore experienced firsthand the “semaine des barricades” (during which barricades
were erected in the area to protest against de Gaulle’s Algerian policy). The teacher
who was of “pied-noir origin” was a man whose mother was a pied-noir. His
grand-father had been a pilot in Air-Africa. He had two uncles who were members of
the O.A.S. The other teacher who also did a lot on the Algerian war in class, but who
was not of “pied-noir” origin, had been in Algeria with her husband “en coopération”
and said that during the Algerian war she had had “une mauvaise conscience”. “En
coopération” is linked to military service and meant working in another country for the French state rather than being a soldier in France.

Before the change in programme (which came into effect in September 1998) one of these teachers did six hours on the Algerian war, two did five hours and the other one did three and a half hours. This kind of interest makes the teachers do more than can easily be taught in the programme which is what a lot of teachers stop at (about two hours) and significantly more than what need be done (perhaps one hour). Here we can see a clear example of the way the process of transmission of memory can be more pluralistic than a view in which the programme is simply imposed. In this instance this is clearly linked to groups and a quite distinctive group memory. We can note that in the teacher sample pied-noir origin led to more interest in the subject and in the pupil sample maghrébi origin will be seen to lead to increased interest in the subject. However this choice by individual teachers to spend more time on the Algerian war, while it exists, is still in an environment in which significant imposition takes place and is fairly marginal given the amount of teachers susceptible to exercise it and the degree of deviance.

3.2.1.2. Pupil Influence

At the opposite end of the scale, if we group the teachers according to school, then it is clear that the two teachers at the Cité Scolaire Internationale and two of the three teachers interviewed (the other being “pied-noir” and doing the war in detail) at the Lycée du Parc do similar things in class and considerably less than others. This could be seen in the time they spent in class on the war and their general comments on teaching the conflict. Both these schools are “prestigious” schools fairly centrally located in Lyons in which, very importantly in this commentator’s opinion, there are fewer pupils of North-African origin than other schools. Perhaps teachers in such schools are also under more pressure to provide very good results at the baccalauréat and therefore stick to the programme and are more influenced by preparing the pupils for the examination. Such issues seemed to be evident in the comments of the teacher quoted in the previous chapter who said that his pupils would criticise him if he spent a lot of time on the Algerian war since this was not a subject they would have to address in the baccalauréat examination.

This links in to the central question of “demand” for the subject. Teachers, for example, answer pupil questions but only if there actually are questions. Often teachers insisted on this point. While they described the lesson as being very teacher-centred they also said that they answered questions that they were asked. As one teacher said: “On est amené à préciser certains points en fonction des questions des élèves... ça ne me guide pas, j’ai mon cours préparé mais ça peut m’amener à aller plus loin” (Teacher
The ethnic make-up of the school was also something mentioned in a lot of interviews. For example one teacher stated:

Dans la banlieue où j'enseigne il y a près de vingt pour cent des élèves qui sont d'origine maghrébine. Et je pense que ce n'est pas inintéressant de leur apprendre ce morceau de leur histoire qui est aussi notre histoire. C'est à peu près la même chose qui fait qu'on essaie de donner une place plus large à l'étude de l'Islam et des sociétés maghrébines, enfin islamiques en général, dans le cadre des programmes — qu'ils traitent plus ou moins bien — mais autant que possible, je ne sais pas, on essaie d'en parler de manière plus étendue. (Teacher 1)

Another teacher, this time at the Lycée du Parc, said: "En général les élèves écoutent mais en fait ne se sentent pas concernés... parce que, bon pour eux, c'est à la fois trop vieux et puis leur famille souvent n'est pas concernée par le phénomène" (Teacher 5).

Below and in the next chapter will be discussed the definite change in memory linked to the change in generation but here we can note that for this teacher at least, interest in the subject depends to a large extent on family (and sometimes therefore ethnicity). One teacher in an interview mentioned how the pupils in two secondary schools where he had worked were not the same and therefore his approach to the Algerian war had changed. He did not describe exactly how his approach had altered but he said:

J'avais des élèves au début des années 80 qui étaient aussi bien intéressés mais il y en avait aussi pas mal qui étaient d'origine maghrébine... d'origine algérienne — pas tous algériens, certains étaient marocains ou tunisiens. Et puis j'ai changé de lycée et dans le lycée où je suis il y a peu de maghrébins, donc l'approche n'est pas la même, évidemment. (Teacher 2)

Differences between schools can perhaps be understood through reference to the work of Maurice Halbwachs on collective memory in which he insisted on the importance of groups. For Halbwachs the present is very important in shaping memory, as groups reconstruct the past in relation to their present interests. People’s individual memories are influenced by the group they belong to, the place that they occupy in this group, the relation of that group with other groups; indeed they are influenced by all groups that have ever existed. Halbwachs examines family, religious and class collective memories. Why does Halbwachs examine these groups and not others? Could a school or class be a group? Perhaps this would not be possible due to the limited nature of belonging to such a group. Halbwachs does not seem to define a group but would seem to examine groups that clearly significantly influence(d) people’s lives (at his time of writing). This commentator believes that many other groups exist, that Halbwachs’s findings on the groups he studied do not rule this out, and that one example of this could be an ethnic group (at this time of writing). It strikes me as extremely difficult to state precisely what exactly constitutes a group — e.g. is an ethnic group sufficiently homogenous? — but we know that Renan spoke at least of different
communities in countries and the way these communities had to forget to unite in a nation. Here the idea of a community of people of immigrant descent is more likely to correspond to Halbwachs's view of a group. In my sample, listening to teachers, it would seem that classes, schools and ethnic groups do influence classroom content and therefore ultimately memory.

Social constructionist theories of memory could also be used here to explain this choice of what to teach on a subject linked to the pupils' origin and perceived interests. This is since memory is seen to be inherently social (rather than individual memory formed of images). It is something that is constructed as we remember together and discuss memories somewhat negotiating their veracity. Therefore who we are with is important. This again tends to fit in with theories of memory that emphasise pluralism. Imposition takes place in terms of the programme and examination questions, but there is more pluralism in the classroom in different schools. Obviously again my sample is limited but the difference between some teachers and some schools does seem to be quite stark.

3.2.1.3. The Influence of Other Elements of the Present

Indeed the present is also important in other ways in understanding classroom content. Numerous teachers mentioned the present in why they studied different elements of the war. One example of this was the study of harkis. Teacher 12 said she studied the harkis in lesson and mentioned current affairs in this choice as well as a "lieu": the Duchère (district of Lyons) and a stele (which was the "monument aux morts d'Oran", which was brought back from Algeria to Lyons at the initiative of pieds-noirs who fled Algeria and settled in the Duchère). Another teacher said:

J'en ai parlé parce que c'est un problème qui revient encore maintenant. Ça ils ont été très sensibles. Je crois qu'ils ne savaient pas finalement très bien ce que c'était. Je crois qu'ils ne savaient pas. Donc j'en ai parlé. J'ai expliqué ce que c'était exactement que les harkis, pourquoi leur situation était particulièrement difficile et injuste... (Teacher 17)

Another teacher mentioned the demonstration that ended tragically at the metro station Charonne and current affairs: the way in which during the Papon trial there had been a lot of media coverage of this event in the Algerian war had led her to do it in more detail than other years. A third teacher mentioned recent books on the events of the night of October 17, 1961, which meant he wanted to spend more time on this subject in future. Furthermore the rise of the French Front National (a far-right party) was also cited as a reason to spend time on a study of the Algerian war in history classes by teachers, as was the situation in Algeria in the 1990s (i.e. a particularly bloody civil war). On the link between the Algerian conflict and the rise of the F.N. one teacher said:
The civil war in Algeria was also mentioned by several teachers throughout different interviews. These reasons given to defend teacher motivation support the argument that the Algerian war is an important subject. As one teacher said: "Ça m'intéresse justement parce que je sens que pour les Français... par rapport à l'Algérie, même aujourd'hui, ça a de l'importance. C'est une histoire qui éclaire pas mal notre présent." (Teacher 7). Clearly then the present influences what is taught.

To resume the argument so far we have seen that the programme is "an official memory of sorts" and that the programme heavily influences classroom content, so it is possible to argue that there is a lot of imposition of what should be remembered by being taught in history lessons in state secondary schools. This is linked to national identity and social cohesion as the content of the programme (its aims etc.) have all been discussed and negotiated by elites, whose comments, as was seen in the previous chapter, show the importance attached to history and history classes in instruction civique, intégration and generally belonging to and living in a community. However, the programme and examination questions, while developed by elites in a very political environment are also influenced by wider memory and society. Furthermore, the above discussion has also illustrated the importance of teacher choice in this process of teaching the Algerian war in terminale. This shows the way that collective memory can be more plural and the way that what is taught is a memory of sorts as it is highly selective. This choice has also been linked to groups and the work of Halbwachs, it was argued, can help us to understand this. This view is reinforced by the question of the present in the teaching of the Algerian war. It will also be shown below that what is selected is overall "glorious" and what is forgotten consists to a large extent of the shameful aspects of the war. Plurality may correspond to influences on the programme or teacher choice, as was shown above, but below it will be shown that it does not correspond to the way the programme is taught. References to the Algerian war are scattered into wider chapters of the programme rather than the Algerian war being central to the programme.

Having identified that what is taught is indeed a memory of sorts, between memory and history, let us turn to the practical translation of the programme to study these points and see how this is the case. The discussion of the practical reality of the programme will highlight how what is taught about the past in the present reflects present agendas and that less is being taught. It will also show that the way the war is
taught supports theories of memory that put the accent on imposition rather than pluralism (especially on this question). Lastly it will highlight the fact that the references to the Algerian war are scattered into a study of wider topics rather than the war being studied “en elle-même”. An explanation of these characteristics of the teaching of the Algerian war will be given by situating education in the realm of social memory.

3.2.2. The Change in Programme

As can be seen from the above figures on time spent in class on the Algerian war, there is a significant difference between the amount of time spent in the period 1989-98 and in the post-1998 programme. Changing the whole programme in 1998 has significantly changed the way the Algerian war is taught. As was seen in the previous chapter, this has been a long term trend which was begun in 1989 (but was accentuated in the reform that came into effect in September 1998). Changing the programme has made teaching the Algerian war even more dependent on the choices of teachers and has made its study increasingly to the detriment of other parts of the programme. Before this was already the case but it is much more so since the change in programme. The change in programme was at the centre of the B interview questions and was therefore discussed at length in the interviews with teachers. The general consensus was that there has been even more of a move away from a factual history to a broader history which is more general and more synthesised.

The programme is longer because of the reintroduction of World War Two in the terminale programme and, indeed increases in size every year because of the “De 1939 à nos jours” emphasis which means there is more to do every year in order to study “until the present day” (therefore significantly more so than in 1983). The programme was also made more general by the introduction of very general chapters e.g. four country/system models. On the change in programme, one teacher stated: “... on nous demande d’insister sur les grandes périodes de manière beaucoup plus générale. Donc en fait on nous demande de rentrer moins dans les détails...” She also said: “Sur la décolonisation on devrait aller plus vite. La guerre d’Algérie on devrait la citer que comme exemple de guerre coloniale mais sans vraiment rentrer dans les détails” (Teacher 11). Another teacher said “... on ne peut pas exiger des élèves des informations très pointues donc on reste dans les grandes lignes, c’est ça le programme, c’est là-dessus... c’est les grandes lignes de notre histoire contemporaine.” She continued by saying: “Moi je sais que cette année je m’appesantis moins sur, disons sur les détails, enfin les détails, sur les points particuliers. Et la guerre d’Algérie, si on l’étudie, on entre dans le particulier...” (Teacher 12). These points are fully supported by another teacher when he said: “On demande aux élèves uniquement de retenir les grandes articulations.” Also: “On demande aux élèves de retenir de moins en moins une
histoire factuelle mais beaucoup plus des évolutions globales” (Teacher 14). In fact all the teachers interviewed after the change in programme make these points.

What is dropped? For one teacher an example of what was dropped was what happened in the rue d'Isly in Algiers on March 26, 1962:

Je n'en parle plus. Avant, les autres années, j'en parlais mais là je n'en parle plus. Je n'ai pas le temps... Manque de temps. Pour que les élèves puissent comprendre il faudrait rentrer plus dans le détail. Je ne peux plus. Moi je ne le fais plus. (Teacher 17)

A further example of something dropped by her was the bombing in 1958 of Sakchef-Sidi-Youssef in Tunisia by the French airforce, which resulted in numerous deaths (children being amongst the victims). Another teacher also said that the change in programme would lead to less events from the war being studied. When asked whether it would be possible in 1998-99 to continue to study the Algerian war in its own right she replied:

Moi je pense que non. Je pense que ça va être très difficile de garder la guerre d'Algérie en elle-même... Je suis à peu près sûre que je vais la traiter de manière très, très rapide et que je n'aborderai pas toutes les questions que j'abordais auparavant. Donc de manière pas satisfaisante. (Teacher 15)

Another way of seeing what has been dropped due to the change in programme is to examine textbook content with the emphasis on the difference between pre and post-1998 editions. This was done in the previous chapter in which it was shown that less information is in general available in the 1998 textbooks on the Algerian war. As will be developed in the next chapter which is based on interviews with pupils, these general aims of the programme have a very direct impact on classroom dynamics. Choices made by the programme designers, inspections and governments are therefore very important.

3.3. How and Where the War Is Taught

3.3.1. How the War Is Taught: “Imposition” Not “Social Construction” or “Pluralism”

The above comments on the actual time spent on the war and the choices of teachers give us a better idea of the reality of the programme i.e. actual classroom activity. How the programme is taught is of key importance. This is the kind of information that can only be gained by actually talking to teachers. Arguably the way the Algerian war is
taught — qualitative aspects of the question — is more important, for example, than how long is spent on the war — quantitative aspects of the question — although there is clearly a link between the two. The programme is inevitably described as long and demanding. Above all it is important to note that the Algerian war is taught in terminale, which differs from the seconde or première years. In the French education system pupils pass through seconde, première to then finish their secondary education in terminale. All teachers said that the lessons were conducted as a “Cours Magistral” which means that the teacher lectures and the pupils write. In the next chapter we will see the attitude of pupils in class and the way they tend to spend the whole lesson simply writing what the teacher says. Teachers often mentioned the difference between different years in the lycée and the way different teaching practices were possible in other years. A lesson dynamic in which the teacher speaks and the pupils write tends to support theories of history (and the nation) being “imposed” (rather than being plebiscited daily as Renan would have us believe). In the context of the classroom in terminale, there is little discussion or remembering together. Teachers said that in other years different teaching practices were possible which allowed teacher and pupil to spend more time on subjects (since there is no national examination to prepare for there is less of a time constraint). A more pluralistic view of memory could however see memory as follows:

The historical study of memory would be the study of how families, larger gatherings of people, and formal organizations selected and interpreted identifying memories to serve changing needs. It would explore how people together searched for common memories to meet present needs, how they first recognized such a memory and then agreed, disagreed, or negotiated over its meaning, and finally how they preserved and absorbed that meaning into their ongoing concerns.4

In this quotation there is obviously a lot of room for pluralism, as negotiation takes place. In the classroom however, at least in terminale, it would be more accurate to talk of imposition and a distinct lack of discussion. Other teachers also mentioned the “utility” of the classes: “On essaie au maximum que ce qui est fait en classe soit utile/utilisable” (Teacher 1). This means that teachers try to make classroom content relevant to answering examination questions. The way the Algerian war is taught also depends on the série:

Le problème des Terminales S est que le coefficient d’Histoire-Géographie à l’examen/au bac est relativement faible, donc ils vont minimiser leurs efforts et ils préfèrent qu’on leur présente un matériel tout fait qui n’est plus qu’à réutiliser. Donc on peut bien essayer d’illustrer le cours par soit quelques extraits de bande vidéo,

soit en essayant de leur indiquer des films ou des lectures ou des références mais on n’a pas le temps de les utiliser en classe. Deux heures c’est très, très court. On a juste le temps de faire le tour de la question à peu près mais on ne peut pas approfondir. (Teacher 5)

Although this teacher is talking about the série S (scientific students) his comments effectively also (to a slightly smaller degree) apply to other séries and the terminale year in general. The comments on the attitude of the students echo what was said by other teachers. Also mentioned by all teachers is the problem of time which leads to the difficulty of not being able to go into detail. Support documents are said to be impossible to use in class, which also corresponds to what other teachers have said. Students are preparing for the baccalauréat and are therefore “consumers”. Other sources cannot be used, especially for the Algerian war. The vast majority of teachers talked this way about their lessons, but not all. Those who chose to spend significantly more time on the Algerian war tend to mention these points a little less. Furthermore, it can be noted that the argument that there is a lot of imposition in the teaching of the Algerian war and little room for discussion does not contradict the above argument that the make-up of the class can change classroom content. It might be argued, for example, that while what dominates is imposition which tends to aim to reduce division or pluralism in the creation of some form of “mémorie commune”, there is still room for some pluralism in the form of group pressures and influences in this process.

3.3.2. References to the War Are Scattered into Wider Subjects

3.3.2.1. Lack of Detail

At the centre of an understanding of how the Algerian war is taught and what is taught is the question of the detail that is given on the Algerian war and the fact that most points are just mentioned without sufficient explanation. To a large extent this is linked to the nature and aims of the programme. A quotation was given in the previous chapter in which the teacher (Teacher 4) described the “esprit du programme” which meant that the aim of the classes was to explain the sequence of events during the Algerian war rather than giving details of the events themselves. However it is also due to a very long programme and a lack of interest in the Algerian war “en soi”. For another teacher the aim of the lessons was to show the “étapes” in the war (Teacher 2). This is fairly evident in teachers’ discourse when they stick to a chronology. One teacher brought some documents to the interview, one of which was a chronology of the Algerian conflict taken from Le Monde in 1992 (one A4 page recto-verso included in the appendices). He talked me through the chronology telling me which of the elements he did or did not do in class. Broadly speaking, and this applies to all the teachers in the sample, if the emphasis is put on the stages of the war then very little is done before
1954 (perhaps Sétif May 8, 1945), and then 1954 is studied as the “déclenchement” of the war, 1955 and 1956 constitute an “enlisement” in the war, 1957 is important for the battle of Algiers and 1958 is studied for de Gaulle’s return to power. The lessons show that 1959 included de Gaulle’s speech on “autodétermination”, in 1960 de Gaulle speaks of an “Algérie algérienne” which leads to certain reactions including the “semaine des barricades”, 1961 brings a referendum and more reactions including the O.A.S. and the putsch, and in 1962 there are negotiations, the “accords d’Evian” and independence.

In this way the details of the war, so to speak, are not studied, but the student should understand the development of the war. The stages of the war are studied in so far as the lessons should show how a relatively small insurrection led to independence and, importantly, how over the years peace was achieved (insisting on the role of de Gaulle). As the particular teacher who talked me through the chronology taken from Le Monde said: “Il y a beaucoup de choses qui passent à la trappe... qui sont souvent évacuées” (Teacher 10). In the chronology he gave me, elements of the war not studied but in the chronology included December 1954, Creation of the “Mouvement National Algérien” (M.N.A.: a nationalist movement rivalling the F.L.N.); May 19, 1955, Decision to call up again soldiers who had already done their military service; February 6, 1956, “La journée des tomates”; May 18, 1956, Palestro; September 30, Terrorist attacks in Algiers including one on the Milk-bar; October 22, 1956, Hijacking of Ben Bella et al.; May 29, 1957, Melouza; February 8, 1958, Sakhiet-Sidi-Youssef; 1960 Jeanson trial and the “Manifeste des 121”; February 8, 1962, Charonne; March 26, 1962, La rue d’Isly. While that does not mean that all of the other elements included in the chronology were studied, it does show how many significant events of the war are not done in class. It also shows how much of what is left out includes to a large extent the most violent and ultimately most occulted aspects of the war. In the elements of the war studied by that particular teacher, while there was an emphasis on explaining the overall development of the war (in the way explained above) there was also a lot of insistence on de Gaulle. This kind of approach to the Algerian war is also evident in the lesson plan given in the appendices. Another teacher described the lessons as “general history”:

On fait toujours un cours en fonction de l’épreuve du baccalauréat possible. Donc, on les prépare à tels types de sujets et aussi au fait que c’est un cours d’histoire générale donc on ne rentre pas dans les détails extrêmement précis sur la guerre d’Algérie. (Teacher 3)

One teacher, after the change in programme, seemed particularly unhappy with the way in which the new programme meant she had to examine history in terminale and particularly the Algerian war. She said: “Il faut dire tout, parler de tout, mais sans rien approfondir, ça reste très, très superficiel” (Teacher 16). This is inherently linked to the
problem of time which was mentioned by all teachers throughout all interviews. All teachers have to go extremely quickly. As we have seen, spending more time on one subject is to the detriment of others and teachers often do not finish the programme. A leitmotif in the interviews is: “On n’a pas le temps”. This determines the lecture-style form of the lesson. It also dictates whether sources can or cannot be used. This is true for written documents or video but also for the question of inviting veterans into class (see below in the next section of this chapter). Most importantly of all it means that no details or explanation can be given.

In this way while many teachers said “yes” they studied points I asked them about in my interview questions (included in the appendices), more often than not this treatment was qualified as “citer”, “indiquer”, “mentionner”, “signaler” or “évoquer”. Such words are very dominant in teachers’ discourse and undoubtedly mean that details are not given. As one teacher said: “... la mémoire n’est pas vraiment, je trouve, transmise dans la mesure où c’est évoquée mais ce n’est pas véritablement expliquée” (Teacher 16). The fact that the treatment of the Algerian war is not a detailed study was something very perceptible in the pupil interviews as will be shown in the next chapter. There is very little understanding on the part of students if their knowledge comes from the classroom. Only a limited number of points are dealt with in class and those that are talked about are not done in sufficient detail so that they are understood. This corresponds to the result of history classes, but is not true of knowledge obtained from the family. These points will be discussed further in the next chapter.

One question can be examined in particular to grasp the importance of only mentioning things: torture during the Algerian war. Indeed this aspect of the war was one example given by a teacher to illustrate the way points were only mentioned. The teacher gave the example of torture to illustrate the lack of detail. When asked about how long he spent on the war, he said:

On ne peut pas rentrer dans les détails, on peut juste voir les mécanismes et des indications et on ne peut pas rentrer dans les détails ni des opérations militaires ni en fait de tel ou tel détail significatif comme par exemple le rôle de la torture. On parle du problème de la torture mais on le cite en passant, on n’est pas obligé d’aller plus loin. (Teacher 5)

Teachers when asked about torture, in the B sample, sometimes seemed a little ill at ease. This can be seen in different reactions. It can be heard, as one teacher replied to the question on torture with “Ah!”, or seen, as teachers look uncomfortable. It can be in the content of what is said on torture as teachers immediately insist that there were excesses on both the French and Algerian sides (and while this is undoubtedly true, one has the impression that the phrase is a way to relativise or justify torture). It can also be seen in incoherent answers. One teacher started her answer by insisting on the importance of studying torture (by making reference to the scale of its use and to the
accusations of torture levelled against the leader of the French National Front in the 1980s) and then finished by saying that she just mentioned this question in class. Another started by saying that she did not study torture but then later said that she told the students that the Algerian war had been a very hard war and for a long time torture had been a taboo subject. Beyond this ill-ease in answering the question in the interview, one teacher (out of seven) said she did not talk about it in class. Three teachers described it as being a quick treatment. The other three dealt with it in more depth (though they were all talking about the period before the change in programme). Textbooks’ treatment of torture has already been described in this thesis and amounted in 1998 editions of textbooks to one or two lines and a document.

3.3.2.2. Where the War Is Studied

Also of key importance is where the Algerian war is examined. This is determined by the programme and the examination. As was seen in the last chapter the Algerian war is never examined on its own in dissertations, rather questions on the war are in the wider subjects of decolonisation and the French Fourth and Fifth Republics. Hence the programme very much dictates what kind of information is given on the Algerian war as it is “used” to illustrate wider phenomena. As one teacher stated:

L'objectif c'est l'examen, c'est le baccalauréat, donc le contenu il est pour leur permettre de répondre à des questions; ils n'ont pas la guerre d'Algérie simplement, donc c'est pour leur permettre de répondre à des sujets sur la décolonisation — la France et la décolonisation ou les décolonisations en général — ou pour leur permettre de répondre à des questions sur la Ve République. Elle est toujours vue au travers de quelque chose... (Teacher 7)

Jean-Pierre Rioux, in an interview in 1995, mentioned the way the war was studied in wider subjects:

[...] elle (la guerre d'Algérie) est enseignée depuis le début des années 80 en troisième et terminale. Même si c'est dans le cadre d'un panorama du monde contemporain, et bien qu'elle ait été très soigneusement inscrite dans le contexte de la décolonisation mondiale, cela a très certainement contribué à dépasionner l'enjeu de mémoire.⁵

This comment includes numerous points of interest. Rioux is, in my opinion, certainly correct to point to the importance of the context in which the war is studied and to mention that the war is not studied in a chapter of the programme of its own. The way he talks of it being “soigneusement” (carefully) put into the decolonisation chapter

allows us to reiterate the fact that the programme is the result of choices and ultimately negotiation in the face of varying societal pressures. My initial reading of the phrase “soigneusement inscrite dans le contexte de la décolonisation” was that the difficult subject of the Algerian war was somewhat disguised in the less offensive decolonisation chapter. This in part came from the structure of the phrases. Rioux starts by saying that the war is taught, and finishes by saying that this has somewhat eased tension on the subject. In between he says “mème si” and “bien que” which are link words that limit his other (positive) comments. “Soigneusement” then becomes somewhat negative and restrictive.

However, in the interview with him I conducted in Paris in February 2000, he said that what he meant by “soigneusement” was that the war was not to be forgotten. Care was to be taken that its study took place. This commentator remains somewhat sceptical on this point and wonders whether the question asked in my interview was perhaps not clear enough. The exact question asked was: “Vous avez parlé d’une guerre d’Algérie “très soigneusement inscrite dans le contexte de la décolonisation mondiale” (Télérama 1995). Que vouliez-vous dire, surtout par le mot “soigneusement”?” Did Rioux really remember the comment I was referring to? Should I have been more explicit? These are questions that this commentator cannot answer with certainty, however I still tend to stand by my initial reading of his comments. Lastly, as will be argued throughout this thesis, the way the Algerian war is taught does take the passion out of the subject and does therefore contribute to an overall change (across generations) in French collective memory of the Algerian war. However, this is only achieved by partially studying the subject which ultimately perpetuates occultation and leads to ignorance of the subject. It has not been achieved by bringing the subject out into the open and discussing it.

The place of the Algerian war in the programme has very important consequences on the sort of information that is given (and also that which is not). For example in the section on the French Fourth and Fifth Republics:

On fait une étude assez précise des événements de mai 1958 et on essaie de montrer l’enjeu du changement de gouvernement. Donc on parle beaucoup des problèmes algériens mais aussi des problèmes institutionnels en même temps. C’est donc plutôt comme à-ce-stade-là un morceau de l’histoire politique française. Ensuite on revient sur la question de la guerre d’Algérie quand on étudie la politique du général de Gaulle jusqu’en 1962, et donc c’est pareil, on voit les principales étapes mais au milieu d’une analyse des réalisations gaullistes à-ce-moment-là. (Teacher 1)

Another teacher stated:

Lorsque je la traite dans le cadre de la décolonisation je vois en quoi l’Algérie est un exemple de décolonisation. Quand je la traite dans la Quatrième et la Cinquième Républiques je vois en quoi l’Algérie a été un facteur politique d’évolution pour la Quatrième et la Cinquième Républiques. En quoi par exemple elle a précipité la fin
de la Quatrième ou le début de la Cinquième. Comment le général de Gaulle l’a traitée. Ce n’est pas du tout la même optique. (Teacher 14)

The problem with viewing the Algerian war in these chapters is that it means only certain information is used to illustrate these wider phenomena and it is not the Algerian conflict that is studied in its own right. The Algerian war is somewhat lost in these vast chapters. This is why (and how) in terminale classes there is only a very partial study of the war. Only certain aspects of the war are studied and others are never studied. The study is not only partial but also broken up into different parts. As Paul Fournier said about textbooks at the “Agoras Méditerranéennes” in 1983: “Le cadrage dispersé aboutit donc à une absence de réflexion sur l’ensemble du problème de la guerre d’Algérie”6. The partial nature of the treatment of the Algerian war explains why the conflict can be described, for the purposes of the programme, in one page of text in many 1998 edition textbooks. Certain elements of the war can easily be and are avoided. My B interview questions allowed me to analyse in depth the content of lessons on the Algerian war in which it is clear that overall only information that corresponds to the aims of the programme is given.

In the French Fourth and Fifth Republics much of what is done on the Algerian war in the period 1958-1962 to a large extent concerns de Gaulle (see the lesson plan in the appendices with the predominant position of firstly “le règlement du conflit” in the lesson and secondly de Gaulle in “le règlement du conflit”). It can however also be noted that even when the Algerian war is studied in the chapter on decolonisation de Gaulle’s policy is also studied to the detriment of other elements (see copy of Belin, 1998, plan “La France et la décolonisation, 1944-1962” in appendices). Perhaps this is due to the general aims of the programme with the emphasis put on “grandes étapes” and the fact that it is something now viewed as a good policy. The importance of de Gaulle can be seen in the quotations given above. For one teacher the second of her two hours revolved around de Gaulle (Teacher 11; and this would seem to be fairly typical). For all teachers in the B sample de Gaulle was said to be central. Indeed when asked whether she studied de Gaulle one teacher said: “La politique de de Gaulle. Evidemment. Elle est au cœur du programme. Les institutions et tout ça” (Teacher 12) For another de Gaulle’s policy “chapeau le reste”: “C’est la politique gaulliste qui est le chapeau du chapitre sur la guerre d’Algérie” (Teacher 13). This was also a point made by Teacher 2 (and other teachers e.g. Teacher 10) in the A sample:

[...] surtout je leur montre comment de Gaulle essaie de résoudre le problème par petites touches [...] surtout comment de Gaulle ayant vu que finalement il n’était pas possible, du moins, en 1958/59 lorsqu’il est au pouvoir de garder l’Algérie, comment il va faire évoluer les différents niveaux d’opinion vers l’indépendance — que ce soit

As was very clear in one teacher interview (supported by others), the study essentially focused on de Gaulle and used other events to illustrate de Gaulle. Other events are "integrated" into a study of de Gaulle's policy. For one teacher the study of de Gaulle was central and so the first thing on the list that she said she studied was de Gaulle's policy, and then other things on the list were mentioned to illustrate the reaction to de Gaulle in France and Algeria (especially for her the putsch, during which certain generals in the French army tried to oppose de Gaulle by the threat of force, and the O.A.S. which also used force to oppose de Gaulle's abandonment of Algeria). This can also be seen by the use of sources in classes i.e. predominantly de Gaulle's speeches. For example one teacher said: "on lit des morceaux de discours ensemble" (Teacher 17). This seems to be common. Teacher 14 said he used video as a source and that this was a de Gaulle speech and linked to article sixteen of the Constitution during the putsch. Teacher 4 said that he used a de Gaulle document as a "texte de réflexion". Teachers 1 and 10 also said they used video footage of May 13, 1958; and the latter also used a video from the C.N.D.P. ("Centre National de Documentation Pédagogique") on de Gaulle's press conference in which he talked of "une Algérie algérienne". We saw in the previous chapter the way if questions are set at the baccalauréat linked to the Algerian war this very often takes the form of a textual commentary of a de Gaulle source. Unsurprisingly the interviews conducted with pupils showed that they were particularly strong on de Gaulle's change in policy but very weak on most other aspects of the Algerian war. This will be shown in the next chapter.

The way the lesson can be created around de Gaulle's policy is very important in understanding how the programme "works" and "operates" and similarly ultimately how narratives are created. It is important to note that history (especially in history classes) is used to "show" things and that what is shown is the result of varied agendas, choices and aims. This is reflected in teachers' discourses by the much used phrase "je montre". If they want to show what de Gaulle's policy was, then that means mentioning the policy, the reactions to this policy and not other things. In my B interviews teachers did not for the most part study the following items given on the list proposed in the interview: "les porteurs de valise" (French resistance to the Algerian war), "les luttes internes au sein du F.L.N." (division and in-fighting in the F.L.N.), the massacre at the end of the war in "la rue d'Isly" in Algiers, the military side to the war or only very briefly mentioned many points (see above for an idea of the scale of "mentioning"). Perhaps to a large extent this is because the above items do not directly illustrate what is to be shown. This argument could be linked to the general values linked to the war. Robert Frank has, for example, argued that the Algerian war does not convey the same values as does a commemoration of World War Two i.e. especially the Resistance. This
explains to some extent why the war has been so difficult to commemorate and it might also be argued that it is not as “studiable” as World War Two. This however need not necessarily be the case. If more of an effort were made, perhaps values and lessons could be found that are to be transmitted e.g. the way conscripts did not follow the putsch; or the vicious circle created by terrorism/torture so well described by Albert Camus. This would only be possible after considerable dialogue.

In terms of decolonisation, the emphasis is essentially put on the origins of the Algerian war. Teachers, in the interviews, said that they did the origins of the war in detail and this is something also present in textbooks. Unfortunately however this study “a un aspect de catalogue” (Teacher 1). For one teacher (Teacher 16) the beginning of the lesson was “les causes de la décolonisation” i.e. in general. On different nationalist movements in Algeria before 1954 one teacher said: “je les évoque... rapidement... parce que c’est compliqué en fait” (Teacher 17) while another said “on ne peut pas rentrer dans les détails, ce n’est pas possible” (Teacher 11). Teacher 14 did not examine the reform of 1947\(^7\) because it was too complicated, did not spend much time at all on nationalist movements and only cited Sétif; but he did do inequality in Algerian society, the impact of World War Two and other decolonisations. Given the place of the Algerian war in the programme it is perfectly understandable that teachers cannot go into significant detail on the origins of the Algerian war. The amount of detail done on decolonisations in general and on Algeria in particular is one thing that separates teachers who spend (or rather spent, since they were talking about the period before the 1998 reform) a lot of time on the Algerian war (Teacher 15 and Teacher 13) and those who do/did not.

To conclude this section, the fact that the Algerian war is not studied in its own right seems to allow us to talk of something that resembles “dissimulation” of the Algerian war. This reminds us of the way the Algerian war is not openly discussed in French society. Where the war is studied has very important consequences on what kind of information is given on the Algerian war and enables the most divisive and difficult aspects of the war to be ignored. Indeed, as can be seen from the way torture is examined in class, such aspects of the Algerian war are not easily dealt with.

3.4. The Specificity and Importance of History Classes as a Vector of Memory

\(^7\)A reform passed by the Ramadier government. It created an assembly in Algeria with two electoral colleges of equal size. Elections were loaded in favor of the settlers since although they numbered less than one million their votes elected the same number of representatives as those of the Muslims did, who numbered nine million.
The teaching of the Algerian war is only one vector of memory of this conflict. Others that could obviously have an effect on young people’s knowledge of the Algerian war include the family and the media. In the interviews conducted for this Ph.D. project the questions asked of pupils allow us to comment on the relative place of each of these vectors (and others) in the transmission of memory of the Algerian war. These interviews will be studied in depth in the next chapter. This thesis argues that history terminale classes, relatively speaking, are an important vector of memory and an important source of information on the Algerian war for young people, mainly due to the weakness, even absence, of many other vectors of memory, but also due to the place given to history (classes) in French education and society. However, history classes are dependent on other vectors of memory if they are to succeed in transmitting information. Moreover in absolute terms (presently, especially since 1989 and perhaps even since 1983) very little information is being transmitted. Indeed it has been shown above that less and less is being taught. In the next chapter we will compare teaching in depth with the family, due to the possible importance of the family. Other vectors of memory will also be discussed. In this chapter we can reflect briefly on the specificity of teaching by comparing it to associative vectors, due to the potential place of testimonies given by members of associations in class. This cannot however be an exhaustive study of associative vectors of memory.

3.4.1. Teaching, Veterans and the Importance of History Classes

One way of beginning to examine associative vectors of memory is to look at the number of veterans of the Algerian war who have been invited to the classes of teachers or pupils whom I interviewed. One way associations can transmit information on the Algerian war is by testimonies given in schools. A parallel might be drawn between an ex-conscript giving testimony in history classes forty years after the end of the war, and conscript testimony during the Algerian war which played such an important role in revealing to French public opinion that there was actually a war in Algeria. Similarly testimony by people such as Henri Alleg during the Algerian conflict exposed the use of torture. Quantitatively two out of eighteen teachers had ever invited veterans of the Algerian war, although one of the two did not speak exclusively about this colonial war. None had done so between September 1997 and June 1999 which was the period in which the interviews with teachers took place. This seems to me to be a rather low figure, all the more so, when compared with the number of World War Two testimonies below. A first reason for the low number of classroom testimonies from veterans of the Algerian war is the problem, already mentioned above, of time in terminale. One

---

particularly telling example of the current race against the programme is the practicability of inviting veterans to the school.

One of the two teachers who had invited a veteran of the Algerian war to school had done so over ten years ago. The meeting involved a veteran and an Algerian to get two viewpoints on the war and lasted two hours. Above all, the discussion created a lot of interest and a lot of questions — notably on the everyday life in Algeria, feelings, opinions at the time of the war etc. That meeting took place twice in the early 1980s and according to the teacher has not been done recently since:

Ca ne s'est plus reproduit parce que justement dans les anciens programmes on avait plus de temps, et donc comme on avait moins de temps dans ces programmes, ça ne s'est pas fait. (Teacher 4)

Indeed, the terminale year is very different from other years as can be seen from the fact that even the testimonies on World War Two were done in première or troisième. The problem of time has been aggravated by the reform to the programme that came into effect in September 1998. The practicalities of inviting a veteran might also be problematic as veterans have to be organised in associations, to be able to be contacted and to agree to come to the school. This may not be the case. One teacher also mentioned that the Algerian war is still a very delicate subject to talk about. Another referred to the problem of subjectivity and said she did not really want someone in class whose experience would make him particularly partial. A last interesting point to note is the impact on teachers of wider society, which I would argue means that teachers might not even think to invite a veteran of the Algerian war as they might a veteran of World War Two. Perhaps because the war was for such a long time not referred to as "une guerre". One teacher, for example, said: "Je n'y ai jamais songé" (Teacher 14). Another teacher said: "Je n'ai même jamais pensé à le faire" (Teacher 17).

These examples make me wonder whether the wider societal influences of the memory of the Algerian war — i.e. that it is somewhat taboo and occulted — mean that teachers do not even associate the Algerian war with a war whose veterans can be invited to class in the way veterans of other wars clearly are. Throughout this thesis it is argued that wider societal factors, including the French collective memory of the Algerian war, influence what takes place in the classroom. Yet it is also argued that this is a two-way process since the teaching of the Algerian conflict influences collective memory. Interestingly, even the second of the teachers who had invited someone who gave a testimony on the Algerian war, when asked: "Est-ce qu'un ancien combattant est venu à un moment donné parler aux élèves?" replied: "Je ne fais pas venir d'anciens combattants de l'Algérie" before mentioning that the person who had come was Hélie de Saint Marc i.e. an important figure from the war in Algeria. This answer can perhaps be explained by the fact that the testimony was aimed at explaining how an officer could disobey his orders and so he was invited as a French army officer rather than
exclusively as a veteran of the Algerian war. He also spoke at length in the testimony of
the war in Indo-China. This subject however is inherently linked to the Algerian conflict
and so Hélie de Saint Marc spoke for three quarters of an hour on the Algerian conflict in
a testimony of two hours. The teacher had prepared the visit by spending a little more
time on the years 1960-1961 (during the Algerian conflict) to explain the reasons for the
April 1961 putsch. It might also be true that Hélie de Saint Marc is not exactly an
"ancien combattant", a term which makes one think more of appelés and rappelés
(conscripts). As the teacher said, Hélie de Saint Marc had come:

[...] non pas en tant, je dirais personnellement... en tant qu'ancien combattant
d'Algérie, mais en tant que officier de l'armée française revêtu contre le général de
Gaulle, parce que ça permet de comprendre les hésitations, parfois même peut-être les
contradictions du général de Gaulle et comment un officier de l'armée française
qui normalement est au service de l'Etat, peut à un certain moment en conscience se
révolter contre l'Etat. Et ça c'est très intéressant. (Teacher 18)

We can note that the teacher had invited Hélie de Saint Marc due to his “sympathie
personnelle” for the man and since he respected this person who had been “fidèle à sa
conscience”. He was able to come once a year for four or five years until 1997 because
he lives in Lyons. The pupils had found the testimony fascinating and had asked a lot of
questions. Lastly we can state that the insistence on de Gaulle’s hesitations and
contradictions mentioned in the quotation above are not at all evident in textbooks’
description of de Gaulle’s Algerian policy. Nor are notions of rebellion and disobeying
the state.

None of the pupils had been in a class in which in terminale a veteran of the
Algerian war had spoken. One pupil had however been in a class in troisième to which a
veteran of the Algerian war had been invited. Troisième corresponds in Britain to
G.C.S.E. (“General Certificate of Secondary Education”) fourth or fifth year. That
particular pupil (Pupil 11, who is of Algerian origin) had received a lot of information
from her grandfather who had actively fought against the French in Algeria (he was in
her words a “maquisard”, therefore a member of the F.L.N.). She learned a lot however
from the testimony since it gave her a different point of view to that previously
received. In that lesson there had been two people who gave testimonies: one on the
Second World War, the other on the Algerian war. For the latter it was a French soldier
(an appelé) who was also a pied-noir. He spoke for an hour and a half and talked about
everyday life: “le vécu”. Qualitatively we can note that the information given in class
and that given through an oral testimony is radically different. One teacher explained
the difference between the teacher’s lesson and the veteran’s testimony in the following
terms:

C’est le positionnement par rapport à l’élève. Nous quand on est face à l’élève on est
un enseignant qui avons des connaissances... qui apportons des connaissances à
l'élève. Là ils auraient quelqu'un qui a vécu le fait dont il parle et donc ils ont une tendance à avoir un intérêt redoublé et à poser des questions souvent plus précises qu'ils pourraient nous poser à nous. Et c'est pour ça que c'est intéressant. On le voit par exemple avec les anciens combattants de la Seconde Guerre Mondiale ou quand il y a des anciens rescapés des camps de concentration, c'est vrai qu'ils ont plus tendance à... ils s'accrochent mieux à la formation historique, ils s'y accrochent bien mieux et c'est vrai que souvent... qu'ils posent des questions souvent très intéressantes. Beaucoup plus qu'ils ne posent à l'enseignant qui lui a une approche — c'est un rôle d'intermédiaire entre le fait et l'élève; l'élève il se dit qu'il canalise le fait alors que là ils ont le fait direct par celui qui l'a vécu. (Teacher 13)

We can note that the teacher who said this had not been able to invite a veteran of the Algerian war to give a testimony in class, but would have liked to. It was not possible due to time and practical considerations. He said in the interview that he would have liked to invite a man called Bernard Gerland, who has written a monologue that he repeats on his experience as a soldier. This is a fascinating and very memorable account that I was lucky enough to see in a theatre in Lyons in 1997. It is however a hard-hitting recital as, after a somewhat positive introduction to his time in Algeria, he suddenly begins to describe how he executed a prisoner in a "corvée de bois" (illicit summary execution after interrogation). Clearly he has never recovered from this act. Both of the teachers who had invited people who gave testimonies on the Algerian war (Teacher 4 and Teacher 18) said that those meetings had gone very well. They gave rise to a lot of interest and a lot of questions. The difference between a lesson and a testimony is also in part shown in pupil comments on lessons as compared to testimonies since all but two of the twelve pupils interviewed had at some point (usually première but sometimes troisième) heard a testimony on World War Two, the Resistance or deportation. Pupils when describing testimonies described them as being "parlant" in the sense that "ça illustre bien" (Pupil 9), "réel", "émouvant", "intéressant" etc.

The difference between World War Two and Algeria on this point is fascinating and very important too. The relatively high number of testimonies seen on World War Two shows the current importance attributed to transmitting information on World War Two from generation to generation. Again the Algerian war can be seen to be overshadowed by the memory of World War Two. Pupil comments also show the importance in terms of transmission of the "Centre d'Histoire de la Résistance et de la Déportation" (C.H.R.D.) in Lyons. Many of the testimonies given on the Second World War reflected in their content the concerns of this "centre d'histoire" and would seem to have been organised with the help of or through the C.H.R.D. Clearly the existence of museums and other historical centres is important for the transmission of memory, and while an exhaustive study of museology for the Second World War and Algeria cannot be undertaken here, it can nonetheless be said that the Algerian war does not benefit from the same museological interest as the Second World War. This is important in so far as a museum can be a lieu de mémoire.
However, associations can act in other ways apart from through members giving testimonies in the classroom. As is clear from reading *L'Ancien d'Algérie*\(^9\), a publication of the “Fédération Nationale des Anciens Combattants d'Algérie, Maroc et Tunisie” (F.N.A.C.A.) veterans' association, one aspect of the F.N.A.C.A.'s activities which is particularly relevant in this discussion is the “Commission Guerre d'Algérie, Jeunesse, Enseignement” (G.A.J.E.). Numerous publications of veterans' associations have been consulted for the purposes of this project. They were obtained from different associations in Lyons\(^10\). As concerns the G.A.J.E., in the issue no. 358 published in June-July 1997, we can read a full-page article on page five entitled “Le G.A.J.E dans le Lot”, which was published in the section “Mémoire”. The article describes the exhibitions and debates that took place in the Lot from 1995 to 1997 “à l'intention de la jeunesse et des populations de nos cantons”. The G.A.J.E. is described as a “commission de la mémoire” and the exhibitions as having a “vocation d'enseignement de cette page de notre histoire”. The important factors for us to note are the activities of the G.A.J.E. and the way in which the F.N.A.C.A. attempts to transmit memories of the Algerian war. The presence of groups of school children at such exhibitions is also very important, one example of which is given by the town of Martel from April 2-6, 1997, where pupils from *troisième* and *quatrième* (which corresponds in Britain to G.C.S.E. fourth and fifth year pupils) visited the exhibition and subsequently were to conduct a piece of work on it. However, in Lyons I was able to visit the exhibition in March 1999 and although it was very interesting, there were particularly few visitors. Despite the fact that the exhibition was in the lobby of the 8th district's town hall it was not visited much. Talking to the people who represented the association that day and manned the exhibition, there would seem to have been about fifteen visitors per day. It is therefore perhaps fair to say that the exhibition is informative but struggles to reach a decent audience.

Other activities of associations include helping members to get the “Carte du Combattant” (proof that they fought in Algeria) and social events. They do not really concern transmitting memory. However the transmission of memory is a stated aim of associations. They also act to a very large extent as pressure groups and recent developments such as the naming of the Algerian war (see the Introduction) and commemorations or the issuing of a commemorative stamp can to a large extent be attributed to their lobbying. Publications of veterans' associations are useful to gain


information on many issues such as the number of members and the development of associations, the naming of streets and the creations of monuments, the commemorative stamp issued in 1997, the commemoration of the war, relations between associations and politicians, and the Rhône sections. In other issues of *L'Ancien d'Algérie* in the section “Mémoire” or “De nos correspondants” details are often given of the naming of streets and squares. This usually takes the form of a photograph of the inauguration of the street, alley, square, or roundabout and about one hundred words describing the event. Consulting such columns in *L'Ancien d'Algérie* allows the reader to evaluate the extent of action undertaken in the F.N.A.C.A.’s movement to obtain changes in street names in favour of those bearing the date “19 mars 1962”. The period around the thirty-fifth anniversary of the end of the war would appear to be a very fruitful time for this movement as in the issues nos. 357 and 358 fifty-four name changes are announced (including steles). It can be noted in passing that in Lyons the “U.R.S.S.A.F. de Lyon” (which is the Social Security centre) is now located “6, rue du 19 mars 1962” so all monthly pay slips received by employees now contain this date.

To conclude this section, associations do exist and are active. They are perhaps increasingly active as members are currently coming up to retirement or are currently retired. This constitutes a development in the memory of the Algerian war as Jean-Pierre Rioux mentioned in 1995:

> Les appelés du contingent ont également trouvé une nouvelle distance vis-à-vis du passé : ils arrivent aujourd’hui à l’âge de la retraite, ils ont davantage de temps pour s’investir dans leurs associations et font pression de façon beaucoup plus forte depuis quatre ans.¹¹

Some of their activities include the transmission of memory and directly concern the teaching of the Algerian war, others are more practical everyday activities. Overall associations do not seem to have a significant impact on young peoples’ knowledge of the war due to the quantity and the quality of their interventions. This is a first element which allows us to state that history classes are, relatively speaking, an important vector of memory concerning the Algerian war. However there are inherent limits to a class since a class cannot be like a testimony. The type of information given in a testimony and its impact are not the same. There are also imposed limits of a class since some things are supposed to be done in class and lastly there are choices since teachers choose to some extent what they teach. Yet despite these limits of the class as a vector of memory, teachers and their classes are important in transmitting information on the Algerian war. All teachers agreed that the Algerian war is now “ancient history” for teenagers in France at the end of the 1990s. One teacher said: “La guerre d’Algérie c’est

loin, ils sont trop jeunes, ils n'en ont pas entendu parler. C'est nouveau pour eux.”
(Teacher 11) Others insisted more on the fact that it was something that the pupils had
heard a little about before class and that the lessons enabled them to understand much
more. One teacher said:

On sent quelquefois quand on a des thèmes comme ça qui les intéressent... il y a la
guerre d'Algérie, le Moyen-Orient... la guerre du Viêêt-Nam aussi les intéresse
souvent. Parce que c'est peut-être des choses dont on leur a beaucoup parlé qu'ils
connaissent de nom mais ils ne savent pas exactement ce qui s'est passé. (Teacher 7)

Although some pupils may know nothing while others know a little only very few know
a lot. The relative importance of classes as a vector of memory will be examined further
in the next chapter, but for now we can see that without classes pupils might not know
anything about the war. One student said: “A part en histoire je n'en ai jamais entendu
parler” (Pupil 9) while another said: “Je n'en entends pas beaucoup parler” (Pupil 3).

3.4.2 The Algerian War Inside and Outside History Classes

In interviews a lot of interviewees mentioned colleagues, friends, or family who had
been involved in the Algerian war. In doing so, they inevitably mention that these
people do not like to talk about the Algerian conflict or that when they do talk about the
war they still express knee-jerk, passionate reactions. For example, Teacher 7 said her
father-in-law had been a conscript in Algeria and that this was “un sujet dont il ne
parlait pas énormément”. Teacher 2 spoke in the interview of a pied-noir colleague:

J'ai une collègue au lycée qui est pied-noir, donc rapatriée, mais qui justement ne
parle pas... jamais de ça. Tout juste je sais qu'elle était sur le forum d'Alger le 4 juin,
je crois le 4 juin 1958, pour le discours de de Gaulle “Je vous ai compris”. Voilà,
qu'importe, quelque chose comme ça, c'est tout. (Teacher 2)

Very interestingly another teacher, Teacher 4, during the interview said that he did not
have any pied-noir colleagues, when in fact he did: Teacher 6. Presumably they had not
spoken about this subject. Teacher 10 said that he knew people at work and in his
private life who had links to the Algerian war but said: “c'est des gens qui généralement
n'en parlent pas”. Teachers, (for the most part) due to their age, are very aware of the
division that the war created. For Teacher 2: “[...] la guerre d'Algérie est un problème
qui n'a pas été digéré, c'est toujours quelque chose d'extrêmement, comment dirais-je,
on aborde ça avec une certaine émotion, alors on est dans le domaine du passionnel
encore largement lorsqu'on évoque l'Algérie.” Later in the interview he added: “C'est
encore un sujet de polémique. La cicatrice n'est pas fermée quoi, d'une certaine
manière.” Teacher 7 said that “la réconciliation n'est pas faite” and that there is still
“beaucoup de passion”. Teacher 5 spoke of two colleagues of his. One of these was a
woman who was pied-noir (Teacher 6) and another was a man who had been a student at the time of the Algerian war. He qualified their reactions on the subject of the war as “réactions épidermiques ou passionnelles”. In wider society the Algerian conflict is often described in scholarly work as being “tabou” or “refoulé”, as was seen in the Introduction to this thesis. Remembering the Algerian war has been highly problematic for French society and at the end of the 1990s continues to be so. While it may be argued that there have been some changes in the collective memory of those who lived through the Algerian war, it might be argued that significantly more changes have come about in the French collective memory as a whole due to changes in generations.

In class, although these characteristics of the wider memory of the war are reflected, what is taught is not quite an exact reflection of the wider memory. There is undoubtedly a significant change in the memory of the Algerian war across the change in generation (to some extent actually due to classes). The way the Algerian war is taught has played some role in this process since because there is very little information transmitted on the war in class (as well as out of class through the media, the family etc.) the Algerian war has become less divisive since ignored. Hence the way the war is taught both reflects the wider memory of the war (what is taught is effectively a memory of sorts and in between memory and history) and plays a role in determining the latter (since the designers of the programme define its role as to “donner aux élèves une mémoire”). Perhaps the teaching of the Algerian war, by not introducing a study of the most divisive aspects of the Algerian war, with associated debate, contributes to the generational change in memory. This has been achieved, in my view, by studying the war very little and by avoiding its most divisive aspects. It has not been achieved by any significant discussion of the question. It has however led to a change in the collective memory of the Algerian conflict as for young people this question is not as divisive as it was/is for their grand-parents.

One way this could be seen in my interviews was the manner in which teachers referred to the difficulty of talking about the Algerian war in society, yet stated that in fact the war was not a difficult subject to teach in class. Clearly this tells us a lot about the way the war is taught. One teacher when asked whether the Algerian war was difficult to teach said: “Non pas particulièrement, pas plus que mai 68 d’ailleurs. Je trouve qu’il y a au contraire... peut-être parce qu’on ne fait pas une étude très détaillée, il y a un large consensus, une vision assez généralement admise.” (Teacher 1) However, perhaps it would be more accurate to say that it is difficult to talk of consensus concerning the Algerian war unless very little is said about the war. Even then it is difficult to imagine much which is universally admitted. Clearly, as the teacher said, what is taught is not a very detailed study of the war which means that unlike in society some sort of consensus (albeit limited) can be found. Indeed one teacher, a pied-noir, said that before teaching the war she thought that this would be difficult but in fact found it not to be. Yet she also said that pieds-noirs in general (including her) talk about
the Algerian war in terms of the good memories but not of the actual war and its
horrors. This again would seem to be instructive in terms of our identifying classroom
content as presumably, if she does not find the war difficult to teach, it means she gives
classes without talking about the worst aspects of it. Similar views would seem to be
held by other teachers as was shown in a study published in *Vingtième Siècle* in 1985.
In that study teachers said that they had feared teaching the Algerian war but that in fact
there had been no problems. For them, they insisted on the fact that different
generations saw the war in different ways:

Les témoignages abondent sur une guerre d'Algérie traitée "sans étincelles"... "Dans
un établissement où il y a 15 à 20 pour cent de Maghrébins, nous explique ce
professeur, je craignais d'abord ce sujet. Il n'y a eu aucun problème; des élèves
algériens comme les élèves français ont semblé tout découvrir au moment du cours".
"A mon grand étonnement, poursuit un autre, pas de difficultés en ce qui concerne la
guerre d'Algérie. Pour mes élèves c'était "de l'histoire". Pour nous c'est si proche!
Et il était logique que la France quittât l'Algérie dans le cadre de la décolonisation ...
même pour les enfants de pieds-noirs."

Numerous comments can be made here. Clearly these comments concord with the
findings of the interviews conducted for this Ph.D. project in so far as teaching the
Algerian war is far less difficult than teachers expect. There is a difference between
talking about the Algerian question in society and class. There is clearly an important
generational aspect to this. However, it is argued in this thesis that the reason why the
Algerian war is not difficult to teach is not just since it is no longer divisive due to
changes in generation, but mainly because relatively little is done in class on the war.
The way the war is taught therefore plays a role in the decrease in division caused by
this conflict. All the more so since, as can be seen in the quotation above and in my
interviews, lessons are relatively a very important source of information for young
people on the Algerian war due to the lack of other vectors of memory. Teachers tend to
belong to the generation that fully realises how divisive the war has been whilst the
pupils belong to a second group that minimises the war and ignores how important the
war was. The way the Algerian war is "ancient history" for pupils and how the pupils
are extremely passive was mentioned in interviews and is important in understanding
the impact of changes in generation on French collective memory of the Algerian war.
More will be mentioned on these points in the next chapter and in the Conclusion.
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3.5. Conclusion

To conclude, this chapter has shown what is actually taught by teachers in history classes in terminale on the Algerian war and, very importantly, how this takes place. It has been shown that there is a lot of imposition of what should be remembered. The Algerian war is only partially studied by teachers. Indeed less and less is being taught. This study has been seen to be focused to a very large extent on de Gaulle’s Algerian policy, and teachers say that the Algerian war is studied within much bigger chapters in order to illustrate wider phenomena. It is not a detailed study and is very selective. It avoids many of the most divisive and occulted aspects of the war. The way the war is taught in class cannot be said to be as difficult as talking about the war outside of class is. Nonetheless, despite the general concordance between what is supposed to be taught and what is actually taught, a more pluralistic view of memory can be identified in so far as teachers have a certain degree of latitude in their choices of what to teach. What is taught was seen to be linked to groups and the present. Fascinating differences in what is taught have been identified and shown to be influenced, in my sample, by the personal or family history of teachers, the make-up of classes and more generally various aspects of the present. In this chapter we have therefore seen the exact types of particularities that on the state-prescribed side to teaching would seem to be attempted to be minimised. We have begun to show that in relative terms the lessons are an important source of information for young people. Indeed they have played a significant role in the change in memory of the Algerian war that at the end of the 1990s can be seen principally across the change in generation. This argument will be developed in the next chapter in a more in depth study of pupils in this educational process.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE PUPIL LINK
The Pupil Link

4.1. Introduction

This chapter is based on eight interviews conducted with twelve pupils in terminale history classes in Lyons. The interviews were conducted in two lycées in April and May 1999. The pupils were in four different classes (two in each lycée) and were contacted through the four teachers who taught them, who had been interviewed as teachers. Very importantly, seven of the pupils who came forward for an interview were of Maghrebian (and more precisely Algerian) origin. As will be argued in this chapter, that suggests that there is more interest in the Algerian war in this group than in others who could also have volunteered to speak to me but did not. We will also see that the family origin of the children would seem to influence their knowledge of the Algerian conflict in important ways. The chapter also draws on secondary sources such as opinion polls. It is the last link in what has been referred to before in this thesis as the educational chain. By interviewing pupils we are able to reach the “end-users” in the educational process and thus to comment on the actual impact of the lessons. Indeed, pupils are an important source of information on the way the Algerian war is taught and some information can only be gained from talking to them. It also allows us to confront sources and to check the validity of what has been concluded from other sources. The questions asked of pupils are included in the appendices.

As in the previous chapter we can begin by giving a brief biographical summary of the interviewee sample. This biographical information is also given in the Interviewee List included at the end of the thesis. The pupils are referred to as from Pupil 1 to Pupil 12. Of the five pupils who have no family contact with Algeria there is perhaps little to be said. They are terminale pupils in different séries in different classes of two lycées. However two can be commented on. Pupil 6 has an uncle who was in the contingent. She said that the Algerian war was a bad experience which he does not like to talk about. Also Pupil 10’s father did national military service. He died in 1998. She said he was involved in repatriation at the end of the Algerian conflict, although she was very unsure of dates. Apparently he had spoken to her about this. Here we can see the way conscription during the Algerian campaign significantly affected a whole generation. Most families in France will have someone (often a grand-father, father, father-in-law or an uncle) in it who served in Algeria.

Seven pupils in the sample were of Algerian origin. Pupil 1’s grand-father was the son of a settler who left Algeria before the war. There is therefore a link to Algeria but
less than for certain others. Her family had no direct involvement in the war. Pupil 2 has family who still live in Algeria. These are especially her mother's uncles and her grand-parents. She spends time in Algeria. Pupil 5's parents are from Algeria. She too has family who still live there. Her core family did not seem directly concerned by the Algerian war given what she said in the interview but she seemed interested by the subject since she said it is "mon pays". Her father came to France as a manual worker, perhaps in the 1970s, according to her. Concerning Pupil 8 and Pupil 9, neither of them gave much detail of their family biography but both have close contacts with Algeria and are of Algerian origin. Pupil 11's grand-parents were concerned by the Algerian war, especially her grand-father with whom she talks about it. He lost members of his family including his brother during the conflict. She described him as being an Algerian resistance hero. Pupil 12's uncle, great-uncle and grand-parents were all directly concerned by the Algerian war.

In the previous chapter we examined another link in the educational chain: the teacher link. That chapter examined what teachers actually teach in class on the Algerian war. The impact and presence in class of community memories was shown in so far as "pied-noir origin" led to more being done on the Algerian conflict than should be done in the programme. Reference was also made to the way teachers all knew people involved in the Algerian tragedy and the way these people were referred to as not liking to talk about the subject or as expressing extreme, passionate views. It was seen that what is done in class is in between Illemory and history. The study of the Algerian war is a very partial one. Not much information is transmitted due notably to the way references to that war are scattered into wider subjects, the lack of detail, how the war is taught, the enormity of the programme and the place of World War Two in history class. This is a choice and reflects priorities since the war in Algeria could be taught differently. The overall aim of the programme is to teach pupils "global history" which acts to the detriment of a detailed study of the Algerian war. However the history of World War Two is taught in extremely detailed terms. World War Two, and more precisely Vichy, are to be remembered, unlike the Algerian war. The specificity of history classes was shown by comparing the educational vector with associative vectors of memory. It was argued that to understand why the Algerian conflict is taught the way it is, we need to take into account various theories of memory, all of which however are social in nature. The chapter showed that there is a lot of imposition of what is taught from the programme and examination questions, which significantly constrain teachers, but that there is also some pluralism since teachers' approaches in class to the Algerian war differ.

This chapter will examine in more detail the relative impact of different vectors of memory and will support the findings of the previous chapter in so far as it will argue that lessons are relatively speaking an important vector of memory on the Algerian war. It will examine in particular in more detail the actual impact of lessons and also the
impact of the family. It will be shown that the impact of lessons in absolute terms is slight due to the partial nature of the study of the war. Below we will also examine in more depth how history classes have played a significant role in the change in memory of the Algerian war that at the end of the 1990s can be seen principally across the change in generation. We will see that this change can be accounted for by the minimisation of the importance of the conflict in history classes and wider society. Lastly it will reflect on the argument forwarded by various scholars that significant developments in the memory of the Algerian war, if they are to come, will come from beurs (children of immigrants from North Africa). The chapter is divided into three sections. The first of these examines pupil knowledge of the Algerian war through reference to pupils' answers during the interviews to questions on the history of that particular colonial war. The second section analyses the difference between various vectors of memory on the Algerian conflict. The last examines the argument that significant developments in the memory of the Algerian war will come from beurs.

4.2. Impact of the Classes: Pupil Knowledge of the Algerian War

4.2.1. A Superficial Knowledge of the Algerian War

As was argued in the previous chapter, history classes are in relative terms an important source of information on the Algerian war for young people. By including the Algerian conflict in terminale all pupils who take the baccalauréat général are virtually guaranteed to obtain some information on the war, whereas via other vectors they may or may not. In general it can be said that the memory of the Algerian war is not significantly transmitted by other vectors, as will be argued below. However, in absolute terms not much information is transmitted in history classes because the Algerian war is only partially studied. This is something that can be seen through talking to pupils. The fact that its treatment is not a detailed study was something very perceptible in the pupil interviews. For one pupil: "Il n'y a pas un point spécifique qu'on développe bien, comme la guerre d'Algérie, ce serait intéressant de plus en parler" (Pupil 6). For another: "On ne fait pas de l'histoire événementielle" (Pupil 1). Again this is linked to wider historical movements and is not just the case for the Algerian war. However it is not true of the study of World War Two. To some extent one has to be pragmatic and accept that there are other things to study beyond the Algerian war. On the other hand, this commentator feels that the war in Algeria is more important than a few pages in a textbook compared to one hundred pages for the Second World War. He also feels that the place of that colonial war in terminale is due to a large extent to the wider memory of the war and societal factors, and is not
fortuitous. Therefore studying the way the war is taught is instructive for understanding contemporary France.

The result of the treatment of the war in class is a general lack of detailed knowledge on the part of the pupils and no real understanding. Often when asked a question on a particular point — e.g. what was the O.A.S.? — they may have heard of it (at best) but do not know much about it. Perhaps it was something “cited” or “mentioned” by the teacher. As one teacher noted, explaining how a historical reality could be deformed: “Ce n’est pas parce qu’on la déforme sciemment, mais parce qu’on simplifie tellement pour aller vite que comme eux ils simplifient sur notre simplification il risque d’avoir des confusions voire des contresens” (Teacher 1). This is indeed the case as was clear during the pupil interviews. One pupil, trying to answer a question on a specific event in the interview, referred to the lesson plan but could only say: “Il y a juste la date. On ne sait pas ce qui s’est passé” (Pupil 6) n.b. the question was on what happened during the battle of Algiers and the notes (included in the appendices) read “Janvier 57 - Septembre 57: ‘bataille d’Alger’: victoire militaire pour les Français mais désastre politique”. There is little understanding on the part of pupils if their knowledge comes from the classroom. Furthermore even if points are mentioned in class there is some loss from the teacher to the pupil e.g. perhaps pupils do not take good notes. This description corresponds to the result of history classes, but it is not true of knowledge obtained from the family.

Since the study of the Algerian war is not a detailed one pupil knowledge of what might be called “details” is very weak. This was seen in the interviews. Pupils were very weak (and usually knew nothing) on what happened at the “métro Charonne” on February 8, 1962 and at “la rue d’Isly” on March 26, 1962; French resistance to the Algerian war; internal division in the F.L.N.; the massacre in Paris on October 17, 1961; the military aspects of the war; and the “semaine des barricades” (during which pieds-noirs blocked parts of Algiers to oppose de Gaulle). On the other hand, the O.A.S. was usually at least recognised. Pupils could usually explain the exodus at the end of the Algerian war. They could also explain what the “Accords d’Evian” were. They knew the dates for the beginning and end of the war and the length of the war. The putsch was sometimes known. A possible explanation of why pupils have this knowledge but no knowledge of other aspects of the war can be found by reference to what was seen in the previous chapter i.e. the place of de Gaulle and the study of the reactions to his policy. It is also to be noted that the above knowledge does not include the least glorious aspects of the war. Throughout this thesis it is argued that division and violence in the past tend to be minimised in part to promote unity in the present, by not aggravating divisive memories that exist in France and in the classroom, which reflects the social role and nature of memory. One exception however was the bombing of Sakhiet-Sidi-Youssef, which was well known by Pupil 2, Pupil 11 and Pupil 10 (the first two of whom are of Algerian origin). A possible explanation of this is the importance in
the programme of showing in class the internationalisation of the conflict, which was mentioned by teachers.

Therefore the study of the Algerian war in terminale is very partial. Overall it is not a study of the aspects of the war that do not “help to tell bigger stories”. In my opinion this inhibits significant transmission of the memory of the Algerian war through classes in terminale. One way that we can see that information is not effectively transmitted is through the numerous examples of confusion in the interviews: most pupils could not remember things, had to use their notes to answer questions and confused names or events. There are also numerous examples of pupils guessing. This often took the form of phrases such as “il doit y en avoir” (for example on whether there are books or films on the Algerian war) or “il a dû y en avoir” (for example on whether there was censorship during the period of the Algerian hostilities). This can be linked to the fact that the Algerian war is studied in wider subjects which makes a comparative study possible and perhaps incites students to draw parallels. Faced with gaps in their knowledge, it is a logical reaction on the part of pupils. Furthermore, the answer to the question in the interview on Sakhiet-Sidi-Youssef given by Teacher 11’s three pupils was only possible with notes, so it is also possible for us to comment on the loss of information from teacher to pupil and to question what pupils actually leave the class with. Indeed in terminale pupils finish with notes. They also equate the time spent on the Algerian conflict and the importance of the subject with the amount of notes they have.

The arguably weak impact in absolute terms of history classes can also be explained by the way the lessons are given. We have seen how classes are very much lecture-based and do not involve much discussion. Rather the teacher speaks and the pupils take notes. One pupil in particular seemed to summarise accurately the way the war is taught when she mentioned that:

Le programme c’est sûr qu’il est chargé, qu’il y a beaucoup de choses, énormément; on a peu d’heures. Donc les profs ils font le maximum. Ils éssaient d’aller le plus rapidement possible. On ne peut pas avoir toutes les précisions qu’on veut... Ils traitent les choses en général, donnent une vue globale. C’est vrai que pour avoir plus de précisions il faut par soi-même... aller lire des manuels... se documenter plus précisément. (Pupil 2)

Pupils therefore echoed teachers throughout the interviews by mentioning the lack of time and the length of the programme. As was mentioned above it is not possible to study the programme in detail. This was shown in the previous chapter in which the word “imposition” was used to describe the way lessons are very much a one-way transmission of knowledge as pupils learn what the programme dictates is important and should be known. The terminale year involves note-taking but not discussion i.e. no exploration or argument. I think it would still be fair to talk at the end of the 1990s of a
very Jacobin France, and feel we can also describe the French education system as still being highly centralised. This system is increasingly under pressure, too, as an article in *Le Monde* \(^1\) entitled “L’école fait face à une montée des revendications identitaires des élèves” shows us. The article describes the way school authorities are increasingly being asked to make special exceptions, in many spheres ranging from dress to meals (importantly for this study including criticism of the content of what is studied in class), for and from pupils of foreign descent. School authorities are struggling to deal with these demands. There are more and more tensions caused by the school system imposing Republican principles that deny the right to differences amongst communities within the nation. The strain comes from the increasing fragmentation of society, to a large extent representing the social legacy of immigration, which can be seen in pupil identity. At present however the Republican model still dominates, hence the increasing tensions. Concerning history classes, Pupil 3 said: “nous on écoute, on prend des notes parce qu’il y a que ça à faire, on prend des notes”. We have seen above that other teaching practices are possible in other years at school but that in *terminale* it is the “Cours Magistral” that is used. One teacher mentioned how the programme is adapted to good pupils who take good notes. On the programme he said: “Il est beaucoup trop lourd, beaucoup trop étendu par rapport au temps qu’on a pour l’enseigner; ce qui oblige à courir tout le temps, toujours très rapide, donc à être très souvent, quasiment tout le temps, magistral. Et c’est éventuellement adapté à de bons élèves qui comprennent vite et prennent des notes convenablement. C’est presque impossible à suivre pour les élèves moyens ou faibles” (Teacher 1).

Broadly speaking, pupil knowledge corresponds to what teachers say they do in class, but there is some loss from teacher to pupil as pupils are unable to talk about aspects of the Algerian war that teachers said were done in class. To some extent this is inevitable, but much of this could be due to teachers “mentioning” points but not giving sufficient explanations. It is also the result of what is imposed by the programme since the programme imposes to a large extent what is taught and in what detail. However there are inherent limits to the class. If too few details are done in class then pupils have no understanding of the Algerian war due to lack of explanation. Alternatively, if too many details were done in class then perhaps pupils would have no understanding due to being drowned in a sea of facts to memorise. Clearly history in *terminale* has to be selective; a memory of sorts. Despite the lack of detailed knowledge mentioned above, all pupils are relatively strong on two things in particular: the origins of decolonisation and de Gaulle’s policy concerning the Algerian question. It can also be noted that not all students have the same knowledge: perhaps the pupils with the most knowledge spoken to were the group of Pupil 8, Pupil 9 and Pupil 12. These three pupils are all of

---

4.2.2. A Knowledge of Selective Aspects of the Conflict

The interviews conducted with pupils showed that they were particularly strong on de Gaulle's change in policy but very weak on most other aspects of the Algerian war. This fact was seen in the previous chapter in the way teachers said the study of de Gaulle's policy in Algeria was central. One pupil when asked when in the year they had done the Algerian war in class said: “c'est en arrivant avec Charles de Gaulle qu'on a parlé de son rôle avec la guerre d'Algérie” (Pupil 4 whose teacher is Teacher 1 who studied the war mainly in the French Fourth and Fifth Republics rather than in Decolonisation). She was also able to talk about de Gaulle's policy, which she mentioned on several occasions during the interview, but was much weaker on other questions. In another interview, when asked whether there were any things that they had done in class that I had not mentioned in my interview questions one of the pupils said: “Vous, vous n'avez pas beaucoup parlé de la politique de de Gaulle; nous c'est ce qu'on a bien vu ça” (Pupil 6 who is a pupil of Teacher 11 whose lesson plan is given in the appendices). In another interview, the pupils said: “ce n'était pas particulièrement sur l’Algérie, c’était global”, “on n’a pas fait un cours spécial sur la guerre d’Algérie”, “on l’a pas étudiée en tant que telle” (Pupil 8); “Pourquoi on a parlé de la guerre d’Algérie? C’est pour parler de de Gaulle. Ce n’est pas la guerre d’Algérie en soi” (Pupil 12; both he and Pupil 8 are in the same class with Teacher 3 who spent two or three hours on the Algerian war). Another pupil also talked of the way the war is not done in its own right. When explaining why she will study it for the baccalaureat she said: “Il y a toujours une relation à la guerre d’Algérie, ou alors la politique de de Gaulle face à cette guerre, ou alors qu’est-ce que la décolonisation” (Pupil 11). Surely though there is more to the Algerian war than that since the result of this placing of the Algerian conflict is her description of it as being on “les périphéries”.

The interviews with pupils also showed that they were particularly strong on the origins of the war in comparison with other questions on the Algerian war. Sometimes this tended to be the origins of decolonisation in general but not on the origins of the Algerian war in particular. For one pupil (Pupil 11) there seemed to be a difference between what she herself thought, therefore had learned from other sources apart from the class, and what she had been told in class. In this way she said: “Les origines, du moins comme on nous l’explique en cours, les origines elles sont vagues”. By this I think she meant that in class they had insisted mainly on the origins of decolonisation in the world rather than on the Algerian war in particular. Another pupil, Pupil 1, spoke of decolonisation in general. She did not mention anything specific to Algeria. She said
that the French had asked all colonies to supply soldiers during World War Two and in return had promised to liberate colonies. At the end of the war this promise had not been kept. So Algerians (although if we had been talking of another decolonisation she presumably would have said other people) had wanted independence. She also spoke of the influence of other decolonisations e.g. British. She did not mention the Algerian population, economy or political situation. Pupil knowledge can be explained by the fact that the Algerian war is studied in decolonisation in general in the programme. Decolonisation is a possible examination question that necessitates this type of knowledge. However we can also note that Pupil 10 in her notes and the group of Pupil 8, Pupil 9 and Pupil 12 were very good on the origins of the Algerian war.

Also in history classes we can state that generally the military side of the war and the least glorious aspects of the conflict are not studied. One pupil said: “Côté militaire on n’en a pas trop parlé” (Pupil 4). None of the pupils said they had studied the military side of the war in class. Teachers, in interviews, said that the military side of the war was something that they did not do in class or only a little. One teacher in particular, Teacher 17, said this was an aspect of the Algerian war that she no longer studied. Before she said she had used maps of Kabylie and the Aurès and had explained the difference between fighting in towns and in the country. She said she had not done a great deal before but that it had been more than now and since the 1998 reform of the programme. The way the military side of the war is not studied may however be linked to the nature itself of the war. Although there were military operations that mobilised soldiers in what is now referred to as a war, much of the Algerian war was a political war. It was a “revolutionary war” (as Indo-China had been) in so far as the enemy was hard to identify, blending into the population like Mao Zedong’s “poisson dans l’eau”, and used terror (often in terrorist attacks) to achieve its goals. The army became involved in a wide range of activities including political, economic and psychological action. We have seen in this thesis how such factors can constitute a barrier to memory, as other commentators have argued.

Other examples of what we might call minimisation or underestimation of the war include the question of the number of French soldiers who were appelés or rappelés. Pupils were fairly weak on this point and generally surprised by the real number. Their weakness on this question was however less clear-cut than it had been on other issues. Pupil 1 had no idea of the number of French young men who had been sent to Algeria and when was forced to put forward a figure suggested 10,000 maximum. The group of Teacher 11’s three pupils disagreed amongst themselves at first and when one of the three suggested “millions” the others were surprised. Pupil 2 did not know. However, teachers often said that this was something they did in class. Another stark example of the minimisation of the Algerian war came from Pupil 5 when she said: “La France n’était pas brute avec les Algériens”. This could be linked to her parents’ choice of coming to France. More examples of the underestimation of aspects of the war include
the way pupils sometimes knew Ben Bella’s name but not the fact that he had been hijacked in a plane by the French airforce. This was the case for Pupil 6 and Pupil 7 (in one of the groups). It was also the case of Pupil 10 and the group of Teacher 3’s three pupils. Similarly Pupil 2 and Pupil 3 had heard of Sakhiet-Sidi-Youssef but did not mention deaths. Harkis were named but their massacre was not referred to by the group of Teacher 11’s three pupils. This pupil knowledge reflects what was said during the teacher interviews on class content.

Another result of the partial study of the Algerian conflict in terminale is the minimisation of the stakes of the war and is shown in the way pupils have no understanding of what is meant by the term “the memory of the Algerian war”. While most scholarly work, notably in France but also internationally, has shown that the war has been occulted and repressed, pupils seem to have no understanding of these concepts. Again pupils talk in general but not in particular on the war in Algeria. They say for example that we must remember and not forget in order not to make the same mistakes as in the past — which very much resembles Nora’s description of “duty-memory”. Such opinions may have been expressed in class concerning the Second World War and are used by pupils for all cases of memory. Pupil 11 however answered this question very well in the interview. Some pupils were also able to link the Algerian war and its problematic memory with current tensions in France e.g. the group of Pupil 5, Pupil 6 and Pupil 7. Lastly it might be advanced that the Algerian conflict is something they have heard a little about outside of (before) class and that they know is not talked about much.

4.3. History Classes, the Family and Other Vectors of Memory

4.3.1. History Classes

In the previous chapter we saw the difference between a history class and a testimony. It was argued that the kind of information and the impact of the vectors differ. This is in part due to the fact that in the context of a class it is clear that pupils are not necessarily receptive to information. This was mentioned in particular by two teachers. One of them pointed to the fact that it is important to note that the Algerian war is taught in terminale, which is a different year than seconde or première (the two years before terminale in French secondary education). He said:

Globalement vous avez en terminale les élèves assez passifs. Ils sont passifs parce que la clef c'est le baccalauréat, donc leur attitude c'est une attitude de consommateur. Ils écrivent, ils écrivent, ils écrivent sans beaucoup d'esprit critique,
ils sont là pour digérer une matière qu’on leur donne. Leur but est un but utilitaire, c’est d’avoir la meilleure note possible au baccalauréat. (Teacher 3)

This comment gives us a good indication of the set-up of the lesson: clearly one in which the teacher lectures and the pupils write. Beyond the transmission of the memory of the Algerian war, it shows the inherent limits of any transmission of memory through history classes in terminale. This chapter on pupils needs to take into account societal changes such as consumerism that may, essentially for young people, have changed education and relationships to the past. It would seem that due to changes in society pupils in education can be equated with “consumers”. They are not in class to debate or discuss but to follow a pre-determined programme, take notes and regurgitate this “knowledge” in an examination. Many other social factors have changed our relationship to the past and have been discussed throughout this thesis: the place of the media, work habits, changes in the structure of the family, urbanisation and “globalisation” to name but a few. The work of Francis Fukuyama, Pierre Nora and Kristen Ross all highlights changes in society that have had consequential impact on the environment in which pupils live and study. Clearly in the above quotation we can see important factors that could influence the impact of the classes. The comment “digérer une matière qu’ on leur donne” supports the imposition argument. Students take notes that later they will try to learn off by heart and repeat parrot-fashion in an examination. The attitude of the pupils also depends on the série, as was seen in the previous chapter. One teacher in particular was quoted as saying that in Terminale S the pupils, due to the weak weighting of history in this série, minimised their efforts. Here again pupils are in class to pass an examination and want to take notes to “use” in the examination, which might be seen as a fairly narrow definition of “teaching” and “education”. This is possibly linked to changes in education (briefly discussed in chapter two) especially after the oil crises of the 1970s which arguably led people to question the “utility” of history (and also philosophy). Paradoxically it might have been such considerations that led post-1945 history to be studied at all in terminale classes as supporters of history tried to make its study more “useful”. It is however possibly such a “utilitarian” view of education that weakens the impact of lessons. The weighting of subjects also reflects their importance and can detract from the impact of history classes. History is weighted lowest for Science students. For them history is weighted three while maths is weighted nine. History is weighted four for Literature students and five for Economics/Social science students. There is very little understanding on the part of pupils whose knowledge comes from the classroom. Only a limited number of points are dealt with in history class and those that are talked about are not done in sufficient detail so that they are understood. To some extent classes are inherently limited and there are things that are simply impossible. However the limits of class are also to a certain extent imposed by choices.
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This knowledge corresponds to the result of history classes, but is not true of knowledge obtained from the family. One particularly interesting way that this can be seen is on the question of torture in the Algerian war. Before looking at the findings of the interviews with pupils concerning the family however, we can note that in the survey quoted in "The State-Prescribed Link in Teaching" chapter, in which the Algerian war when taught autonomously (rather than in the Decolonisation chapter) was "un sujet chaud", these reactions noted by teachers were principally attributed to family history:

Qu'est-ce qui motive les réactions des élèves? D'abord, l'histoire familiale (dans 44% des cas). Explique-t-elle le poids des guerres — 1939-45, Algérie — dans l'ordre des préoccupations?2

Family history is therefore to be expected to be important in motivating the reactions of pupils in class. The interviews conducted with pupils for this thesis support this statement. Torture is one aspect of the Algerian war that is not done in detail in class. Either the subject had not been done at all or it certainly had not been memorable. For one pupil: "Il n'y a pas fait référence" (Pupil 2 on Teacher 1's class). She went on to say that Sétif May 8, 1945 was "le seul événement dont il nous avait parlé où les Français avaient fait du mal à l'Algérie". For another: "On n'a pas vu ça" (Pupil 7 on Teacher 11's class). For others the subject had been done quickly in a minimum of words. One pupil's notes read "jan 57-sep 57 : mission de nettoyage d'Alger, mais par quelles méthodes!! (sur le style de la Gestapo= désastre politique=grand bruit.)" Two other students told me that the subject was not essential and that the Algerian war was not like Vichy/World War Two. Pupil 8 said: "Ce n'est pas quelque chose d'essentiel" and Pupil 12 mentioned that for torture during World War Two: "c'était autre chose... c'était de la vraie torture ça". The subject had clearly not been done in sufficient detail and was therefore underestimated in turn by pupils. None of the pupils interviewed had gained any detailed information on torture in class because the subject had at best been covered very quickly in one or two sentences.

Concerning the theoretical work on memory studied earlier in this thesis, the treatment of torture in class, the model for which also comes from the programme and textbooks, certainly indicates difficulty treating the subject as it is repressed and occulted and not openly discussed or faced up to. Ross in her book *Fast Cars, Clean Bodies*, can perhaps be of help here. She states that: "Torture in the Algerian war strove to 'leave no traces' — which is to say, to immobilize time, or to function as an ahistorical structural system."3 This may explain part of the difficulty of teaching about

---


torture. Ross provides a fascinating account of the growing obsession with hygiene and cleanliness (in housekeeping) in mainland France during the period of the Algerian war, in a rapidly changing France, while in Algeria raged a “sale guerre”. A main reason why this war was “dirty” was the use of torture which even if it was “artisinal” to begin with soon “industrialised” and “modernised”.

4.3.2. The Family

However, two pupils had obtained significant information from their family on torture which allows us to compare this information to that which we know is given in history classes. Firstly Pupil 2, who is of Algerian origin, said that in class: “On n’en a pas trop parlé”. However in her family her mother, mother’s uncles and grandmother talked about the Algerian war, especially in Algeria. According to her mother, villagers often helped the F.L.N. so the French took the food from the village and regrouped populations. She was able to give a very detailed description of this treatment: “regroupment”. She described this as follows:

Les résistants ils venaient souvent la nuit pour venir chercher la nourriture. Donc ma mère elle m’a dit qu’ils prenaient la population, enfin les gens du village, et ils les amenaient dans des endroits et ils les entassaient tous ensemble. Ils leur disaient ‘vous restez là, comme ça on est sûrs que les autres ils ne viendront pas chercher la nourriture chez vous’. Donc elle m’a dit, ça c’était ma grande-mère aussi, elle m’a dit: ‘ils nous prenaient et ils nous mettaient avec les enfants et tout dans des petites maisons et ils nous entassaient tous les uns sur les autres’. Elle me racontait des anecdotes: elle me disait qu’il y en avait qui se pissait... qui se urinaient les uns sur les autres tellement c’était difficile. Et donc ils les laissaient là pendant la nuit. (Pupil 2)

She also knew about torture and described the use of electricity, suspending people from rafters and rape. Members of her family had been tortured. She said these were subjects that it was not easy to talk about. There was a stark difference between her answer given to the question on torture in the interview and her answers to other questions. On this subject she was able to provide a significant amount of relevant information to support her answer. She talked for a long time. Also fascinating is the way she talks of “resistance fighters” (F.L.N.) and “collaborators” (people who worked with the French). Such descriptions highlight the tremendous division caused by the war, including in families: indeed she talked of her uncle “collaborating” but her grand-father “resisting”. Clearly such reflections on a colonial past which ended barely decades ago can still be divisive and uncomfortable in the present.

Secondly, for another pupil (Pupil 1), who is also of Algerian origin (but more
distant as her grand-father was the son of a settler who left Algeria before the war),
there was a stark difference in the quality of information received from the family
(grand-mother) and the class. In history classes torture had been studied but they had
not spent much time on it. She said: "On indique que la France n'avait pas hésité à
utiliser la torture, les moyens violents..." She also said: "On nous a dit qu'on a
beaucoup utilisé la torture et que ça avait choqué quand même à la fin certains Français,
parce qu'ils n'étaient pas au courant pendant". She could not remember why the French
army had used torture although this had perhaps been mentioned in class. Her
grandmother however had given her a real example of violence during the war. Pupil 1
had asked her grand-mother a question (her grand-father is dead) while she was revising
history to prepare for a test to talk about the Second World War (on the Occupation:
"What was life like during the Occupation?") but the conversation had also drifted onto
the Algerian war. The grand-mother had been told by her neighbour, who had been a
conscript in Algeria and had driven such trucks, that the French collected people in
trucks whom they suspected of resisting and threw them off a cliff into the sea. This is
the kind of information that can not be obtained from a class. It can be noted that this
kind of information is possibly divisive in so far as it concerns different sections of
French society which were opposed in the past and also concerns a period during which
terrible actions were performed in France's name.

Lastly, a third pupil's comments can be described here. Pupil 11, whose grand-father
participated in the F.L.N. in the Algerian war, had also obtained a lot of information
from the family, members of which had died during the Algerian war. It is of course
highly noteworthy that two of these three examples of pupils who had gained
information from their families (notably on torture) are beurs and have strong links with
Algeria. The other also has a family history linked to Algeria. We can also note the
difference in terms of memory between France and Algeria that other studies have
shown — basically, for France, scholars talk of repression whereas for Algeria scholars
talk of memories of the war being honoured. These points (on beurs) will be discussed
further in section four of this chapter. Unlike the other two pupils, for Pupil 11 it is
better not to speak of such things: "Je crois qu'il vaut mieux cacher les choses horribles,
par heurter les âmes sensibles." In class on torture they had done very little, perhaps
even nothing. Again we can see how this subject is still very divisive as she talks of her
grand-father's lifelong (since the Algerian war) "hantisse de l'Etat français, l'armée
française". Apparently she often talks with her grand-father: "Il aime en parler mais il a
besoin d'en parler". It is important to note that he was described by Pupil 11 as a "grand
maquisard" (F.L.N.). Perhaps this is a good example of the way if the past is glorious

4See RIOUX, J-P, "Trous de mémoire" and HASSAN, R, "Un seul héros, le peuple" and "L'Histoire
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and serves present purposes then it is discussed. This was not however easy due to trauma since he had lost members of his family in the war including his brother.

This claimed involvement in resistance activities during the Algerian war reminds us of the French memory of World War Two in the first few decades after that conflict. The claim that members of the family resisted the French in Algeria could be compared to the mythified French portrayal of the French Resistance to the Nazi occupier. Faced with such narratives, a “critical distance” can be argued to be needed in order to understand and take into account the role of selective memory in a group’s construction of present identity. However, beyond the important fact that the sample interviewed for this thesis is extremely limited and there do not seem to be many secondary sources on this question, we can note that reference was also made in the interviews to members of the family collaborating (see Pupil 2) and that Pupil 11 thought it was better not to talk of such things and therefore cannot be said to have particularly sought to impose a glorified view of her family history on the interviewer. Nonetheless, a wider study might show more evidence of a mythified Resistance to the French in Algeria and this is certainly a delicate, yet fascinating area to investigate further. There are many other aspects of the Algerian war which have echoes of World War Two. Whatever the answer to the questions, by not studying in more depth the Algerian war in order not to aggravate or reactivate divisive individual and group memories of the Algerian conflict, state authorities are very wary of such (potential) memories.

More generally on the family we can note that not all families of beurs where the grandparents had experience of the Algerian war talked of this period. Some other sources beyond the interviews conducted for this project are given below in section four of this chapter which confirm this. One example of little family transmission is given in a fascinating edition of Hommes et Migrations on “Les Harkis et leurs enfants”. In this we can read:

Fréquemment, de la part d’un ex-suppletif, c’est le silence qui accueille toute question portant sur la nature des opérations auxquelles il lui fut donné de participer durant la guerre d’Algérie. Que les questions soient posées par les enfants ou par un étranger ne change pas grande chose à l’affaire. Tout au plus parvient-on à obtenir un récit des raisons qui ont amené à l’incorporation et à un récit du départ en France. Entre les deux c’est le mutisme. Toutefois on aurait tort de mettre ce silence sur le compte d’une démarche d’autocensure résultant d’un sentiment de culpabilité. En effet, on peut retrouver la même discretion chez les Algériens ayant adhéré au FLN [...].

Interestingly Roux in this quotation talks of the silence of both harkis and ex-F.L.N. members (in France). A last example can be given here of lack of transmission of memory through the family in this ethnic group. It appears in another edition of

Hommes et Migrations, in an interview with the son (at the time in terminale) of a man who was at the Paris demonstration that took place on October 17, 1961. In it the interviewer asks: "Et ton père, te parle-t-il souvent du 17 octobre 1961?" The interviewee answers:

Non, il n'est pas trop revenu dessus. Parce que je pense que c'est quelque chose qu'on a peut-être envie... pas d'oublier, parce que ça restera, mais... on n'aime pas trop parler des mauvaises expériences.  

This reminds us of what we know about families of appelés or rappelés (conscripts). Our knowledge of their memory comes from sources such as Tavernier's film La Guerre sans nom (1992) and Mauss-Copeaux's book Appelés en guerre d'Algérie (1999). In this last study the author states: "[...] aujourd'hui beaucoup ne veulent pas en parler à leurs enfants." When commenting on the fact that in only one of the thirty-nine interviews that she conducted was a conscript's child present, she says: "Ils se disent en général plus réticents à partager leurs souvenirs avec leurs enfants et reconnaissent leur refus obstiné de répondre à leurs questions." In this group of people there is very little discussion on the Algerian war. Stora's work can also be useful in understanding family transmission for conscripts. In his television series Les Années algériennes (1992) a conscript (Mr. J-M Linné) is questioned. The dialogue is as follows:

Interviewer: Vous avez des enfants?
Linné: J'ai trois enfants. J'ai six petits-enfants.

Interviewer: Vous leur en dites quoi de la guerre d'Algérie?
Linné: Je n'en parle jamais.

Furthermore it is very unlikely that within families of other groups e.g. "opinion métropolitaine" which have few links to Algeria much information is transmitted. What is meant by this group is French public opinion in metropolitan France during the Algerian conflict. These are people who lived through the conflict, but were not involved in the war, despite some potential knowledge of it or even a distant member of the family or friends serving in the army in Algeria. In this group we may find lack of interest for the subject and very little information to be transmitted. In families where the parents come from Algeria there is not always discussion. Pupil 8, Pupil 9 and Pupil 12 said that they did not talk much with their grand-parents. Pupil 12's great uncle had served five years of prison during the Algerian war and did not talk about it since it was too difficult. He said that he talked a little with his father because his father had not

8 Ibid., p. 61.
lived through the Algerian war. Pupil 9 said: "ils n’en parlent pas" and "je n’en parle pas" and Pupil 8 said "on ne s’implique pas trop" and "ça fait partie du passé".

To sum up, there are therefore families in which there is no discussion. Due to the limits of this sample it is impossible here to state with certainty exact numbers. However we can say that if information is obtained it is very detailed and much richer than information obtained from the class. We can also state that in some families information is transmitted. This would seem to be information that is given since it is not shameful to those who tell the story and supports what they want to say. However we must note that not all families transmit information and that if this does not happen it can be because such memories are painful. Furthermore if they did talk about it, this communication can also be fairly superficial. Pupil 5 said that she spoke with her grand-mother about the Algerian war but that this often equated to looking at photos and "se rémener des gens". She said that she received "des informations mais pas beaucoup, beaucoup". This could be supported by what we know about families of pieds-noirs. One teacher whom I interviewed who is pied-noir (Teacher 17) said that pieds-noirs spoke about Algeria in their families but only of the good things about the colonial period.

4.3.3. Other Vectors of Memory

Let us now reflect on other sources of information by drawing on the pupil interviews. The main sources of information used to prepare for the baccalauréat are the lesson notes and the textbook. More generally, as concerns all sources of information on the Algerian war for young people, we can state that the role of teachers, and therefore classes, and the textbook is very important and more important than the role of other sources. However as we have seen above the potential impact (although not realised at present) of other sources such as the family is greater than the present impact of classes which is inherently limited. The important role of education has also been shown in various opinion polls in which it can be seen that answers to questions differ depending on the level of education received. Predictably the further in the education system one has gone the more accurately one can answer questions on history. According to the answers given in the interviews conducted for this thesis, the other significant source of information is the family. As was seen above if information is gained from the family it can be very detailed, but there is a risk that on the Algerian war members of the family do not transmit information on the war — be they for example appelés, pieds-noirs, harkis, ex-F.L.N. or M.N.A. The information is also subjective and partial (i.e. a lot of information on a limited number of issues) rather than the global objective view supposedly given through the class.

Other sources of information are available to young people and can be said to play a role in the transmission of memories, but their impact is perhaps limited due to the
number of people who had received information from such vectors in the sample. It is possible for example that pupils have read books on the Algerian war. This concerns novels rather than scholarly books. Quantitatively two or three pupils out of twelve had read novels, each of whom had read one or two books on the Algerian war i.e. there is relatively little impact from this source. Pupil 10 had read one book *Un Été algérien* by J-P Nozière; Pupil 1 had read two books whose names she could not remember, one based in Oran the other on the struggle between the F.L.N. and the O.A.S.; Pupil 2 had possibly read novels but could not remember exactly. Teachers said that it was perhaps not even worth asking them to read books or watch films due to the lack of time. This fits in with what has already been said on the difference between classes in *terminale* and *seconde* and *première*. Furthermore we must remember that pupils study *Histoire* and *Géographie*. Also they have other subjects at the *baccalauréat*, with higher weightings. One pupil said she could not read outside of lessons because: "J’ai déjà la philo, les lettres, je n’ai pas trop le temps" (Pupil 3) and those pupils who said they had read books often said it had been earlier in their life or during the holidays. It is also interesting to note that secondary schools have C.D.I.’s (“Centres de Documentation et d’Information”). I visited two of these and in both there was virtually nothing in terms of books on the Algerian war. The C.D.I.’s mainly stocked textbooks and the press and were places where pupils could work. However, the central public library in Lyons has a wide selection of sources on the Algerian war.

Pupils who have seen films are rare but slightly less so than those who have read books on the Algerian war. Quantitatively five pupils had seen films on the Algerian conflict. Pupil 3 had seen one film but could not remember its name. She said it was a film with Roger Hanin and Gina Lolobrigida on television. Pupil 12 had seen three films though he could not give the names. Pupil 8 had seen *Chronique des années de braises* and Pupil 11 had seen Courrière’s *La Guerre d’Algérie* on ARTE television channel and on satellite television a programme on the role of women in the Algerian war. Pupil 2 had possibly seen films especially in Algeria. Pupil comments on the impact of films included: “on dirait que ça a existé vraiment parce que quand on en parle comme ça ce n’est pas pareil que quand on regarde vraiment ce qui s’est passé à l’époque” (Pupil 10) and: “ça marque bien” (Pupil 9). Pupil 3 talked of the way in which a film gives the “ambiance de l’époque”. Pupil 4 spoke of the difference between the lesson and a film. She had not seen a film on the Algerian war so spoke of a film on World War Two. She mentioned the films “Il faut sauver le soldat Ryan” and “La vie est belle”. She said:

J’ai vu des films sur la Seconde guerre mondiale avec le génocide et des choses comme ça, et je pense que même si c’est un peu... ça fait un peu roman parce qu’il y a une histoire derrière, je pense que c’est vraiment intéressant de voir comment ils ont vécu réellement et ça permet de mettre des images au cours qu’on a. Dans nos têtes, les images on les retient plus que des phrases. Donc ça choque plus. (Pupil 4)
We should also note that these two films are far more “mainstream” than anything that has been made on the Algerian war. This is linked to the fact that the Second World War affected many countries. The number of sources on the war is therefore logically greater and the “market” is also greater, in this example in terms of audience. We have also seen how World War Two can perhaps more easily transmit values than the Algerian war. It is perhaps worth noting that no pupils could actually name a book or film that they knew existed but that they had not read or seen. Perhaps this shows that such films and books are not well known or mainstream. Most pupils also had difficulty remembering the name of books and films that they had read or seen.

Reviews and magazines are also another source of information. Given the age of pupils and the lack of time or need for reading, pupils who read reviews are not numerous but both Pupil 10 and Pupil 12 read *L'Histoire*. In fact we can say that such reviews have sold more and more in recent years, and have played a role in diffusing history and especially contemporary history. Information on the Algerian war is not really obtained from the television. There are possibly more programmes with information on the war in Algeria on satellite television. Films on the Algerian conflict are highly rare at the cinema. Neither papers nor ceremonies would seem to influence young people on the Algerian war either. Regular reading of *Le Monde* over a period of time shows how few articles in that paper there are on this colonial war.

The last influence on pupils discussed in the interviews was the present. The present clearly influences lesson content as was seen in the previous chapter. Theoretical work on memory highlights the link between the present and memory. In interviews present concerns often came to the fore. For example, in the teacher interviews, the interviewees often mentioned motivation for their interest in the Algerian war. Pupils also mentioned the present in terms of the war in Kosovo and the situation in Algeria (the group of Teacher 11’s three pupils, and Pupil 11). They also talked of *lieux*: for example Pupil 1 whose mother when passing through Lyons with her daughter pointed out that it was there that there had previously been the *bidonville* where a lot of harkis had lived. It is noteworthy that this is not something that French people generally want to remember. Pupil 10 also mentioned another *lieu* which had stimulated her memory of the Algerian war. It was a cemetery in which her father is buried (he died in 1998). Visiting the cemetery she had noticed the tombstones of young people who had died in the Algerian war.

**4.4. Future Developments: the Beur Argument**
4.4.1. The Positions of Other Commentators

Stora and others have argued that developments in the memory of the Algerian war may come from beurs (descendants of immigrants from North Africa). He has argued that this group could take a lot of interest in this subject and therefore advance the memory of this colonial war. There is not however a consensus on this point, which is shown in the following comments by Claude Liauzu in an article in 1999:

La 'Marche des Beurs' de 1983 a ouvert une nouvelle phase. Au delà de l'action directement politique, un travail culturel, une quête identitaire ont été engagés. Ils sont à l’origine de la création de l’association ‘Au nom de la mémoire’, du livre et du film de Yamina Benguigui, Mémoires d’immigrés, de publications, etc. Mais cela concerne-t-il la majorité? Dans les situations d’anomie, dans les banlieues en déréliction, dans les familles désagréées, ce qui l’emporte c’est sans doute l’impossibilité d’accéder à une mémoire, de se reconnaître et d’être reconnu dans l’histoire enseignée.9

The “Marche des Beurs” was literally a walk undertaken by children of Algerian immigrants and harkis. It started from Marseilles and Lyons and finished in Paris, where at its end 60,000 people marched. It was a “marche pour l’égalité, contre le racisme”10. For Liauzu therefore, despite numerous important actions, beurs have not yet significantly changed the wider French collective memory of the Algerian war. Nonetheless, Stora has argued that this group could have a major impact on the collective memory of the Algerian war. Stora, in La Gangrène et l’oubli (1991), argued that the French model which equates nationality with citizenship was in crisis. From children of immigrant origin there were increasing tensions between demands for universal treatment and a desire to be specific. For Stora, such problems were directly linked to the colonial system since children of Algerian origin in particular were accorded French nationality at birth whereas other children of immigrant origin were not11. This problem is inherently linked to intégration and to what it means to be French. It is also perhaps linked to changes in generation. For Stora it is very difficult for such children to reconcile assimilation into France and respect of the culture of the parents. This is aggravated by the fact that immigration, while in the media in the

11Children born in France to Algerian economic migrants before 1962 lost French citizenship that year when Algeria gained independence, but the children of harkis remained French, and children born in France to Algerian immigrants after 1962 have all been French from birth. Throughout this period, children born in France to immigrants of other nationalities were not born French but automatically became French on reaching the age of majority. So both groups automatically became French, but at different ages. In 1993 a reform required those who previously became French on reaching the age of majority to request French nationality but this reform was reversed by the Jospin government in 1997.
present, is never examined historically, as the origins of this immigration are occulted. For these reasons Stora has argued:

De plus en plus nombreux, les jeunes de l'immigration se fixent donc l’objectif de réactiver les héritages de mémoire de leurs pères, de leurs grands-pères. [...] Les jeunes issus de l’immigration (ou les enfants de harkis, avec une autre démarche dans une même histoire) partent à la recherche de leur mémoire, celle de la guerre d’Algérie, qui continue à exister, à circuler dans les familles, mais n’est pas reconnue, ni connue publiquement. Dépositaire des expériences passées, la mémoire des pères, des mères, est garant de leur propre survie au sein d’une société qui masque ces continuités.12

In a later article13 Stora continued this line of argument by stating that historiographical progress, were it to come, would be made by beurs since such progress depended on demand or need and this group of people — with children of harkis and pieds-noirs — wanted to know their parents’ itinerary in order to understand their family history. He compared this to the role of Jews in changes in the collective memory of Vichy in the 1970s. Similarly Philippe Bernard et al. have argued in Le Monde (notably in a series of articles published in 1992) that there is a strong desire of children whose parents came from Algeria to discover the Algerian war. One example he gave of the way this interest can influence collective memory was the role played by beurs in attracting attention via a commemoration to the massacre of October 17, 1961. Another example, this time given by Stora, is the action undertaken by the fils de harkis to draw attention to the history of their parents. In both of these examples French society as a whole has not shown interest in these subjects and indeed has actively occulted these histories. Children whose parents came from Algeria have played a role in breaking this silence. Furthermore, for Bernard:

[...] la transmission accélérée de la mémoire privée est un phénomène général. En vieillissant, les parents, acteurs et témoins directs des événements consentent à livrer leur passé. La montée de la xénophobie et les difficultés de l’intégration en France, les succès de l’islamisme en Algérie alimentent les craintes, réveillent les vieux antagonismes et aiguisent la curiosité de la deuxième génération à l’heure de son enracinement en France.14

4.4.2. This Commentator's Position

At the end of the 1990s I feel that overall we cannot say that beurs have had a very significant impact on the collective memory of the Algerian war. This has not occurred in any significant way in this commentator's opinion even though it is true that beurs were instrumental in drawing attention to the events of October 17, 1961. I do not think that this collective memory has changed significantly in recent years, although there have been developments which were described in the Introduction to this thesis. Numerous points in the arguments given above are open to discussion.

While in general it may be accepted that there is a general desire as one grows older to talk of the past, as Paul Thompson showed in The Voice of the Past\textsuperscript{15}, there does not seem to be any way to see to what extent this general desire might apply in particular to families where the parents come from Algeria. Bernard does not give any source that supports this argument. And does the present situation in Algeria lead people to examine the past or overshadow the Algerian war of 1954-62? The three pupils in one of the groups interviewed (Pupil 8, Pupil 9 and Pupil 12) all said that they talked about the present situation in Algeria rather than the Algerian war (1954-1962). Similarly, an interesting argument has been used by Rioux to explain the lack of memory of the Algerian war. This argument to a large extent reflects the findings of the 1988 La Guerre d'Algérie et les Français conference that because there are significant stakes of the war there cannot be memory. The argument was that the issues of the Algerian war are still at stake in metropolitan France in the present and so this period is not memorable, rather it is (re)lived in the present:

\[\text{Sur les questions fondamentales de nationalité, d'identité, de citoyenneté, l'immigration et le racisme constituent aujourd'hui un enjeu tellement présent, tellement tangible au quotidien qu'on n'a pas besoin de faire un transfert de mémoire. Il y a trop de tensions aujourd'hui pour nourrir une mémoire de l'hier.}\textsuperscript{16}

On the precise question of transmission of memory by the beur group, it might be argued, supported by the findings of the interviews conducted with pupils for this thesis, that transmission is (at least) just as difficult in such families as Bertrand Tavernier's film La Guerre sans nom (1992) showed it was in the families of appelés and rappelés. It might even be more difficult for people who came from Algeria to talk about the Algerian war due to issues such as the choice of France and intégration. As we have seen throughout this thesis powerful "integrating" forces are used by French authorities, including education, to suppress community memories and create or support the nation.

\textsuperscript{16}RIOUX, J-P, "Trou de mémoire", interview conducted by Irene Berelowitch, published in Télerama hors série entitled "L'Algérie. La Culture face à la terreur" in 1995, p. 90.
While it would seem in contemporary France that *intégration* is far from completely successful, it might be strong enough to destroy the development of any significant community memory in the *beur* group around the Algerian war. Would it be correct to say that young *beurs* are neither fully integrated into French society nor respectful of their parents’ origins; rather they have constructed their own identity somewhere outside of these two poles (although influenced by them)? A stronger argument than Bernard’s above argument, yet one example of which is also mentioned in Bernard’s article, is that faced with family silence children whose parents came from Algeria are more curious and may well try outside of the family to discover their past. The example given was as follows:


However, such knowledge will not be obtained from history classes in *terminale*. Such a partial study in class of the Algerian war may however itself also fuel young people’s curiosity in the same way that family silences may do. Indeed, of the twelve people who spontaneously came forward and agreed to an interview for this project seven were of Algerian origin. This would suggest that there is more interest for the question in this section of society than in others i.e. children whose families have no direct connection to Algeria or the Algerian war. In the previous chapter we saw that family history could influence pupil interest in class as one teacher, talking about the prestigious *Lycée du Parc*, said that pupils listened but did not feel affected by the war since it took place a long time ago and did not concern directly their family (Teacher 5).

As concerns the pupils who were interviewed for this project, for one pupil (Pupil 2), half of her family (on her mother’s side, most of whom live in Algeria) talk about the war a lot whereas the other (father’s side in France) do not talk about the Algerian war. In France she had learnt nothing from her family. In Algeria she had learnt a lot, including what was mentioned above on torture. For her: “Si ma mère, elle, ne m’en avait pas parlé ou ma famille, beh je n’aurais pas su que il y avait les tortures comme ça.” She explained the silence in France by mentioning “la honte” (shame), division and pain concerning the Algerian conflict. The fact that the subject is taboo is supported by other pupils. For example, Pupil 12 said he did not talk much in his family of the Algerian war with people in the generation who had fought in the war. The other two pupils present in the interview, Pupils 8 and 9, agreed that they did not speak much about the Algerian question. One person (Pupil 11) however whose grand-parents did

---

often talk about the Algerian war was a pupil whose grand-father had been, in her words, "un grand maquisard" (F.L.N.). Pupil I had also spoken about the Algerian war with members of her family.

Perhaps from this brief and inherently limited discussion it can be concluded that if information can be obtained from the family then it is very rich information. However it is not evident that much discussion takes place within families affected by the Algerian war. Furthermore, only certain groups of people in France are closely linked to the Algerian war — *fils de harkis/beurs* and descendants of *pieds-noirs* or conscripts — and in other families it is unlikely that there is much discussion on or interest in the Algerian war. It might be argued that this group of pupils whose parents came from Algeria has at best the same transmission problems as other groups or even worse problems due to their particularly difficult position in relation to the history of the Algerian war and life in France. The Algerian conflict was a very difficult period for them and of course included many horrors which are not easy to discuss. It has clearly shaped their lives one way or another.

Neil MacMaster gives a very good description of the position of Algerian émigrés in France during the war in his book *Colonial Migrants and Racism*18. He identifies police and press racism aimed at this community, and a process of segregation and discrimination in housing. He shows how F.L.N. "containment" of this population amounted to very severe control of the community, the elimination by the F.L.N. of the rival M.N.A., and led to attacks on the community by the French police and army (with the use of *harkis*). He also shows an increasingly hostile public opinion to be linked to the F.L.N. bringing the Algerian war to metropolitan France. However, whether the children or grand-children of Algerian émigrés receive fairly detailed information or are faced with silence on the subject, the result seems the same: more interest in the question than other sections of French society.

Other sources also tend to support these findings. For example, there would seem to be some evidence that the Algerian war has not been talked about in the Algerian community due to a desire to integrate and not to question the choice of coming to France. In a review in *Le Monde* of the film "Vivre au paradis" we learn that:

Bouriem Guerdjou ne répugne pas aux grands mots, il parle volontiers de missions qu’il s’est assignées : rendre justice à la génération de ses parents en évoquant leurs conditions d’existence lors de leur arrivée en France ; rendre justice, aussi, aux victimes du massacre du 17 octobre ; et redonner un sens d’appartenance à la deuxième génération, lui offrir une possibilité de se trouver des racines. Il raconte [...] que, alors qu’il travaillait au film, ce sont ceux-là mêmes dont il évoque le souvenir qui lui déconseillaient de montrer le bidonville ou le drame du 17 octobre.

---

"On me disait de ne pas reparler de tout ça, de faire plutôt 'une histoire française'."

The idea of "redonner un sens d'appartenance à la deuxième génération, lui offrir la possibilité de se trouver des racines" is linked to intégration in contemporary France. Jean-Louis Hurst was interviewed in a special issue of Quo Vadis entitled "Douce France : La Saga du mouvement beur". Quo Vadis is a review published by the lm'Media press agency, run by minority ethnic journalists. Hurst was, at the time of the Algerian war, a member of the "réseau Jeanson" and therefore someone who tried to oppose the war. Such people have since been referred to as "porteurs de valise". When describing the history of the "beur movement" he said: "Je suis, il est vrai, choqué par la méconnaissance des beurs de leur propre histoire." Later in the interview he said:

Le jour de l'arrivée de la Marche, j'étais près de deux anciens de la Fédération de France, lors du discours de Montparnasse. J'ai vu le dégoût sur leurs visages lorsqu'une beurette s'est publiquement prétendue française.

Such comments, and the concepts that underlie them, are very interesting for numerous reasons. Firstly they are of interest concerning what it means to be French, as we can note the two poles competing in beur identity --- one Algerian and one French. This thesis has made reference to the link between memory and the nation through a discussion of the ideas of scholars like Renan, who argued that the essence of a nation is that its members have forgotten a lot of things. In this way very divisive community memories had to be forgotten. Secondly, this thesis argues, the way the Algerian war is taught is influenced by such considerations as divisive group memories are not to be aggravated and are in practice somewhat pasted over. Such points were discussed in "The State-Prescribed Link in Teaching" chapter. Lastly, we can note that the fact that it is Jean-Louis Hurst who makes these comments in such a critical fashion also shows the way such issues are still at stake in the present and the way the Algerian war can still be divisive in the present. These are presumably the types of memories that Rioux said the "éducation nationale" tried to avoid aggravating.

Various other commentators have argued that beurs are constantly drawn between two poles: the family and France. Alec Hargreaves for example has noted this concerning literature written by sons and daughters of Maghrebian immigrants. He speaks of the tensions that can be found in beur authors' work between success within France and respect for North African heritage. In many ways beurs are torn between France and Algeria. These kinds of tensions are, for example, present in the work of

---

20 "La Mémoire sélective des années algériennes", interview with Jean-Louis Hurst, in a special issue of Quo Vadis entitled "Douce France : La Saga du mouvement beur", autumn-winter 1993, p. 76.  
21 Ibid., p. 76.
Neither of these authors can feel at home in France or Algeria and want to escape to a third make-believe place where they could settle. For Hargreaves:

_Beur_ novels generally take the form of a bildungsroman, where the central thread is the youthful protagonist’s search for a sense of direction in life amid the conflicting cultural imperatives to which he or she is subjected.23

Another example of the lack of transmission of memories of the Algerian war in the Algerian-immigrant community in France, that we can add to those given above, can be found in Stora’s documentary _Les Années algériennes_ when Farid Aichoune talks about the memory of October 17, 1961. In that year he was nine years old and was arrested on October 18. He said:

_Il y avait une mémoire mais une fois que la guerre elle a été finie c’est basta. Il y avait un mot d’ordre que les Algériens disaient [...] “Sept ans ça suffit” donc les gens conservaient à l’intérieur d’eux-mêmes un certain nombre de souvenirs mais n’aimaient pas trop en faire état. Une sorte de pudeur quoi._24

A further example of the absence of family transmission in this group was given in the above mentioned issue of _Quo Vadis_. It consisted of an interview with Mohamed Hocine, founder of the “Comité contre la Double peine” and his family. This committee was a pressure group which campaigned against a law that allowed people of foreign nationality to be expelled from France if they were convicted of a crime. The subject of the conversation was principally how and why his parents had come to France which led to a discussion of his father’s experience during the Algerian war, including his participation in the October 1961 demonstration. The overall impression given was one of the discovery for the first time by Mohamed Hocine of his father’s history as if this kind of discussion had never taken place before despite the age of the participants. Mohamed Hocine said:

_Il y a beaucoup de jeunes qui ne connaissent pas l’histoire de leurs parents. Ils nous ont engendrés, ils nous ont vu grandir, ils savent tout sur nous, et nous on ne sait rien sur eux._25

---

24 _AICHOUNE, F, interviewed in Les Années algériennes, STORA, B et al., volume three “Je ne regrette rien”, produced by Antenne 2, Première Génération, Ina enterprise, 1991._
Three of the examples given above all concern October 17, 1961, and therefore one of the war’s most tragic events (importantly in France). Although this is (perhaps) an extraordinary event in the hostilities, transmission of its memory in the beur group would seem to be fairly typical of all groups’ relationship to the Algerian war. Again there are similarities with what we know from Tavernier’s documentary of the memory of conscripts in Grenoble i.e. silences, repression, trauma. The film provides fascinating examples of people who were sent to fight in Algeria and who have not talked to their families about this experience. Indeed in many notable instances the fact of talking about the Algerian conflict immediately brings them to tears, even thirty years after the event. Clearly they were very traumatised by their experiences and have not come to terms with this period of their lives in a way that would enable them to discuss it in the present. Pieds-noirs also have problems transmitting memories. It is a difficult history to assume for this group through the fact of leaving Algeria, violence in the war, de Gaulle’s betrayal, the arrival in France and the O.A.S. In Le Monde we learn of an example of a pied-noir who does not talk of the war:

Michel N. a accepté, à contre-cœur de nous y rencontrer: ‘Les journalistes devraient attendre qu’en crève tous pour parler de l’Algérie.’ A cinquante-quatre ans, il est catégorique, et c’est presque avec violence qu’il dit: ‘Il vaut mieux garder l’histoire pour soi. Mes quatre filles, de moi, ne sauront jamais rien.’26

This reminds us of the appelé in Stora’s Les Années algériennes quoted above. Bernard, describing families of pieds-noirs and fils de harkis, said: “N’ont-ils pas baigné leurs enfants des récits émerveillés de la vie ‘là-bas’ [...]”27. Rioux also talks of “une ‘nostalgorie’ efficace et cohérente”28. There are therefore silences and very selective transmission. Roland Dhessy explains these silences as follows:

Roland Dhessy, cinquante-cinq ans, qui est secrétaire général adjoint du RECOURS France (l’une des plus importantes associations de rapatriés), a peut-être la clef de ces silences, de ces pannes de transmission, et il la laisse filer, l’air de rien, entre deux phrases : ‘Peut-être, au fond, est-ce parce que, finalement, c’est un peu honteux, pour nous, d’être partis de là-bas...’ Ils finissent par parler, les anciens, laborieusement parfois. Contenant difficilement la colère, l’émotion qui les prend par surprise. Et ils s’étonnent eux-mêmes de revivre aussi intensément devant l’inconnu ce qu’ils ont préféré taire à leurs enfants.

4.5. Conclusion

To conclude this chapter, interviews with pupils have shown that the absolute impact of classes on the Algerian war is weak. This supports the findings of the previous chapter which drew on interviews conducted with teachers. The study of the Algerian war is a partial one which puts the accent on a study of de Gaulle and the general origins of decolonisation, to the detriment of a detailed study of the war itself. We have seen that pupils have a superficial and partial knowledge of the conflict. The way classes are given in *terminale* is also important in understanding the impact of classes on young people’s knowledge of the Algerian war. Nonetheless, pupils all insisted on the importance of history classes in their process of learning about the Algerian war. Little information had been obtained from other sources. We can state therefore that, in absolute terms, history classes on the Algerian war are an important vector of memory, but that in relative terms not much information is transmitted. The main other significant source for pupils was the family. If information had been obtained from the family it was very rich and has more potential impact, in my opinion, than history classes. This is partly due to the changes in society described throughout this thesis. However this information so far has been shown to be partial or sometimes non-existent in all families of groups concerned directly by the Algerian war. The *beur* group in particular might, despite the arguments of other commentators, have just as many, if not more problems in accessing a memory as other groups in France have been shown to have. Yet family history does seem to lead to much more interest in the subject. It was shown to colour pupil knowledge of the Algerian war in very important ways in certain cases. Ultimately, the existence of such memories in the classroom changes classroom dynamics, and crucially as this thesis argues can be said to influence the programme in so far as these are the very types of potentially divisive memories that are not to be aggravated.
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Teaching the History of the Algerian War in Post-Modern France

5.1. The Continuing Relevance of the Algerian War

The Algerian war (1954-1962) was and is a very significant event in contemporary French history. Stora has called it one of the hardest wars of decolonization ever fought. It lasted more than seven years and finished less than forty years ago. During the war a whole generation of young people born in France between 1932 and 1943 were sent to fight in Algeria. This meant that most French families were directly concerned by the Algerian war in a way in which they had not been by the war in Indo-China, since it was the corps expéditionnaire, composed of professional soldiers, that had fought in Asia. We have seen in this thesis the way all teachers knew somebody, often a family member, who had been involved in the Algerian war. This gives a good indication of the impact of the conflict on French society. Most of these people are still alive. The war led to the end of more than one hundred and thirty years of French presence in Algeria, which had been three French départements. It is therefore very much linked to French colonial history which, as Ross has argued, has been denied by the French, with serious consequences on opinions and stereotypes of immigrant workers. Furthermore certain myths, such as a Gaullist-myth of the creation of a modern European-looking France, originate from this period.

The Algerian war saw the use of the worst methods of warfare to avoid another shameful defeat. These methods included torture. They had been developed during the colonial war the French fought in Indo-China, which was a conflict they ultimately lost after the battle of Dien Bien Phu. This took place in a context of political abandoning of power with consequential increase in military power in the field. In this way French generals were given sweeping powers in Algeria, voted by the French parliament. The methods employed therefore raised very serious moral questions which today, we might argue, are still highly important to understand. It also traumatised many people who were in Algeria during the war, to such an extent that its memory has been repressed by its actors. Numerous events during the war were sufficiently dangerous to France that they have been occulted by the French state: including torture, massacres, and executions. It brought down the Fourth Republic and caused immense division in
France and Algeria as different communities emerged: such as conscripts, professional soldiers, O.A.S. members, gaullists, porteurs de valise, harkis, and pieds-noirs.

These communities are still very evident in French society today. These groups have formed associations and communities. We can identify important associations of veterans, pieds-noirs, and harkis. Such groups tend to be very hostile to other groups. The war provoked an exodus of pieds-noirs and harkis and contributed to present day phenomena in France such as the French National Front, anti-Arab racism, and difficult Franco-Algerian international relations; without forgetting the legacy of a civil war situation in Algeria. Indeed many commentators link the electorate and the organisation of the French National Front to people very clearly involved in the Algerian war. Stora in his book *Le Transfert d'une mémoire* speaks of four or five million people in France who have "une mémoire à vif" of the war. We have seen how both teachers (in my sample pieds-noirs) and pupils (in my sample pupils of Algerian origin) can be concerned by the Algerian war and the way they bring memories to class. Indeed, it is in important ways their history. This history is linked to identity: the identity of pupils, teachers and ultimately the French in general.

5.2. The Continuing Importance of History Classes

This thesis has argued that identity is intricately linked to history and memory. It is clear that history classes still play an important role in constructing a collective memory in France. This can be seen through the numerous statements of participants in and commentators on education given throughout this thesis (notably Serge Berstein, Dominique Borne, Jean Peyrot, Jean-Pierre Rioux, and Henry Rousso). It is shown particularly distinctly in the place of World War Two and Vichy in the programme; in the importance attributed to the study of this period and the reactions to its place in the programme. These reveal what is at stake in the programme and the way that history and memory are still essential components of identity. We can also note the current length of time children spend in education and changes in other vectors e.g. a reduction in the importance of the state in memorial activity and a decrease in national and family memories. All of these factors explain the continuing, or I would argue even renewed, importance of what is taught.

What is taught in schools is perhaps one of the last widely shared cultures in what is an increasingly fragmented society. This has been shown in this thesis to be particularly important concerning "La République". Jean-Pierre Rioux said in the interview conducted by this author: "Le problème de l'enseignement en France comme ailleurs est toujours: que dire à tout le monde?" Indeed that is to a very large extent what education is: the transmission of a shared culture. The stakes in education can also be seen in the
way it is at the centre of efforts to favour “civic” behaviour, linked to instruction civique and intégration in contemporary France. I believe importance is attributed to education (and notably history lessons) in the face of perceived assaults on France and “French identity” ranging from sub-national regions at one end of the spectrum to Europe at the other, without forgetting the constant onslaught of the English language and the American/Anglo-Saxon model. Some commentators even talk of “the end of history”. Fukuyama argues that liberal democracy has triumphed, which shows the clear demise of other alternative models of society. This is especially problematic for societies that do not follow the Anglo-Saxon model. One can identify a “post-modern condition” linked to phenomena such as the spectacular development of information technology, the media, the end of the Cold war, and the triumph of liberal democracy. France as much as any other country has entered in a post-modern era. Education is increasingly important in such societies (and in French society). As Antoine Prost said in L'Histoire: “La démission de la société charge l'école d'une fonction très lourde de socialisation des élèves”\textsuperscript{1}. And changes in society — reflecting the above-mentioned “post-modern condition” — have led to an increase in the importance of memory. Nancy Wood in the introduction to her book Vectors of Memory states:

Memory is decidedly in fashion. [...] It has also become a subject of intense contestation amongst vying social groups and an essential bulwark of the identity politics that motivates many of these debates. [...] In contrast to the future-orientated gaze of post-war decades, any injunction to ‘turn the page’ of history, especially those pages from which resentments still fulminate, is greeted with suspicion or scorn.\textsuperscript{2}

However one must reflect on the changing place of memory in society i.e. teaching in post-modern France. The French Fifth Republic is clearly not the same as the Third Republic. The impact of school classes has, I think, been modified by changes in society. In general our best source on French post-modern society’s relation to the past is the work edited by Pierre Nora under the title Les Lieux de mémoire. Nora describes commemoration and concludes that: “En vérité, le modèle traditionnel a éclaté.”\textsuperscript{3} For Nora the traditional model of commemoration has been destroyed and replaced by a more varied model which is “un système éclaté, fait de langages commémoratifs disparates, qui suppose avec le passé un rapport différent, plus électif qu’impératif, ouvert, plastique, vivant, en perpétuelle élaboration”\textsuperscript{4}. French collective memory in general is therefore more fragmented than it was previously. This is due to, and can be
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\textsuperscript{1}PROST, A, “La fin des professeurs”, L'Histoire, no. 158, September 1992, p. 79.


\textsuperscript{4}Ibid., p. 983/4.
seen in, the proliferation of memories and identities. Hence the title of the third volume of *Les Lieux de mémoire: Les France* (plural).

This shift took place according to Nora throughout the twentieth century especially due to World War One, World War Two and the colonial wars that France tried to win. It significantly accelerated after the death of de Gaulle, the end of the *Trente glorieuses*, and the decline of Marxism in the 1970s. Another point I would make is the way during this period that France also became an increasingly multi-ethnic country as between 1950 and 1974 the immigrant population doubled from 1.7 million to 3.4 million. Furthermore the structure of immigration changed from circulation, where individuals came to France to work for short periods of time, to family reunification. Most importantly the children and grand-children born of these families are very present in contemporary France, including in schools. These factors have in themselves profoundly changed French society. For Nora, this shift means that, unlike in the Third Republic schools are no longer central to commemoration:

> Ce n'est plus à l'école, instrument central du dispositif traditionnel, sur les places publiques, dans le rituel de moins en moins vivant des 11 Novembre, 14 Juillet et autres 1er Mai que s'affirme l'identité collective et que s'exprime l'esprit de la commémoration, mais à la télévision, dans les musées, au Mémorial de Caen et à l'Historial de Péronne, dans les milliers d'associations créées à cet effet, dans le déluge de représentations théâtrales et musicales et d'animations folkloriques; avec surtout, et partout, les deux piliers inévitables de la commémoration contemporaine que sont devenus l'exposition obligatoire et le fatidique colloque.

However, that does not mean that what is taught is unimportant. What is taught now does not take the form of overt commemoration that it did in the Third Republic, but has been shown in this thesis to be a memory of sorts and therefore important. In relative terms history classes are an important vector of memory. This is especially true of the Algerian war given the weakness, even absence, of other vectors of memory. All pupils interviewed stated that the teacher and history classes were a very important source of information on the Algerian war. Indeed Nora himself, while showing how commemorations no longer follow the traditional model but are rather varied, points to the fact that all French national commemoration is now highly political. This means that there are stakes in the present linked to what is remembered and “memory battles” take place since “[...] plus un seul événement, depuis la guerre, n’est intégrable de plein droit à une mémoire nationale unitaire.” We have seen throughout this thesis the
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7 Ibid., p. 984/5.
8 Ibid., p. 985.
importance to memory of the present (and the importance of the present to memory) and the way the stakes of the Algerian war in contemporary France hinder its remembrance, including in education, thus shaping its memory. As Rioux said in the interview in Paris:

L’école républicaine en France ne pense pas qu’il faille privilégier la guerre d’Algérie au détriment d’autres événements pour aussi ne pas prendre le risque, parce que ça l’école ne veut pas, d’envenimer les conflits de mémoire qui existent et dont on peut prendre compte en classe, c’est évident, pour toujours les ramener à des éléments de connaissance et d’acquisition de connaissance par tous les élèves sur un phénomène comme la guerre d’Algérie. (Rioux 2000)

Nora also points to the way commemoration has become less national and more local. I would argue that rather than weakening the role of schools in the transmission of memories, this has made them one of the, if not the, last area(s) of transmission of a collective knowledge. Nonetheless this commentator agrees that memory is now more local and feels that this merits more study in the future concerning the Algerian war. Indeed one of the aims of this project, by focusing on a case study of Lyons, was to put the emphasis on the local level. In addition to analysing teacher and pupil interview-findings gathered in fieldwork in secondary schools in Lyons, we have seen in part the way veterans’ associations function in that city. Nora also shows that since commemoration is more local it is in the hands of various associations and groups, and his findings therefore strengthen the pluralist model of collective memory in which groups compete. We have seen in this thesis the way individuals and groups can influence the wider memory of the Algerian war through the history they write; the role they play in the elaboration of textbooks or programmes; the choices they make as teachers; the testimony they give in or around class; their interest as pupils and so on. We should also note that in this pluralist model there is an immense amount of competition concerning just what to remember. In addition, Nora shows how ultimately memory is still “used” despite changes in the nation and in commemoration, and is still essential to identity:

Il y avait donc autrefois une histoire nationale et des mémoires particulières; il y a aujourd’hui une mémoire nationale, mais dont l’unité est faite d’une revendication patrimoniale divisée, en permanence démultiplication et recherche de cohésion. D’un côté, cet album de famille découvert depuis trente ans avec attendrissement et pieusement enrichi de toutes les trouvailles de grenier, immense répertoire de dates, d’images, de textes, de figures, d’intrigues, de mots et même de valeurs [...] De l’autre, des groupes pour qui la ‘mémoire’, c’est-à-dire, en fait, répétons-le, la récupération de leur histoire, joue des rôles très différents, mais toujours constitutifs
de leur identité, c’est-à-dire de leur existence. [...] Les usages sociaux de la mémoire sont aussi divers et variés que les logiques identitaires.9

What is more, this “memory” is in fact history. In all instances a reading of Nora shows that memory and history are still important in contemporary France. He developed this idea in his conclusion as follows:

Ce que l’on appelle aujourd’hui communément mémoire, au sens où l’on parle d’une mémoire ouvrière, occitane, féminine, est au contraire l’avènement à une conscience historique d’une tradition défunte, la récupération reconstitutrice d’un phénomène dont nous sommes séparés, et qui intéresse le plus directement ceux qui s’en sentent les descendants et les héritiers; une tradition que l’histoire officielle n’avait nullement éprouvé le besoin de prendre en compte parce que le groupe national s’était le plus souvent construit sur son étoffement, sur son silence, ou parce qu’elle n’avait pas affleuré comme telle à l’histoire. Mais une tradition que ces groupes désormais en voie d’intégration à l’histoire nationale éprouvent, eux, le besoin urgent de reconstituer avec les moyens du bord, des plus sauvages aux plus scientifiques, parce qu’elle est constitutive de leur identité. Cette mémoire est en fait leur histoire.10

5.3. The Teaching of the Algerian War

History is still important, hence the importance of what history is taught. In practice, terminale history lessons ultimately transmit a lot of information especially concerning World War Two and giving an overall view of post-1939 history. However history classes on the Algerian war are also “important” in so far as not much is taught on the subject. We have seen that there is a significant difference in the way World War Two/Vichy and the Algerian war are examined in class. This reflects to a very large extent the importance attributed to this subject by different groups (such as intellectuals, veterans, teachers) for the values that it can transmit. The Algerian war is not the same in terms of its history, its memory, or the way it is taught. The Algerian conflict was highly divisive (and still can be due to the age of people who participated in the war); was “une guerre sans nom” (until 1999); does not have easily identifiable dates (epitomised in the battle over whether or not to commemorate the war on March 19); and was “une sale guerre”. Jean-Pierre Rioux in his contribution to the book La Guerre d’Algérie et les Français highlighted the barriers to a memory of the Algerian war, by making reference to the weakness of “cadres de mémoire” for this conflict, some of which now no longer apply.11 Its memory has been shown by scholars to have

---

9 Ibid., p. 1010.
10 Ibid., p. 997.
been occulted and repressed. Rather than being central to the programme, it is marginalized in the history terminale programme.

On the Algerian war, history classes are a relatively important vector of memory for young people, due to the weakness, even absence of other vectors. This situation can be contrasted with that of World War Two but also with that of World War One. At a conference organised by the University of Stirling French Department in March 2000, Jean-Sebastian Sériot (from the French Institute in Edinburgh) gave a paper in which he discussed his personal experience of the transmission of memories on the First World War during his formative years in France. He divided this transmission into three circles: the family (various members of his family), the village, and the school. For this commentator, the important point to note was the high number and variety of vectors of information and the way they complemented each other. Important transmission took place. As Nora and other commentators have pointed out, there is a significant difference between memories of Word War One and other conflicts, as later conflicts have been very divisive. French society has changed significantly, for example, in terms of the family and the village since Sériot was a child. Indeed given the fact that he was a child in the 1960s, not only since he was a child but also during the period when he was a child that coincided with the end of the Algerian war.

Concerning the Algerian war, some would argue that the subject is not occulted. This thesis has shown that it is true to say that this subject is marginalized. Rioux in the interview in Paris said that there is no "volontarisme de mémoire" concerning the Algerian war in the history terminale programme but there is no "volonté d'occultation" either. He said that it is "peu enseigné en termes de volume" but that what is said is correct: "On dit peu mais ce que l'on dit est intéressant et surtout assez sûr, il n'y a pas d'enseignement partial de la guerre d'Algérie". He spoke of "le minimum vital en connaissance" although he accepted that this is not necessarily enough. While generally I can accept these comments, one can argue that it is through the small study that the Algerian war becomes partial. Although what is said on de Gaulle may be true and fair, if one chooses to talk only about that to the detriment of other subjects, the whole study in a way becomes partial in the sense of being not only incomplete but also biased (e.g. a Franco-French bias, or avoiding the shameful aspects of the war). On the one hand, this is inevitable (as all programmes are limited and therefore incomplete) but, on the other hand, we have certainly seen in this thesis the way such choices are determined by the present and by the wider memory of the Algerian war and are in no way fortuitous. A more detailed study of the way Vichy is currently taught than that which this thesis has been able to undertake would probably show the same thing. However this marginalization is ultimately rather similar to "occultation" since in the Larousse

French dictionary "occulter" is defined as "passer sous silence, dissimuler". In absolute terms not much is transmitted on the Algerian war through terminale history classes.

Despite the above definition, I can accept that the Algerian war is not occulted — the word is perhaps too strong since I do not believe we can talk in the same terms concerning history classes as we can of, for example, the occultation that took place around the events of October 17, 1961 — rather what is transmitted through the programme, examination questions, textbooks and teachers concerning the Algerian war (and can be seen through talking to pupils) has been shown to amount to the marginalization of this aspect of French history. It is a small, incomplete, divided, highly selective study of the Algerian war which does not go into detail. To understand how the Algerian war is marginalized we need to take note of its place in wider chapters in the programme. The French Fourth and Fifth Republics (in a study of "La France depuis 1945") and Decolonisation (in a study of "Le Monde de 1945 à nos jours") are chapters in the programme and are what is taught. Somewhere within these chapters is the Algerian war, which means that the war is studied, but only partially as it is there merely to explain wider phenomena. This was shown in particular in both teacher and pupil comments.

In reality elements of the Algerian war are given to explain the fall of the Fourth Republic and de Gaulle's presidency. This has been seen through talking to teachers and in their lesson plans. Also "Decolonisation" is a vast subject and the Algerian war occupies a very small place in it as an example of a violent decolonisation. The positioning of the Algerian war can be seen in examination questions, too, which are important because the aim of teachers and textbook editors is to a large extent to prepare pupils for the baccalauréat. This was reflected in pupil knowledge. Questions set at the baccalauréat are generally on Decolonisation or the French Fourth and Fifth Republics in mainland France. We saw that very few questions have ever been set in mainland France in June sessions in which the Algerian war was central to the question. Such questions are very rare and now seem to always take the form of a textual commentary of a de Gaulle source.

The study of the Algerian war has been shown in this thesis not to be a detailed one. Pupils in interviews were very weak on "detail" questions and better on "general" questions. What I mean by "detail" questions were those in my interviews that were on precise elements of the Algerian war such as the arrest of Ben Bella; the events of 17 October, 1961, or the metro Charonne; the "porteurs de valise"; the "semaine des barricades" and so on. The emphasis in class is often put on the different "stages" of the war: "origines", "déclenchement", "enlisement", "mai 58 et le retour de de Gaulle" and "règlement du conflit". In this way the details of the war are not studied, but the pupil should understand the development of the war. We discussed the example of a teacher who talked me through a chronology taken from Le Monde and who said that there were a lot of elements of the Algerian war that were often dropped. In the chronology he gave
me, elements of the war not studied in class but in the chronology included many of the most painful and divisive events in the Algerian war.

Also we have usefully been able to reflect qualitatively on things which affect the impact of classes (sometimes of all subjects, sometimes specifically the Algerian war). We noted the extent of teachers' "mentioning" points rather than giving detail and explanation. They also unanimously insisted on the lack of time and how the study of the Algerian war was a very quick, short one. This meant that all teachers interviewed used a "Cours Magistral" lesson technique and tended to lecture to pupils. The lessons therefore involved above all note-taking. This allows us to state that much of what is taught is "imposed" by the programme. Another qualitative finding was the way films are not shown in class on the Algerian war but may be shown on World War Two. Furthermore, actors of the Second World War come into class to give testimonies in significant number. This shows the way memory is used "exceptionally" to teach history on this subject. The way the Second World War is taught can be described as an "exception" in so far as it stands on its own in the programme, occupies nearly a quarter of the programme, and is taught through reference to film and participants' testimony.

Quantitatively however only two out of eighteen teachers I interviewed had ever invited actors of the Algerian war, and one of the two did not speak exclusively about the Algerian war. None had done so recently. Only one pupil had been in a class to which a veteran of the Algerian war had been invited. This was not in terminale but in troisième (the equivalent in France of G.C.S.E. fourth or fifth year). All but two of the twelve pupils interviewed had however at some point (usually première but sometimes troisième) heard a testimony on World War Two, on the Resistance or deportation. In addition, we have seen that the impact of a class and of a testimony is very different. The Algerian war is not an "exception" in the programme — Republican values would seem to forbid this according to Rioux — and is not therefore discussed in any detail. There is no "volontarisme de mémoire" concerning the Algerian war. We have seen throughout this thesis various reasons for this situation, which will be recalled below, one of which is effectively the way Republican values do not allow the Algerian war to be privileged, but other reasons have also been advanced.

We were also able to note a significant difference between information obtained in class and that which comes from the family. This was shown concerning torture which is one aspect of the Algerian war that is not studied in detail in class. However, three pupils interviewed (of Algerian origin) had obtained significant information from their family on torture. An example of one pupil was given who spoke about the Algerian war with the mother's side of her family, especially in Algeria. She was able to give a very detailed description of treatment at the hands of the French during "regroupement". She also knew about torture and other atrocities. Members of her family had been tortured. She said these were subjects that it was not easy to talk about. We can note the way this took place in Algeria rather than in France (such memories
being honoured in that country rather than occulted and repressed as in France) and, while painful to evoke, were “convenient” in so far as they denigrated the French. A fascinating point to note here is the way memory is always “used” one way or another. There was a stark difference between her answer given to the question on torture in the interview and her answers to other questions. On this question she provided a significant amount of relevant information to support her answer and talked for a long time. For two other pupils there was also a similar sharp evident difference in the quality of information received from the family and from the class.

These findings show clearly the way memories of the Algerian war are still present in the classroom, which is something Rioux referred to in the interview. We also saw how they can be highly divisive in so far as these pupils referred to harkis as traitors. Pupil 2, who is of Algerian origin, speaking of harkis said: “j’en ai entendu parler” and used the word “collaborateurs”. This information would not have come from class. In her family she had described the division between her mother’s and father’s sides relating to actions in the Algerian war. This division was between France and Algeria as her father’s family were in France whereas her mother’s family were in Algeria. Another group also spoke of harkis. Pupil 9 said: “c’est ceux qui ont trahi l’Algérie” and Pupil 8 used the word “traitres”. Pupil 11 spoke in the interview of her grand-father’s “hantisse de l’Etat français”. Also Rioux has argued that this is a problem of generation:

Le travail de deuil sera achevé quand la dispersion des mémoires sera moins forte. Et cela se fera avec le temps, à mesure que les générations qui ont vécu cette guerre disparaîtront. Aujourd’hui, il est trop tôt. 12

One pupil also gave details of an argument she (the daughter of an F.L.N. member) had had with the son of a pied-noir. Lastly we noted the importance of the make-up of the sample — the way in which beurs came forward and seem to be more interested in talking about (and learning about) the Algerian war than other groups not as concerned by the conflict.

In attempting to explain the place of the Algerian war in terminale different theories of collective memory have been referred to, one of which sees collective memory as a form of cohesion as is shown in much theoretical work: Maurice Halbwachs, Emile Durkheim, Ernest Renan. Often they show forgetting to be necessary. Collective memory can also be seen to be the result of different groups competing in a pluralist model. Rather than only talking in “psychological” terms of repression, the reasons for this place have been shown to be varied and multiform. Notably we must not neglect

views of memory as a necessary glue for society and pluralism. This thesis has tried to reflect on factors that can explain this particular position.

These reasons concern, amongst other things, the present and identity. The present is important since the Algerian war was a highly divisive conflict that ended less than forty years ago. Benjamin Stora published a book entitled *Le Transfert d'une mémoire* in 1999 in which he spoke of four or five million French people who have "une mémoire à vif" of the war. Work on the memory of the Algerian war often insists on the continuing existence of "group and individual memories" rather than a "collective or national memory". This is still the case. The historian Jean-Pierre Rioux was quoted above as saying that once the distance between different groups has diminished the "work of grieving" will be complete, but that this will take time and will essentially entail the generation that fought the Algerian war dying off, which could take decades. This thesis supports these arguments in so far as we have seen how divisive memories in the present hinder a more detailed study of the Algerian war.

It has argued that history classes play a role in creating or maintaining present unity and cohesion as has been shown through reference to numerous comments by participants in and commentators on education. In this way collective memory can be seen to be necessary to unity in society. Several comments in particular from the President of the "Association de Professeurs d'Histoire et de Géographie" (A.P.H.G.) were discussed. In his comments he described the teaching of history as the creation out of individual and group memories of "une mémoire commune." In other comments he referred to history and geography as "instruments de cohésion sociale". Reference was also made to comments by the authors of the history programme and to the four broad aims of the history programme, one of which is an "objectif civique". I feel these aims make detailed teaching of the Algerian war difficult. We can say that the continuing existence of divisive memories hinders a significant study of the Algerian war since such a study would not create cohesion.

Examples of the way the Algerian war and its memory are still divisive in the present abound. Below the reactions of *pieds-noirs* to the June 2000 visit of the Algerian president, Abdelaziz Bouteflika, will be mentioned. These will be seen to be a source of conflict in so far as the opinions expressed are particular to the *pied-noir* group and are critical of other groups e.g. *porteurs de valise* (French people in metropolitan France who helped the F.L.N.). Bouteflika himself met some *porteurs de valise* in Paris during his visit, but refused to meet *harkis*. Another example of the division that the events in Algeria during the war still cause in the present is given in a series of testimony published in *Le Monde* in June 2000. On June 20, 2000, *Le Monde* published the testimony on torture of an Algerian woman, Louisette Ighilahriz. On June 22 the same
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paper published the conflicting viewpoints of General Jacques Massu and General Marcel Bigeard, in reaction to this testimony. In Ighilahriz's testimony, she explicitly mentioned the role of Massu and Bigeard in her torture by saying they were present, insulted her and gave orders. Massu commanded the 10th division of French paratroopers during the crucial battle of Algiers. At that time Bigeard was a colonel. Broadly speaking Massu defended Ighilahriz's testimony whereas Bigeard denied all.

In these testimonies, we can note the way Massu supported Ighilahriz's testimony, in so far as he said it was easily believable because such torture "faisait partie d'une certaine ambiance à Alger" and "elle était un cas au milieu de beaucoup d'autres", but denied all personal involvement. He also said that civil authorities in Algiers knew about the use of torture and endorsed it. In addition to torture, the rape and execution of suspects was mentioned in the testimony. He also mentioned the way many in the army knew about torture. Although Massu acknowledges these events in Algeria, and expressed regret and remorse, Bigeard denied all and said "ce papier est malvenu" and "vous allez encore troubler les cartes avec Massu". This would seem to mean that he would far rather this subject was not discussed. He defended his character and his actions during the Algerian war. He finished his comments by saying that people should remember that "le vieux, à quatre-vingt-quatre ans, il est battant, et qu'il sait mordre encore." My reading of this comment is that it is a threat. Clearly this is a subject where the stakes are still high. Although amnesties were passed by the French government, a lot of people alive in France today have "les mains sales" and would still not like this to be known. Some acknowledge that torture was used, others deny it. Some justify the use of torture while others continue to denounce it. In all cases it is a divisive subject.

It has been argued that one particularly important facet of the link between memory and the nation is intégration linked to ethnic minorities. This is connected to ideas of the nation described by Ernest Renan and to views of collective memory as necessary for unity in society. It can be argued that forgetting is necessary to the present. The extreme division that led to much bloodshed during the Algerian war was very negative and some argue this needs to be forgotten. Rioux in the interview in Paris touched on these issues when talking about the way the Algerian war is taught since he said it would not be prudent in history classes to aggravate these memories that still exist in the classroom. The "Teacher Link" chapter showed how pieds-noirs were teaching more about the Algerian war than others, and the way teachers could do more in class than was strictly necessary to respect the programme if they chose to do so. Various factors that could motivate them to do so were discussed. The "Pupil Link" chapter demonstrated that pupils' families are often affected by the Algerian war, especially if
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they are from Algeria, which colours the family transmission of memory in important ways.

Ernest Renan said that the essence of a nation is that its members have forgotten a lot of things. Concerning integration, Michel Winock in the review L’Histoire in an issue on immigration argued that second and third generation descendants of immigrants received “French memories”. Making direct reference to the ideas of Renan he said: “La question (de la possession en commun d’un riche legs de souvenirs), il est vrai, s’effaçait avec la deuxième et la troisième générations : les enfants issus de l’immigration, nés en France n’ont que des souvenirs français”\(^{16}\). This takes place to a large extent in schools including in history classes and on the subject of the Algerian war. One fascinating example of this process and such issues can be found in an interview published in the French review Hommes et Migrations. In it, the eighteen-year-old son of a man thrown into the Seine in Paris on October 17, 1961, (and who was a witness at the recent trial in which Maurice Papon brought proceedings against the journalist Jean-Luc Einaudi for slander) spoke of how he had learned of these events. This was not at school, but more through his father. Throughout the interview, when talking of the French and the Algerian war, despite being born in France, he switched between various pronouns: “on” (we), “ils” (they) and “eux” (them). The person who conducted the interview identified what she called his “difficile identification” with France. She said:

Cette difficile identification se révèle dans le vocabulaire utilisé par Slim. Quand il dit “On a eu les Juifs en 1945”, il s’assimile à la France. “Mais quand même, en 1961, ils ont été capable de recommencer”: ils désigne la France quand il s’en distancie et se dit Algérien. Cette double identité se manifeste à un autre moment de l’entretien: “En France, on a dénoncé les Allemands, mais ils ne dénoncent pas ce que, eux, ils ont fait avec les Algériens.”\(^{17}\)

Here memory can clearly be seen to be linked to concerns in the present and to identity. In this example, it is repression and denial in wider society that have led to what the interviewer called the interviewee’s “difficile identification” with France and the French. While on the one hand some argue that the Algerian war must be forgotten to avoid aggravating memories, others argue that this forgetting is very negative, particularly for children of Algerian origin. For example Claude Liauzu has argued in this way that:

Pour ce qui concerne l’Algérie, un tiers de siècle après, l’amnésie officielle reste lourde de conséquences. Elle laisse le champ libre aux mémoires opposées, elle a


This is a very clear example of the way repression of memory can be argued to be bad for French society. We can note here that even if, in the programme and examination questions, the Algerian war is somewhat marginalized precisely to avoid aggravating divisive memories in the classroom, such memories of the Algerian war are present in the classroom in the present and can be seen to determine what is taught. This is important as regards pluralist views of collective memory, still linked to the present and identity, in which individuals and groups influence wider memory. In terms of individuals and groups this concerns both teachers and pupils. Teachers have a certain amount of room for manoeuvre in the way they interpret the programme and what they do exactly in class. While in general they tend to do very similar things, some fascinating differences have been noted. This can be the choice to do more or less on the Algerian war.

Those teachers who did more in my sample tended to be of pied-noir origin but in a larger sample might be shown to have broader scientific, personal or sociological motivations; while when less was done in class it tended to be in classes with no Maghrebian children. Here in this last example we can see the importance of pupils in this process in terms of their contribution (including memories) and their demand for the subject. One teacher in particular said that questions from pupils could lead her to develop the points she was making and therefore do more on the Algerian war in class. Indeed, of the twelve pupils interviewed for this project seven were of Algerian origin. They voluntarily came forward for an interview suggesting more interest in the subject in this group than in other groups who could also have come forward. We saw how one teacher in a school in which there are few such children said that the pupils listened but were not very interested since their families were not involved in the Algerian war which for them was now “ancient history”.

Another explanation of the place of the Algerian war in terminale lies in society as teachers and pupils are not the only ones to influence what is taught. In an interview I conducted with the historian Serge Berstein (co-chairman of the group that designed the current programme and long-time director of the textbook published by Hatier) in Paris in February 2000, he spoke of the importance of not shocking society in the programme and in textbooks. This was not the role of a textbook. For him, what can be done in class on any one event changed over time and depended on what society already knew about the period in question. This I have argued introduces the idea of the relationship

between what is taught and the position of other vectors as it is they that inform society. We can also note the impact of different pressure groups.

Both points show differences in terms of the way the Algerian war and Vichy are taught. Vichy occupies a large place in textbooks. Its study is one of important themes such as collaboration. Examination questions are set on the subject. Many of the pupils I interviewed had been to a testimony on this war and seen films (including in class). This difference in the way the wars are taught is to some extent due to the difference in the vectors of the two wars. Vectors of memory of the Algerian war I would argue are very weak — in relative terms I think the teaching of the war is an important vector of memory due to the weakness, even absence of other vectors — whereas vectors of memory of the Second World War are much stronger. I think this has allowed the study of Vichy to develop over the years. The study of the Algerian war in terminale has not developed however as one might expect despite the passage of time (indeed less is now taught on this war now than previously) and it is overshadowed by that of Vichy.

Lastly, the place of the Algerian war can be explained by the nature of the overall programme which has considerably changed over the years. The initial programme entered in use in 1983/4, was changed in 1989 and then again in 1998. In fact, we can say that less and less has been being taught on the Algerian conflict since the programme was changed in 1998. Teachers talked of spending much less time on it in the new programme than before. This has meant dropping events as teachers no longer have time to go into sufficient detail to explain things. What has been dropped due to the change in programme can also be seen in textbook content in the significant difference between pre- and post-1998 editions on the war in Algeria. Although the subjects studied and time periods have not significantly changed in the programmes there is more insistence on longer periods and global phenomena to the detriment of short periods in detail. The result is the war is now an event in other wider movements rather than a war studied in itself for its events. The aim now is to teach “global history” and to avoid “histoire événementielle” in order to teach the significance of events. This can be seen very clearly in all sources. This has changed the way the Algerian war is taught.

5.4. The French Collective Memory of the Algerian War

The facts that in absolute terms not much is transmitted on the Algerian war in terminale history classes in France, and that in relative terms this is an important vector of memory, mean that memories of the Algerian conflict are not really transmitted. This has important consequences for the wider collective memory of the war, notably across the change in generation. We can argue that the main changes in the collective memory
of the Algerian war have come about due to the change in generation i.e. through the transmission of memory that this thesis has examined. The change in memory has occurred over the change in generation, but this is achieved through marginalizing and avoiding the subject rather than confronting it. This shows that the subject is still potentially divisive, principally amongst its actors since if this was not so perhaps it would not be marginalized.

Teachers said that for pupils the Algerian war was “ancient history”. This can be linked to the work of Kristen Ross who argued in her book *Fast Cars, Clean Bodies: Decolonization and the Reordering of French Culture* that there is a tendency in France to keep the two stories of modernisation and decolonisation separate. This narrative involves what is effectively a denial of the colonial period since it portrays this period as “archaic” and “exterior”, when in fact this epoch and its dramatic end involved many people now living in France and are therefore a very important part of contemporary French identity. The way the Algerian war is taught is an example of and reflects such a narrative. This is part of a wider account in which the whole colonial period is ignored in French society. Such a point was mentioned in an article in *Libération* in June 2000. The historian Pascal Blanchard was defending the “Musée des Arts africains et océaniens” as a possible lieu de mémoire to “rafaîchir la mémoire d’une France oubliée de son passé de puissance colonisatrice.” He said:

[... ] à la différence des pages sombres de la collaboration et de l’État français vichyssois, la République n’assume toujours pas son histoire coloniale. [ ... ] Le blocage aujourd’hui est au niveau de l’État (et de la République) [...]. Il est temps de proposer dans le seul lieu symbolique de la République bientôt disponible, le MaaO, un véritable lieu de savoir sur ce passé, première étape indispensable pour casser la machine infernale de la non-existence de fait de ces ‘populations’ au sein de la République. [... ] c’est par une prise de conscience globale (et pas seulement médiatique) fondée sur la mémoire et la connaissance de notre passé commun que les mentalités changeront... 19

This “keeping the two stories separate” and marginalization of the history of the Algerian war has perhaps played a large role in “defusing” previous violent memories in France since they are not aggravated, are ignored and not transmitted through this vector. This would very much seem to be the position of the “éducation nationale”. This lessening of tensions, in my opinion, has not been achieved through the work of grieving i.e. through dialogue. It has been achieved through the lack of information from different vectors. This is because the main source of information for young people on the Algerian war — given the weakness or absence of other vectors — consists of terminale history classes, which provide a very partial study of the conflict. Ultimately this still allows us to talk of occultation and repression. One teacher, Teacher 4, said:

Si c’est vraiment le cours il n’y a pas tellement de réactions... une méconnaissance qui amène à peu de réactions, peu de réactions, très peu de réactions. (Teacher 4)

However Stora would perhaps argue that repression crosses generations and perpetuates such feelings. He might argue that it is precisely the fact that colonial memories have not been addressed that is at work in contemporary France contributing to the existence of southern bastions of the French National Front. Liauzu is another French historian who would probably criticise this policy since he has denounced, in particular, difficulties in obtaining access to archives, which is hindering the writing of the history of the war, which in turn favours the continuation of “des guerres de mémoires actuelles”20. In terminale the Algerian war is marginalized and we can identify a lack of ‘will’ to seriously study the Algerian war especially in the state-prescribed link leaving room in the classroom for a complex, yet fascinating, process and interplay of private memories. In reality young people do not receive much information in history classes on the Algerian war and for them therefore it is not as divisive a subject as it was for (perhaps) their teachers or elders in their families. Beyond actors in the war it is a little known period and one that is underestimated in its importance and rarely referred to in private or public life in France.

The stakes of the (memory of the) Algerian war are still high. One can also state that there has been little “change” in the memory of the Algerian war in so far as there is still no national memory of this colonial war. Actual memories of actors have evolved little, although recent developments suggest changes, and logically (following the model of other conflicts) actors will gradually open up about the war. This was the case with World War Two. In general as people age, especially towards the end of their lives, they consent more to remembering painful pasts since if they say nothing and die that past will be lost forever. Memory is something that is in constant evolution so recent changes were to be expected and the future should see many more. Another key period in the evolution of the French collective memory of the Algerian war may be around 2002 which will be the fortieth anniversary of the end of the war. We must not forget that the opening up of French society came at the time of the thirtieth anniversary of the end of the Algerian war.

In the Introduction to this thesis new developments at the end of the 1990s were described. All contribute to the formation of a national memory. Progress is being made on the memory of the Algerian war in so far as the subject is becoming less taboo. This can be seen in changes in street names, stamps (paying homage to pieds-noirs and the contingent), monuments, official developments (notably naming the war and a French judge in court admitting a massacre in Paris on October 17, 1961), historiography,

singers (including Enrico Macias's attempts to give a concert in Algeria) and films (including the April 2000 release of Là-bas, mon pays directed by Alexandre Arcady). Many of these however concern groups; groups which as of yet are not significantly communicating. The memory of the Algerian war is still limited to competing groups. We can still talk of memories (plural). Developments have taken place in terms of recognition of groups/actors rather than transmission, yet... These conditions are perhaps a sine qua non for transmission and debate outside of groups. More progress is needed within these groups before discussion between groups takes place and then transmission of memories occurs.

These issues are very well illustrated in the June 2000 visit of the Algerian head of State, President Bouteflika, to France. On the one hand this constitutes another development in the French collective memory of the Algerian war. We can talk of progress in so far as this was only the second visit of an Algerian President since Algerian independence in 1962, the last being in 1983. Between 1983 and 2000 we can identify very difficult international relations between the two countries, and a civil war situation in Algeria. The Algerian President was generally very warmly welcomed. He gave a speech in French in the French Parliament. He referred to the Algerian war during his visit and his trip led to significant media coverage, including reference to the Algerian conflict. On the other hand, his visit brought to light division. While the Algerian president spoke of pieds-noirs being able to return to Algeria, this was not to be the case for ex-O.A.S. members or harkis. Furthermore, some pieds-noirs did not appreciate the visit of the President. The French daily newspaper Libération published some reactions from pieds-noirs. In these what is particularly striking is the way the interviewees very much perceive themselves as victims, are bitter and express rather extreme views. For example, Alain Timsit, president of the association that organised the "Rassemblement 2000 des Français d'Afrique du Nord et d'outre-mer", said that reconciliation was possible only after certain elementary conditions were applied:

Il ne s'agit pas de se réconcilier à la va-vite, de la même manière qu'on a quitté ce pays qui était le nôtre. Il faut tout d'abord que soient appliqués les accords d'Evian, qui ne l'ont jamais été. Il faut la reconnaissance de l'œuvre civilisatrice française en Algérie: ce qui y reste, c'est nous qui l'avons fait, pas les porteurs de valises et les donneurs de leçons. De ce côté, nous avons été diabolisés trop longtemps, la France doit faire amende honorable. Ensuite, il faut la libre circulation des Français musulmans [les harkis] et de leurs enfants en Algérie. 21

In this quotation we can note the way the comments are critical of France and Algeria, and have a distinctly bitter note to them. The interviewee finished by saying: "Quant à moi, je ne peux même pas prononcer le nom de ce Président [Bouteflika], parce qu'il se

rapporte à des actes terroristes [pendant la guerre d’Algérie].”22 Here he is making reference to the fact that Bouteflika was in the F.L.N. and fought against the French during the Algerian war. This comment is again very critical, bitter and angry. The comments of the other people quoted in the article were similar. Michèle Soler, president of the “Maison des rapatriés” in Nice, said that the wound of the Algerian war was still open. She said pieds-noirs were still grieving. Her father had been killed in Sétif in 1961. She spoke of pieds-noirs being the victims of a “genocide” and concluded by saying: “Faut quand même voir qu’on les a sortis des barbares”. Clearly the Algerian war is still divisive in the present. Also, some French Members of Parliament boycotted the Algerian president’s speech. Part of the reason for this was directly linked to the memory of the Algerian war. As Bouteflika himself concluded, during a speech given to pay homage to Algerian soldiers who fought in the French army and died during the First World War:

“Le sang fut versé des deux côtés, même si ce fut de manière inégale”, rappelle-t-il. “Mais une mort est toujours une mort et il faudra bien qu’un jour nous arrivions, entre Français et Algériens, à saluer ensemble (...) les morts causées de part et d’autre.” Mais devait conclure M. Bouteflika, “cela est difficile car le souvenir est encore brûlant”.23

Concerning the naming of the war, discussed in the Introduction to this thesis, the recognition itself represents a step away from occultation by the state and a victory for veterans and actors in the war. At present its impact on the French collective memory of the Algerian war is however mainly limited to these groups since there is not much wider discussion by the whole of French society on the Algerian war and greater knowledge of this period of French history. The German scholar Jürgen Habermas “invokes public memory as ‘a prerequisite for any process of mourning and working through collective traumas’”24. In France however discussion of the Algerian war is largely absent in “the public sphere”. It might always remain so as Nora’s comments on changes in French society show. Such developments however constitute the slow construction of a national memory of the Algerian war and will in turn lead to other developments.

Other public spheres include the media, literature and cinema. In time these areas may introduce more public questioning of this period of French history. An example of this was the series of articles published in Le Monde in June 2000 on torture and commented on above. The reasons for this choice of subject were explained in an editorial in the paper in which the editorialist spoke of a “travail de mémoire”,

22Ibid., p. 5.
somewhat reminding us of Freud’s "work of grieving". The editorialist said that we know that torture was used in Algeria. Historians have shown this. Despite this knowledge, the paper judged the publication of these testimonies highly important since:

 [...] pourtant, c’est au travers de récits comme celui de Mme Ighilaghiz que se fait et se refait l’indispensable “travail de mémoire”, pour reprendre l’expression du philosophe Paul Ricoeur, l’inlassable répétition de la “représentation des choses passées”, ce qui doit être transmis de génération en génération, contre l’oubli qui n’est pas l’absence du souvenir, mais l’oblitération par la banalisation. [...] Le général Massu, à sa façon, ne veut pas tourner la page; il ne veut pas oublier; il participe au travail de mémoire. Pas par mode de la repentance. Mais pour adresser un message qui pèse lourd, venant de cet homme-là : “Non la torture n’est pas indispensable en temps de guerre (...), dit-il. Quand je repense à l’Algérie, on aurait pu faire les choses différemment.” Ne serait-ce que pour entendre cette leçon, cette dernière phrase, il fallait revenir, en effet, sur la torture en Algérie.25

The Algerian war in the French education system cannot yet fulfil a role of confrontation of memories nor of wider discussion in my opinion since this must first come from other areas. I feel that it will not come from these areas (notably individuals, groups but also the government/state) until the stakes of the war are less important. Other factors (such as the impact on memory of beurs in search of their origins, as has been argued by other commentators) may also lead to significant change in the memory of the Algerian war. One way or another a “will” and effort are needed at present if this subject is to cease to be the protected domain of competing groups and more widely discussed. Ultimately the collective memory of the Algerian war reflects the characteristics of the wider French collective memory in general as described by Nora: fragmented, no longer unitary. This may mean that no national memory of the Algerian war may exist at least for a long time. Perhaps this memory will always be fragmented and local. Until the stakes of the war significantly decrease it is unlikely that the Algerian war will become more visible in the “public sphere”. Until then the “forgetting is necessary” position will probably continue to rule until it is replaced, in a context of smaller stakes, with a position of “coming to terms” with this painful period of French history. Then significant discussion and transmission will take place. This memory will continue to develop and need to be studied.

5.5. Future Research Projects

Much research could be conducted in future on the memory of the Algerian war in France, since it will continue to evolve in coming years. Much more history could also be written, which will be increasingly possible due to the opening of archives. Concerning particular research projects, having contacted veterans’ associations in Lyons, it strikes me that an interesting project on collective memory might be the way these groups construct their memory of the Algerian war. Very clearly identifiable different groups exist in the form of numerous associations which are to a large extent mutually hostile. A Halbwachsian view of memory could be tested. Associations have published books, and most importantly (a very largely unexplored source) monthly publications which take the form of newsletters and newspapers. These could be consulted to determine how their content reflects and constructs the groups’ memories of the war. We could see what they chose to remember and comment on why. This could also be done for other groups. More generally, following Nora’s view of French collective memory, there is a lot of scope for projects on memory at the local level. These would focus on phenomena such as processes of the naming of streets, local commemorations, associative activity and the erecting of steles. Fascinating work could be done in terms of families’ memories of the Algerian war, especially in terms of ethnic minorities, although they would of course be very difficult to gain access to. It would also be interesting to do more work on the way the study of World War Two/Vichy has developed, since this commentator feels that it certainly has in recent years. Lastly, the way the Algerian war is taught could, in a future study, be situated in its wider context in an analysis of the way other colonial wars are taught and indeed the way decolonisation and the whole colonial period are taught.
APPENDICES


8. Teacher Interview A questions

9. Teacher Interview B questions

10. Chronology taken from Le Monde, published in 1992 and obtained from Teacher 10

11. Lesson plan obtained from Pupil 10 of the lesson given by Teacher 11


14. Pupil Interview questions
Étude d'un pays de la CEE, au choix : cadre naturel et humain, structure socio-économique, organisation de l'espace, puissance économique.

TRUCTION CIVIQUE
l'occasion de l'étude de la France (et du pays retenu) on dégagera les grands lignes des institutions politiques et les traits essentiels de l'organisation administrative.

asse de Terminale

TOIRE — De la Seconde Guerre mondiale à nos jours.

La Seconde Guerre mondiale :
- Les grandes phases ; occupations et Résistance,
- la France pendant la guerre,
- les réglement de l'après-guerre. Les organisations internationales (ONU et organisations spécialisées).

Les relations Internationales :
- la guerre froide;
- la décolonisation et l'émergence du Tiers-Monde,
- la détente, l'évolution des blocs, les conflits localisés.

L'évolution scientifique, technique, économique :
- l'accélération des progrès scientifiques et techniques,
- les transformations de l'économie mondiale : croissance ; récessions et crises ; développements inégaux et tensions.

La France de 1945 à nos jours.

Les États-Unis, l'URSS, la Chine, de 1945 à nos jours (évolution interne, institutions, civilisation, influence).

Cartes du monde actuel.

GRAPHIE

- les grandes puissances :
  - États-Unis,
  - URSS,
  - Chine
  (cadre naturel, population, structures socio-économiques, organisation de l'espace, puissance économique).

- les grands problèmes mondiaux.

- une économie mondiale de marchés :
  - grands courants d'échanges,
  - structures et organisations des marchés ; les sociétés multinationales ; les organisations régionales,
  - mouvement de capitaux et relations monétaires internationales ; les déséqui-
  - libres des échanges,
  - le marché du blé, le marché du pétrole.
LE PROGRAMME OFFICIEL *(1989)

construction du monde contemporain
la Seconde Guerre mondiale
du monde au lendemain du conflit (1945-1947)

monde nouveau (1947 — fin des années cinquante)
l'Est une force continentale.
— démocraties populaires — Chine communiste.

l'Ouest la puissance américaine organise le « monde libre » : les alliances,
ruction et édification de l'Europe de l'Ouest.
tionalismes et indépendances en Asie et en Afrique.
ion : un monde bipolaire.

issance mondiale et équilibre des puissances (de la fin des années
au début des années soixante-dix)
croissance : la troisième révolution industrielle. L'explosion du progrès
que et technique. La transformation du travail.

es rapports Est-Ouest. Parité nucléaire et dissuasion.

óstratégies du temps présent (depuis le début des années soixante-dix)
ne crise d'un type nouveau. Déséquilibre et dérèglements d'un système.
ons à la crise.
ursuite et avatars du dialogue Est-Ouest. Le dialogue Nord-Sud. Zones
on et formes des conflits.
narte du monde actuel.

monde actuel

versité du monde

sociétés libérales d'Occident
Aspects géopolitiques de l'Occident : le monde atlantique (Etats-Unis et
; le monde du Pacifique (Etats-Unis, Japon, Australie...).
Formes politiques : évolution et fonctionnement de la démocratie libérale
ons, partis politiques, opinions publiques).
Sociétés et cultures.

sociétés socialistes
Aspects géopolitiques du monde socialiste : l'URSS et les démocraties
es. La Chine. Les États socialistes du tiers-monde.

2.1.2.2. Structures politiques. Evolution et formes actuelles du pouvoir.
2.1.2.3. Sociétés et cultures.
2.1.3. Les tiers-mondes
2.1.3.2. Identités nationales, systèmes politiques.
2.1.3.3. Des sociétés et des cultures entre tradition et modernité.

2.2. Solidarités et communication
2.2.1. La science : évolution de la pensée scientifique, politiques de la science, problèmes éthiques de la science moderne.
2.2.2. La religion : évolution des phénomènes religieux. Les Eglises et le fait religieux dans le monde d'aujourd'hui.
2.2.3. La communication et les langages : la révolution de la communication, la circulation des idées, des sons et des images. Le sport, phénomène mondial.

3. La France depuis 1945

3.1. Evolution politique
3.1.1. La France en 1945. Le poids de l'Histoire. La IVe République : la Reconstruction et les débuts de la croissance. La France devant les problèmes de l'outre-mer.
3.1.2. La Ve République : les institutions. Les présidences du général de Gaulle (La guerre d'Algérie. L'apogée de la croissance, la crise de mai 1968).
3.1.3. La Ve République depuis les années 70. La vie politique (l'alternance) ; la crise.

3.2. Société et culture
3.2.1. De la société traditionnelle au changement social.
3.2.2. Création et pratiques culturelles.

3.3. La France dans le monde
3.3.1. L'identité nationale.
3.3.2. Ambitions nationales. De l'Empire à l'Europe. L'impératif industriel. Indépendance et sécurité.
3.3.3. Le rôle mondial d'une puissance européenne. La présence culturelle de la France dans le monde. La francophonie.
Programme de l'examen à compter de la session 1994.

1. LA CONSTRUCTION DU MONDE CONTEMPORAIN
   Bilan de la Seconde Guerre mondiale
   1.1. Un monde nouveau (1947 - fin des années cinquante)
   1.1.1. A. Une force continentale
   U.R.S.S. - Démocraties populaires - Chine communiste.
   1.1.2. A l'Ouest, la puissance américaine organise le
   « monde libre » : les alliances, les échanges, le système
   monétaire international, le GATT, le plan Marshall,
   réconstruction et édification de l'Europe de l'Ouest.
   1.1.3. Nationalismes et indépendances en Asie et en Afrique.
   Conclusion : un monde bipolaire.
   1.2. Croissance mondiale et équilibre des puissances
   (milieu des années cinquante au début des années
   soixante-dix)
   1.2.1. La croissance : la troisième révolution industrielle.
   L'expansion du progrès scientifique et technique.
   La transformation du travail.
   1.2.2. Les rapports Est-Ouest, Parti
   nucléaire et dissuasion.
   1.2.3. Émergence du Tiers Monde, De Bandung au dia-
   logue Nord-Sud.
   1.3. Géostratégies du temps présent (depuis le début
   des années soixante-dix)
   1.3.1. Une crise d'un type nouveau. Déséquilibre,
   et démembrement d'un système. Les réponses à la crise.
   1.3.2. Pouvoirs et avatars du dialogue Est-Ouest. Le
dialogue Nord-Sud : Zones de tension et formes des con-
flicts.
   1.3.3. Carte du monde actuel.

2. LE MONDE ACTUEL
   L'analyse de la carte du monde actuel (1.3.3) servira de
   point de départ à une étude géopolitique en liaison
   avec le programme de géographie. On approfondira quatre
   thèmes.
   2.1. Les régimes politiques dans le monde actuel :
   on étudiera plus particulièrement, à partir d'exemples
   (Etats-Unis d'Amérique, un Etat d'Europe occidentale,)
   les différentes formes de démocratie.
   2.2. La religion : évolution du phénomène religieux.
   Les Églises et le fait religieux dans le monde d'au-
   jourd'hui.
   2.3. La communication : les langues, les réseaux de
   télécommunication et la communication, la circulation des
   idées, les images, les images et les idées.
   2.4. Organisation et coopération internationales : rôle
   et fonctionnement des Nations Unies. Les Droits de
   l’Homme.

3. LA FRANCE DEPUIS 1945
   3.1. Évolution politique
   3.1.1. La France en 1945. La poêle de l'histoire. La
   V République : la reconstruction et les débuts de la croi-
sance. La France devant les problèmes de l'outre-mer.
   3.1.2. La V République : Institution et
   présidentielle du général de Gaulle (la guerre d'Algérie, l'estop
de la
   croissance, la crise de mai 1968).
   3.1.3. La V République depuis les années 70. La vie
   politique : la crise.
   3.2. Société et culture
   3.2.1. De la société traditionnelle au changement
   social.
   3.2.2. Création et pratiques culturelles.
   3.3. La France dans le monde
   3.3.1. Ambitions nationales. De l'Empire à l'Europe. L'im-
   pensatif industriel, l'indépendance et la sécurité.
   3.3.2. Le rôle mondial d'une puissance européenne. La
   présence culturelle de la France dans le monde. La
   francophonie.
PROGRAMME
Le monde de 1939 à nos jours

I. La Seconde Guerre mondiale (7 à 9 h)
1. Les grandes phases.
On ne reviendra pas sur les origines de la guerre, déjà étudiées en première. L'analyse des grandes phases, à partir de cartes, se limitera à l'essentiel. Elle mettra en évidence l'extension géographique et le caractère total du conflit.

2. L'Europe et la France dans la guerre.
À partir d'une carte de l'Europe en 1942, on analysera les formes de l'occupation, les collaborations, les résistances. On insistera sur l'univers concentrationnaire et l'extermination systématique des Juifs et des Tziganes.

Le bilan permettra d'analyser les ébranlements matériels et moraux provoqués par le conflit, la nouvelle carte du monde et la naissance de l'ONU.

II. Le monde de 1945 à nos jours (21 à 23 h)
1. Les transformations économiques et sociales du monde depuis 1945.
On tracera le cadre économique et social du second XXe siècle en évoquant successivement la croissance et la crise et en insistant sur les mutations sociales, l'évolution de la civilisation matérielle et des modes de vie.

2. Les grands modèles idéologiques du monde (institutions, société, culture) et leur évolution : le modèle soviétique, le modèle chinois, le modèle américain, le modèle européen libéral.
Sans entrer dans le détail de l'histoire événementielle, on insistera sur les traits majeurs qui caractérisent ces modèles. On analysera l'évolution de leur influence, les limites de leur rayonnement depuis 1945.

3. Les affrontements des grandes puissances et la dissolution des blocs.
On insistera sur les lignes de force de la politique internationale sans entrer dans le détail des multiples crises qui ont marqué celle-ci. On évoquera donc la période bipolaire de la guerre froide, puis la formation d'un monde beaucoup plus diversifié et complexe.

À partir de cartes et d'exemples choisis pour illustrer des processus différents, on analysera les mouvements d'émancipation des peuples depuis 1945, et les problèmes multiples qui en sont la conséquence jusqu'à nos jours.

III. La France depuis 1945 (9 à 11 h)
1. L'évolution politique.
On étudiera les grandes phases de la vie politique de la France depuis 1945.

2. Économie, société, culture.
On examinera les orientations durables et les grandes phases de la politique extérieure.
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Les années de Gaulle

1. La politique de la « grandeur »

Le général de Gaulle a l'idée que la France a un destin de grande puissance (doc. 1), indépendante de l'alliance américaine. Mais il faut régler le problème algérien avant d'affirmer la « grandeur » nationale. Laissons d'abord croire aux Pieds-noirs et à l'armée qu'il soutenait l'Algérie française, de Gaulle évolue vers l'idée d'autodétermination : laisser aux Algériens le choix de leur destin et sortir la France de l'impasse. Malgré les mouvements insurrectionnels de 1960 à Alger et les attentats de l'Organisation de l'Armée Secrète, il mène à bien l'indépendance de l'Algérie, reconnue par les accords d'Evian, ratifiés par l'indépendante de zone d'influence privilégiée.

De Gaulle est hostile à la construction européenne. Président, il reste opposé à une intégration politique limitant la souveraineté des États, mais – le traité de Rome étant signé – il développe le Marché commun en coopération avec la RFA, qui, économiquement puissante, ne peut rivaliser avec la France sur le terrain politique et militaire. Il s'oppose à l'entrée de la Grande-Bretagne dans la CEE. Pour mener une politique à l'échelle du monde, il dote la France d'une « force de frappe » atomique (les deux premières bombes thermonucléaires françaises explosent en août 1968) et refuse de confier sa défense à l'armée américaine. Affirmer l'autonomie de la France le conduit à se rapprocher de l'URSS et à prendre des positions souvent antiaméricaines dans le Tiers monde.

2. Les limites du renouvellement politique

Le gaullisme se veut une nouvelle manière de faire de la politique, appuyée sur les Français de tous milieux. L'UNR n'en est pas moins un parti de cadres recrutant à droite. Les autres partis, défaits en 1958, comprennent qu'ils doivent se moderniser, évoluer avec les institutions.

Les élections présidentielles de 1965 sont les premières à se dérouler au suffrage universel, les premiers à recourir aux sondages d'opinion et à la télévision, énorme nouvelle. Jean Lecanuet qui représente le centre-droit de tendance atlantiste et François Mitterrand qui est parvenu à unir la gauche non communiste dans une grande fédération, mettent de Gaulle en ballotage. Les élections législatives de 1967 confirment le recul d'influence des partis de la majorité.

3. La crise de mai 1968 et le départ de de Gaulle

Ni la prospérité économique ni l'idée gaullienne de « participation » des travailleurs dans l'entreprise n'empêchent les tensions sociales. L'agitation étudiante se transforme en mai 1968 en émeute (doc. 3, 5). Elle agit comme détonateur d'une crise sociale avec des grèves qui paralysent le pays. La gauche y voit une occasion de renverser le pouvoir (doc. 2). Le gouvernement de Georges Pompidou négocie avec les syndicats et fait accepter au patronat les Accords de Grenelle qui augmentent les salaires. Les causes de cette crise sont complexes : isolement d'un pouvoir politique au chef vieillissant, influence du « gauchisme » parmi les étudiants, malaise d'une société qui évolue vite.

Le gouvernement reprend la situation en mains (doc. 4, 6) et provoque des élections pour tirer parti de la peur des électeurs devant la menace de révolution. Il obtient une forte majorité au détriment des partis de gauche qui, d'abord surpris, avaient sympathisé avec les étudiants. De Gaulle comprend qu'il faut réformer l'université et que les Français désirent davantage participer à la décision politique.

Mais la France est lasse ; l'opinion ne fait pas crédit à de Gaulle de ses projets de participation des salariés aux intérêts de l'entreprise ; le projet de régionalisation que de Gaulle soumet à référendum est désavoué en avril 1969. En tirant les conséquences, il démissionne aussi-tôt.
L'émanicipation de l'Afrique

1. L'indépendance de la Tunisie et du Maroc

En Tunisie, Habib Bourguiba et son parti, le Néo-Destour (Nouvelle Constitution), réclament d'abord prudemment l'autonomie interne. Une négociation s'engage, mais le 15 décembre 1951, le gouvernement français y met fin. Bourguiba lance alors le mot d'ordre de lutte de la Tunisie (doc. 2). Bourguiba est autorisé de revenir d'exil le 1er juin 1955.

Au Maroc, le parti de l'indépendance (l'Istiqlal), fondé en 1943, jouit de l'appui discret du sultan Mohammed Ben Youssef. La politique autoritaire des autorités françaises, sous la direction du résident général Guillaume, déchaîne une escalade de violences. Le soulèvement de Casablanca de décembre 1952 est durement réprimé et Guillaume détrône et déporte le sultan (août 1953), décision qui a pour effet de généraliser l'insurrection (doc. 1). En 1955, le gouvernement Edgar Faure choisit la négociation. Le sultan Mohammed V rentre triomphalement le 16 novembre et l'indépendance du Maroc est reconnue le 2 mars 1956. Quelques jours plus tard, le 20 mars, la Tunisie passe de l'autonomie à l'Indépendance.

2. La guerre d'Algérie

En Algérie, le 1er novembre 1954 est créé le FLN, le Front de libération nationale qui lance un mot d'ordre d'insurrection nationale. Attentats contre la population civile européenne, guérilla contre l'armée et à l'intérieur, avec tortures contre les prisonniers nationalistes, sont les tristes caractéristiques de cette guerre sanglante qui dure huit ans.

Le conflit use l'autorité de la IVe République, favorise le retour du général de Gaulle au pouvoir en France en 1958. Celui-ci utilise d'abord une politique de force contre le FLN. Puis, en 1959, il se prononce pour le droit à l'autodétermination des Algériens en proposant trois solutions : la « sécession » (l'indépendance), la francisation, ou l'Algérie algérienne associée à la France (doc. 5, p. 245) ; il espère encore sans doute faire triompher la troisième solution.

Mais, lors de sa visite en Algérie en décembre 1960 il se rend à l'évidence : le FLN est capable d'organiser une manifestation de masse à Alger. Dès lors, malgré l'opposition des Européens d'Algérie et d'une partie de l'armée, il accepte de négocier avec le FLN : les accords d'Évian (doc. 5), le 18 mars 1962, accordent à l'Algérie l'indépendance, qui est proclamée le 3 juillet.

3. La libération de l'Afrique noire


Le Congo belge, indépendant en 1960, sombre dans une violente guerre civile qui ne se termine qu'en 1965, après intervention des troupes de l'ONU. Il faut attendre la fin de la dictature au Portugal en 1974 pour que les colonies de ce pays, l'Angola et le Mozambique, deviennent souveraines (doc. 5).

Le coup de force du 20 octobre

Dans l'après-midi d'aujourd'hui, le général Guillaume s'est rendu au palais impérial à Rabat accompagné par l'armée et les blindés français et a exigé de Sa Majesté le Roi, d'abandonner le trône. Sa Majesté a catégoriquement refusé le représentant de la France, dans l'exécution de ses basses œuvres, a constitué prisonniers : le Roi, le prince héritier Moulay Hassan et son frère Moulay Abdallah, et a avion militaire les a emmenés à Corse, là où les Français avaient l'habitude d'emprisonner les corsairs musulmans pris par les flibustiers français. [...] En touchant à Mohammed V, la France a atteint au fond de lui-même tout Maroc, tout Musulman, tout Arabe dans le monde. [...] Nous ferons que le Maroc dera ce que nous en ferons en accord avec le peuple et le roi Mohammed V une fois l'indépendance acquise et l'évacuation des troupes françaises réalisée.

Prie de position d'Allal el-Fasi fondateur de l'Istiqlal (1955)

Le discours de Carthage

Notre politique est une politique libérale conforme aux traditions de notre histoire aussi bien qu'aux aspirations profondes du peuple tunisien et aux promesses qui lui ont été faites. L'autonomie interne de l'État tunisien est acquise et proclamée sans arrière-pensée par le Gouvernement français qui entendent à la fois l'affirmer dans son principe et lui permettre dans l'action le succès de la révolution. Le degré d'évolution auquel est parvenu le peuple tunisien — dont nous avons eu le rôle de diriger — et qui nous avons largement contribué — la valeur remarquable de ses élites justifient que ce peuple soit appelé à gérer lui-même ses propres affaires. C'est pourquoi, nous sommes prêts à transférer à des personnes et à des institutions tunisiennes l'exercice interne de la souveraineté Pierre Mendès France, 31 juillet 1956

Autonomie

Autonomie
Plan de composition

Le bilan politique de la IVe République est-il seulement négatif ?

Plan détaillé

. Des institutions qui favorisent l'instabilité politique

- La volonté d'éviter la possibilité d'une évolution vers un régime personnel et autoritaire entraîne les constituant à donner la prépondérance à l'Assemblée nationale, même si "Consell" et le Président de la République sont des contre-pouvoirs.
- Les institutions ne permettent pas de trouver de solution en cas d'absence de majorité le coalition
- Le dispositif institutionnel, cause d'instabilité parlementaire, car la vie politique française est caractérisée par l'absence de parti majoritaire.
- Deux partis ont vite refusé de participer aux majorités: le PCF et le RPF
- Le choix est entre une majorité de centre gauche ou de centre droit, qui ne s'accordent pas sur quelques problèmes fondamentaux (école libre). Radicaux et modérés font les majorités.
- L'opinion a l'impression que les partis ne sont occupés que de leurs combinaisons, même si l'instabilité des gouvernements cache une continuité des équipes. Elle ne soutiendra pas le régime lorsqu'il sera confronté à une crise grave.

II. La IVe République a su résoudre de nombreux problèmes

- Elle a su régler l'héritage de Vichy sans guerre civile. Une fois terminés les procès pour collaboration, elle est parvenue à reconstituer une unité nationale sur des projets d'avenir.
- Elle a reconstruit et modernisé l'économie du pays et mis en place un système de protection sociale.
- Elle est parvenue à faire accepter un projet économique européen et à le mener jusqu'au Traité de Rome. Elle a posé les bases de nouvelles relations politiques avec l'Allemagne. Si elle n'a pas su se dégager à temps des colonies d'Indochine, elle a ensuite réussi à opérer sans trop de dégâts la décolonisation du Maroc et de la Tunisie. Le gouvernement Guy Mollet amorce, par la loi-cadre Defferre, celle de l'Afrique noire.

III. Elle n'est pas parvenue à tous les surmonter

- La guerre de la CED a entraîné de profondes divisions dans les partis. Elle a contribué à augmenter l'instabilité du régime. Les gouvernements ont eu tendance à en retarder l'issue pour éviter d'ouvrir une crise politique.
- La loi Barange rouvre une question ancienne mais capable de créer une profonde division dans l'opinion. La IVe République ne parvient pas à fixer les relations entre l'école privée et l'école publique.
- Le problème algérien conduit le régime à sa perte. Le gouvernement de Guy Mollet qui voulait mettre fin à une guerre absurde s'engage dans une guerre à outrance. La guerre entraîne une crise morale, la paralysie de la vie politique, la détérioration de la situation financière et de la position internationale de la France.
Plan de composition

La présidence de de Gaulle, 1958-1969
Plan détaillé

I. La «restauration de l'État»

1. Réformer les institutions
   - Le général de Gaulle, hostile aux institutions de la Ve République (discours de Bayeux), chap. 17
   - Donne pour première tâche à son gouvernement de rédiger une constitution
   - Elle est adoptée par référendum en septembre 1958. La pratique du référendum traduit son intention de de Gaulle de s'adresser aux Français en passant au dessus des élus
2. Un régime mixte
   - Les nouvelles institutions maintiennent un régime parlementaire, mais donnent un rôle majeur au Président, c'est-à-dire à de Gaulle puisqu'il est élu en décembre 1958
   - La réduction des pouvoirs du gouvernement et du Parlement, la volonté du chef de l'État de s'adresser directement au pays aboutissent à une crise des partis politiques : acquiescer sans discuter à la politique du général ou se retrancher dans une opposition stérile

I. L'œuvre du général de Gaulle

I. La décolonisation
   - Il réussit à préparer une opinion très divisée à l'indépendance algérienne. Malgré l'opposition violente de l'armée et des Pieds-Noirs, il règle définitivement la question en septembre 1962
   - Les États de la Communauté choisissent d'accéder à l'indépendance. De Gaulle favorise cette évolution en conservant des liens privilégiés avec les nouveaux États africains
   - La politique africaine est un des « domaines réservés » du Président

I. L'indépendance de la France
   - Le grand dessein du général de Gaulle est de redonner à la France, une fois libérée du tari de la décolonisation, un rang de grande puissance
   - Il lui donne son indépendance militaire avec une force nucléaire propre. Il se retire de l'OTAN et prend ses distances vis-à-vis des États-Unis

II. L'évolution de l'opinion

I. Le soutien de l'opinion
   - Pendant plusieurs années, la majorité des Français approuve de Gaulle lorsqu'il prétend exercer un pouvoir « dans l'intérêt de la France », « au-dessus des partis ». Le vote gaulliste est majoritaire à l'Assemblée
   - Le règlement de la question algérienne est un soulagement, mais le référendum d'avril 1962 sur l'approbation des accords d'Évian montre déjà une forte baisse des « oui »

II. L'affermissement
   - La mise en balottage de de Gaulle par François Mitterrand en 1965 est une surprise
   - Les partis de gauche progressent dans l'opinion. Les grèves montrent la montée des tensions sociales. Beaucoup dénoncent l'évolution vers un pouvoir personnel, comme dans la politique extérieure du pays

I. La crise de mai 68 et le départ
   - Née de la question étudiante, elle révèle le malaise social et la faiblesse réelle d'un pouvoir qui semblait très fort. Les élections de 1968 traduisent la peur des Français plus que leur attachement au général de Gaulle
   - Sa tentative de rallier l'opinion sur les thèmes de la participation et de la régionalisation

Pour entrer en matière
L'action du général de Gaulle est dominée par quelques principes simples qu'il a affirmés à maintes reprises : méfiance devant le parlementarisme, préférence pour un État fort dirigé par un Président qui tire sa légitimité du peuple lui-même, primitivité de la grandeur de la France et de l'indépendance nationale, volonté de dépasser l'opposition politique entre la Droite et la Gauche.

Pour établir la synthèse des différentes parties
Les idées et l'action du général de Gaulle marquent la vie politique pour de très nombreuses années. Ses successeurs acceptent une grande partie de son héritage. Ils ont une politique militaire et une diplomatie indépendantes des États-Unis et privilégient leurs relations avec les ex-colonies africaines. Un parti gaulliste survit au général de Gaulle ; il prétend promouvoir une politique qui ne serait ni de droite ni de gauche.
Teacher Interview A questions

1. Les cours

Combien de groupes avez-vous en terminale? Combien d’élèves y-a-t-il dans chaque groupe? Dans quelles séries?

Combien de cours par an passez-vous sur la guerre d’Algérie (sont-ils les CM ou les TD/TP)? Passez-vous plus ou moins de temps sur la guerre d’Algérie que sur d’autres parties du programme? Selon vous, est-ce assez?

A quel moment de l’année examinez-vous la guerre d’Algérie? [Quelles parties du programme se trouvent avant et après celle de la guerre d’Algérie?]¹

Comment est-ce qu’on décide du contenu des cours? Qui décide? Selon quels critères? [Le programme d’histoire, les instructions officielles, les questions au brevet et au baccalauréat ou d’autres facteurs?]

Quel est le contenu des cours sur la guerre d’Algérie? Quels aspects de la guerre d’Algérie examinez-vous? Dans quel contexte situez-vous la guerre? Dans le cadre de la quatrième République, la cinquième République ou la décolonisation?

Comment se déroulent les cours?
• La prise des notes
• Le travail en groupe
• La discussion au niveau de la classe
• Le travail sur les documents etc.

Comment les élèves sont-ils notés? Est-ce qu’il y a de contrôle continu? Quelle forme peut prendre ce contrôle continu? Quel est le poids relatif de l’examen par rapport au contrôle continu?

Cette année, est-ce que vous avez pu travailler sur le procès de Maurice Papon à l’égard de la guerre d’Algérie et surtout le 17 octobre 1961?

Est-ce qu’un ancien combattant est venu à un moment donné parler aux élèves? Quand? Qui? De quelle guerre était-il un ancien combattant (la Première guerre mondiale, la Deuxième guerre mondiale, les guerres d’Indochine ou d’AFN)? Qui l’a invité? Comment cela s’est-il passé?

¹What is in brackets was possible follow-up material to be used depending on the answer given.
2. Les élèves

Comment qualifieriez-vous la réaction des élèves aux cours sur la guerre d'Algérie? [Est-ce qu'ils participent plus ou moins que d'habitude? Quelles opinions expriment-ils? Quelles questions posent-ils? Est-ce que les élèves ont des difficultés particulières à étudier la guerre d'Algérie?] Si vous êtes professeur depuis le début des années 1980, est-ce que vous avez remarqué des changements d'attitude des élèves depuis quinze ans sur ce sujet? Si c'est le cas, quels changements se sont produits et comment expliquez-vous de tels changements? Est-ce qu'il me serait possible de rencontrer les élèves et éventuellement de leur donner un petit questionnaire?

3. Les professeurs

Quel âge avez-vous?
• moins de 30 ans
• 30-40
• 40-50
• plus de 50 ans

Etes-vous certifié (CAPES), agrégé (agrégation) ou maître auxiliaire etc.? Est-ce que vous avez étudié la guerre d'Algérie quand vous avez passé le CAPES ou l'agrégation? [Si c'est le cas, quelle forme cela a-t-elle prise: un cours sur la guerre, une question d'examen etc.] Est-ce que vous avez étudié la guerre d'Algérie à d'autres moments de votre formation?

Depuis que vous êtes professeur, est-ce que la guerre d'Algérie est un sujet qui vous intéresse particulièrement? Si oui, comment cet intérêt se manifeste-t-il?

Est-ce que vous êtes abonné à un journal, une périodique, une revue historique etc.? Lequel/laquelle?

Pendant votre carrière avez-vous eu des collègues qui ont fait la guerre d'Algérie/qui sont des rapatriés? En dehors du travail, connaissez-vous des personnes qui ont fait la guerre d'Algérie ou qui sont des rapatriés?

Trouvez-vous que la guerre d'Algérie est un sujet qui est difficile à enseigner? [Si c'est le cas, dites pourquoi]

4. Les manuels scolaires

Quels manuels conseillez-vous aux élèves?

Qui est-ce qui décide des manuels à conseiller? Comment est-ce qu'on juge les manuels, c'est-à-dire selon quels critères?

Est-ce qu'il y a eu des changements de manuels employés sur les quinze dernières années? Si c'est le cas, précisez quand et pour quelles raisons.
A quoi servent les manuels scolaires lorsqu’on enseigne la guerre d’Algérie? Est-ce qu’ils font partie du cours?

Etes-vous satisfait(e) de la qualité des manuels scolaires? Avez-vous remarqué des améliorations depuis quinze ans/depuis que vous êtes professeur?

Au-delà des manuels scolaires, est-ce que vous employez d’autres sources d’information? Lesquelles? Est-ce qu’il y a un Centre de Documentation à l’école? Est-ce qu’on y trouve des ouvrages sur la guerre d’Algérie? Me serait-il possible d’avoir une liste des livres qu’on a mis dans le Centre de Documentation?

Dans l’exercice de votre métier, avez-vous conseillé aux élèves des livres d’histoire/romans sur la guerre d’Algérie? Avez-vous conseillé ou fait visionner aux élèves un film sur la guerre d’Algérie?

5. Programme/examens

Quelles remarques aimeriez-vous faire sur ce/le programme? (d’après Vingtième Siècle, no.6, avril-juin 1985).

Pensez-vous que ce programme puisse être enseigné avec objectivité? Quelle que soit votre réponse, dites pourquoi (d’après Vingtième Siècle, no.6, avril-juin 1985).
Teacher Interview B questions

Combien de groupes avez-vous en terminale? Combien d'élèves y-a-t-il dans chaque groupe? Dans quelles séries?

1. Les cours

Combien de cours cette année passerez-vous sur la guerre d'Algérie? Passez-vous plus ou moins de temps sur la guerre d’Algérie que sur d'autres parties du programme? Selon vous, est-ce assez? Avez-vous passé autant de temps cette année sur la guerre d’Algérie que l’année dernière?

A quel moments de l’année avez-vous examiné la guerre d’Algérie? [Quelles parties du programme se trouvent avant et après celle de la guerre d’Algérie?]² Examinez-vous la guerre d’Algérie surtout dans le cadre de la décolonisation, de la quatrième République ou de la cinquième République?

Comment est-ce qu’on décide du contenu des cours? Qui décide? Selon quels critères? [Le programme d’histoire, les instructions officielles, les questions au baccalauréat ou d’autres facteurs?]

Comment se déroulent les cours? [la prise de notes etc, la discussion etc.] Est-ce qu’un ancien combattant est venu à un moment donné parler aux élèves? Quand? Qui? De quelle guerre était-il un ancien combattant (la Première Guerre mondiale, la Seconde Guerre mondiale, les guerres d’Indochine ou d’AFN)? Qui l’a invité? Comment cela s’est-il passé?

2. Les interviewés

Quel âge avez-vous?
• moins de 30 ans
• 30-40
• 40-50
• plus de 50 ans

Etes-vous certifié (CAPES), agrégé (agrégation) ou maître auxiliaire etc.?

²What is in brackets was possible follow-up material to be used depending on the answer given.
3. Le contenu des cours

[Est-ce que vous examinez les origines de la guerre d’Algérie en classe? Oui ou non?]
Quand vous expliquez les origines de la guerre d’Algérie aux élèves, examinez-vous (et si oui, comment?):
- les différentes formes du nationalism algérien
- la société algérienne - économie, populations etc.
- Sétif le 8 mai 1945/la répression
- la réforme de 1947
- la deuxième guerre mondiale/l’ONU
- d’autres mouvements de décolonisation?

Presentez-vous l’insurrection du 1er novembre 1954 aux élèves? Si oui, comment?

Par rapport au nombre total d’heures que vous passez sur la guerre d’Algérie, quelle proportion de temps passez-vous sur mai 1958? Comment traitez-vous le 13 mai en cours?

Qu’examinez-vous après le retour de De Gaulle? Examinez-vous (et si oui, comment?):
- le putsch
- Charonne
- l’exode
- la semaine des barricades
- l’OAS
- les accords d’Evian
- la politique de De Gaulle
- la rue d’Isly
- la résistance française à la guerre d’Algérie
- les luttes internes au sein du FLN

Comment abordez-vous en classe la question de la torture?

Examinez-vous les événements suivants? Si oui, comment?
- l’arrestation de Ben Bella
- Sakiet Sidi Youssef
- le 17 octobre 1961
- les harkis
- la censure

Que dites-vous en cours sur l’armée et le contingent?

Est-ce que vous examinez le côté militaire de la guerre?

Donnez-vous un bilan de la guerre en cours? Si oui, lequel?
4. Le programme

Quelles remarques aimeriez-vous faire sur ce/le programme? (d’après Vingtième Siècle, no.6, avril-juin 1985). Qu’en pensez-vous par rapport au dernier programme?

Qu’est-ce qui change cette année par rapport à l’année dernière?

Est-il possible de traiter des parties de cette programme en détail? Qu’en est-il pour la guerre d’Algérie?
• avant la réforme 1998 (donc septembre 1989-juin 1998)
• après la réforme 1998
• pendant les années 1980 (si la personne était professeur pendant cette période)
Du coup de chasse-mouche à l'indépendance

1827
30 avril. — Le duc d'Alger lance un coup de chasse-mouche au nom de la France.

1830
5 juillet. — Prise d'Alger. À l'intérieur du pays, les conférences religieuses appellent à la « guerre sainte ».

1843
14 août. — Défaite d'Abdelkader à l'oued d'Ity.

1848
L'Algérie du Nord est organisée en « trois départements français ». Les colons obtiennent une représentation au Parlement.

1853 et 1873
Un émeut-consulte et le loi Wacker fracturent la propriété et dévastent familles et tribus.

1870
Nouvelle loi est vote de juifs algériens (décrit Colonelin).

1900
L'autonomie bolivienne est accordée aux colons.

1926
Mort. — Naisance en France de l'Étoile nord-africaine.

1937
Octobre. — Le Parti du peuple algérien (PPA), fondé en mars par Messali Hadj, intègre aux élections cantonales d'Algérie.

1943
10 février. — Farhat Abbas rédige le Manifeste du peuple algérien.

1945
8 juin. — Manifestations nationalistes à Alger font rage sur la place des États-Unis, les manifestateurs sont dispersés dans l'Europe. L'armée pagne Guéboum fait face à trois morts européens. Une répression implacable est exercée sur des temps d'indépendance, sur l'atelier. L'écrasement de la rébellion fait des milliers de morts parmi les Algériens.

1946
3 juin. — L'Union démocratique du mouvement algérien (UIMA), fondée en mars par Farhat Abbas, obtient 72 % des voix dans le second tour.

1947
20 septembre. — Adoption d'un statut qui « maintiendra l'Algérie au sein de la République française » et réfractaire à tout esprit d'indépendance.

22 octobre. — Aux élections municipales, victoire du MTLD de Messali Hadj.

1953
21 décembre. — Solution du MTLD entre « massa-bouche » et « centralistes ».

1954
1er février. — Jacques Soustelle est nommé gouverneur général de l'Algérie.

10 février. — Fondation à Alger du Comité révolutionnaire d'utopie et d'action (CRUA), qui veut voir le mouvement nationaliste et agir pour l'indépendance.

31 juillet. — Décès de Pierre Menotti à Carthage, dans lequel l'économie tunisienne de la Tunisie est reconnue.

1er novembre. — « Front des États-Unis ». Une série d'attentats marquent les débuts de l'insurrection armée. Le FLN publie une déclaration-programme demandant l'inDEPENDANCE. Désert. — Messali Hadj crée le Mouvement national algérien (MNA).

1955
3 février. — L'Assemblée nationale refuse la confiance à Moustapha Frère, à l'issue d'interpellations sur la politique en Algérie.

31 mars. — Vote du projet de loi sur l'état d'urgence et son application en Algérie.

19 mai. — Le conseil des ministres décide le rappel de disponibilités et l'envoi de renforts en Algérie.

1956
1er février. — L'Assemblée nationale invente le gouvernement Guy Mollet.


14 février. — Le pélopin joli est pour la première fois en Algérie.

16 février. — Déclaration ministérielle sur la politique algérienne : « Consensus, libéral, décolonisation ».

21 avril. — Le conseil des ministres décide le rappel des émeutes et la dissolution de l'Assemblée algérienne. 70 000 hommes de la classe 1952 sont ainsi rappelés. 30 000 hommes le seront le 9 mai, et la durée de service militaire est portée à vingt-sept mois. Entre janvier et juillet 1954 les forces armées en Algérie passent de 200 000 à 400 000 hommes.

(Lire la suite page 16.)
1957

7 janvier. — Le général Massu, commandant la 15e division de parachutistes, est chargé du maintien de l'ordre dans l'agglomération algérienne. Début de la « bataille d'Algérie ».

29 août. — Dans la nuit du 29 au 30, un commando FLN massacre tous les hommes du village de Melouz (Cité Kabylie), qui appartenaient au MNA (Mouvement national algérien de Hissar).

12 septembre. — Démission de Paul Tellgen, assureur, qui enseigne à l'École des affaires pour l'Algérie, en raison des pressions du général Massu et des parachutistes.

24 septembre. — Le chef FLN de la zone d'Alger, Yacine Saïdi, est arrêté par les Casablanca.

1 octobre. — Le général de Gaulle effectue un voyage en Algérie. À Constantine, il annonce une mise au point de l'investissement économique et de la gestion administrative de la région algérienne. Le général de Gaulle se rend ensuite aux onze villes du pays. À Alger, il propose le remplacement de l'Ordre administratif par un régime de parlementarisation, puis à Lydda.

23-25 octobre. — Une conférence de presse tenue à Fès-Meknès, le général de Gaulle propose un plan de lutte contre les FLN et les parachutistes FLN en clair et en réunions de la FMF. Cette offre sera rejetée le 25 par les dirigeants FLN établis à Paris.

1958

8 février. — En réponse aux attaques du FLN venant du territoire tunisien, le village de Sakbitouche est réduit à la casse et les forces françaises ont tué et torturé trente six civils, dont dix huit enfants. Le gouvernement tunisien souligne que sa souveraineté est entière et réunie de l'autorité française de l'Empire force militaire à Alger dans le cadre de l'armée, qui tient en échec le FLN. 

20 février. — Conversation en Suisse entre Georges Pompidou, Bruno de Laanne, Alain Boumedienne, Saad Dallal et Tidjane Bouhadjral sur les conditions de la transition politique en Algérie.

10 octobre — L'Organisation de l'unité algérienne revendique la libération de cinq prisonniers de guerre. Le général de Gaulle, dans une conférence de presse, se déclare persuadé que l'Algérie serait plus sûre si l'Empire de l'ordre était rétabli. 

22 octobre. — Le général de Gaulle effectue un voyage en Algérie dans le cadre de la politique d'union d'Afrique du Nord. 

1959


11 février. — Le conseil des ministres émet une déclaration sur l'état de la situation algérienne. Le gouvernement français comprend que l'Algérie est une province de l'Empire. Le général de Gaulle confirme aux forces armées de l'Empire de l'ordre que l'Algérie est un territoire français auquel l'ordre doit être maintenu. 

5 mars. — Le général de Gaulle entreprend un voyage en Algérie. Il annonce que la solution de l'Algérie est la souveraineté algérienne. 

13 mars. — Le général de Gaulle effectue un voyage en Algérie. Il affirme que la souveraineté de l'Algérie est une question de principe. 

19 août. — Le général de Gaulle revient sur son voyage en Algérie. Il affirme que la souveraineté de l'Algérie est une question de principe. 

22 août. — Le Conseil national de la révolution algérienne (CNRA), réuni à Tunis depuis le 22, tranche le général de Gaulle et le président du gouvernement provisoire.

19 octobre. — Allocution radiotélévisée du général de Gaulle à Paris, prononcée la veille des élections présidentielles. 

17 octobre. — Violents combats entre Algériens et forces françaises à Alger. Arrivée de l'OPRA à Alger.

La répression... mais aussi réformes.

Krim Belkacem. H. Boufédil....

Pathématiques dans la guerre :


Janvier 56 : une coalition de gauche au pouvoir : le Front Républicain... pl. de teaching !

Guy Mollet président du Conseil

(6 Fév. 56 : "Journée des Tons à Alger : la guerre c'est fini")

L'année débute toute puissante: Oct. 56 : démantèlement de l'Union de Ben Bella.

Oct.-Nov. 56 : affaire de Sétif.

Janvier 57 à Sept. 57 : "bataille d'Algérie" : victoire militaire pour les Français mais défaite politique.

Feuillet, affaire de Sétif : Sidi Youcef (en Tunisie)

difficultés diplomatiques. Condamnation de la France.

+ crise politique, morale, financière en France.

Crisis du 13 Mai 1956 et le retour de de Gaulle.

Transfert de compétences. Renforcement de l'extrême droite. Mauvaise de guerre circule dans le pouvoir.

13 Mai 1956 : visita de de Gaulle à Alger (empêcher l'investiture de P. Pinelli)

La création d'un conseil de Sétif Public présidé par Masse

Le 1er juin : Sétif fait appel à de Gaulle.

Le 2 Juin de Sétif est investi : le 3 Juin : pleins pouvoirs pour changer les institutions.

La chute de la IVe République - fondation de la V République.

Générations du conflit :

Position ambiguë de de Gaulle : appel au pouvoir par les partis自身 de l'Algérie française pour unifier ou à peine que l'indépendance est inévitable.

Sept. 56 : parle de "la paix des braves" -> réplique pol. : fondation du GPRF au Caire.

(Perret Abbès)

Sept. 59 : parle du droit des Algériens à l'autodétermination. "Est-ce possible ?"

La semaine des barricades à Alger en Janvier 60.

(1e pourparlers à Meknès -> échec)

Janvier 61 : référendum en France sur l'autodétermination. "Mai massif (GPRF)

Le putch d'Algérie en Avril 61 (Challe : Sétif, Younou, Zeller) -> échec

dès Fév. 61 : fondation de l'ONI par les ultras de l'Algérie française.

Attentats. Politique de la terre brûlée, "la violence ou le contrôle."

Les négociations reprennent à Evian -> échec (ph. de Sartre et des Niçois

La guerre s'intensifie : les négociations aboutissent enfin

18 Mars 1962 : signature des accords d'Evian


Bilan collectif : exode de près de 1/3 des Algériens. + harkis


Le bilan est lourd : 1/3 de 25000 soldats français tués, 50000 morts et blessés des musulmans. 
Analyser le sujet

- Étude du vocabulaire et de la formulation
  - Ce sujet paraît simple : les termes ne présentent pas de difficulté particulière (même s'il faut distinguer le terme "émancipation", qui évoque une aspiration, de celui de "décolonisation", qui représente un processus. Mais il est en réalité plus complexe qu'il n'y paraît. Sa principale difficulté réside dans son ampleur.

- Délimitation spatio-temporelle
  - Remarquer l'absence de limites géographiques : il faut étudier les émancipations dans les différents empires coloniaux (français, britannique, espagnol, portugais...) sans se limiter à l'étude d'un continent en particulier.
  - De plus, la période à considérer est également très vaste : il s'agit d'étudier les émancipations depuis 1945, ce qui inclut également les émancipations les plus récentes (Namibie...). Ne pas arrêter son étude à la fin de la guerre d'Algérie par exemple.

- Identification du type de sujet
  - Ce sujet propose d'étudier un thème (la décolonisation) sur une période (depuis 1945). Il s'agit de mettre en évidence les différentes applications d'un même processus. Effectivement, il est nécessaire de comprendre que le terme unique d'"émancipation" recouvre des réalités très différentes : l'indépendance très progressive du Ghana n'a rien à voir avec l'indépendance sanglante de l'Algérie. Chercher donc à comprendre les décolonisations et les causes qui leur donnent des visages différents.

Définir une problématique

- Ce genre de sujet, très vaste, demande de classer différentes formes de décolonisation : éviter les plans par espace géographique (la décolonisation en Asie, puis la décolonisation en Afrique) qui sont descriptifs mais pas synthétiques ou les plans chronologiques.

Mettre en œuvre ses connaissances

- Chercher à identifier précisément quelques acteurs de l'indépendance : la biographie de Gandhi suffit à montrer que celui-ci n'envisage pas l'indépendance de l'Inde comme Ho Chi Minh conçoit celle du Vietnam, de même pour Ben Bella ou Soekarno.

Proposition de plan

I - LES CAUSES DE L'ACCESSION À L'INDÉPENDANCE
A. L'affaiblissement des puissances coloniales
  - le rôle des guerres mondiales :
    - la perte de prestige des métropoles
    - les colonies ont participé à l'effort de guerre
B. Les nouvelles grandes puissances sont hostiles au colonialisme
  - les États-Unis, ancienne colonie britannique, nés d'une guerre d'indépendance
  - l'URSS dénonce la colonisation comme le produit de l'impérialisme capitaliste européen
C. L'ONU : « du droit des peuples à disposer d'euxmêmes »
  - charte de l'Atlantique
  - Déclaration universelle des droits de l'homme
D. L'éveil des nationalismes : l'essor des mouvements de libération nationale
  - un phénomène ancien, par exemple l'Inde Gandhi et le Parti du congrès
II - L'ACCESSION À L'INDÉPENDANCE À PARTIR DE QUELQUES EXEMPLES
A. L'émancipation négociée :
  - en Asie : l'Inde (1947)
  - en Afrique : le Maroc, la Tunisie (1956)
  - en Afrique subsaharienne : l'AOF, l'AEF (1960)
B. L'indépendance obtenue sous la pression internationale, l'Indonésie (1949)
C. L'indépendance obtenue par la force au tiers d'une guerre coloniale
  - en Asie : la guerre d'Indochine (1946-1954)
Plan de composition

La France et la décolonisation, 1944-1962
Plan détaillé

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>La décolonisation refusée, 1944-1954</th>
<th>Renvoi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. La difficulté française à décoloniser</td>
<td>236, § 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Le refus par la guerre : l'Indochine</td>
<td>238, § 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Le syndrome de la décolonisation</td>
<td>240, § 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Une tradition coloniale centralisatrice : pas d'équivalent du Commonwealth britannique</td>
<td>240, § 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Le syndrome de la décolonisation</td>
<td>242, § 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. La décolonisation subie ou difficilement acceptée (1954-1960)

1. Pierre Mendès France et l'Indochine
   - Le nécessaire après Diên Biên Phu
   - La France et les accords de Genève du 20 juillet 1954

2. La voie de la négociation en Tunisie, au Maroc et la loi-cadre en Afrique (1954-1955)
   - Pierre Mendès France, le discours de Carthage et autonomie en Tunisie
   - Sous Guy Mollet, indépendance au Maroc et en Tunisie (mars 1958), la loi-cadre Defferre et autonomie en Afrique noire
   - L'opinion évoque : le coût des colonies (cartélisme)

III. La décolonisation voulue (1960-1962)

1. Le tournant de 1960
   - 1955-1956 : le contingent combat en Algérie : évolution de l'opinion en métropole
   - De Gaulle accepte de discuter avec le FLN : longues négociations

2. Les dernières indépendances (1960-1962)
   - En Afrique noire : de la Communauté française (1958) aux indépendances (1960)
   - Paix et indépendance en Algérie : Accords d'Evian mars 1962, indépendance, 3 juillet 1962
Pupil Interview questions

1. Les cours

Combien de cours cette année avez-vous passé sur la guerre d’Algérie? Avez-vous (peut-être l’impression d’avoir) passé plus ou moins de temps sur la guerre d’Algérie que sur d’autres parties du programme?

A quel moment de l’année avez-vous fait la guerre d’Algérie?

Comment se déroulent les cours? [la prise de notes, la discussion etc.]3

Est-ce que vous avez fait partie d’une classe d’histoire où on a invité un ancien combattant venir parler en cours? Si oui, quand? Qui? Un ancien de quelle guerre? Où? Comment cela s’est-il passé? Quelles impressions en avez-vous gardées?

2. Le contenu

Quelles sont les origines de la guerre d’Algérie?

Quand et comment s’est déclenchée la guerre d’Algérie? Combien d’années la guerre d’Algérie a-t-elle duré?

Combien de temps avez-vous passé en cours cette année sur mai 1958?

Qu’avez-vous fait en cours après mai 1958/le retour de De Gaulle? Connaissez-vous ce que signifient les termes suivants (si oui, me les expliquez):

• le putsch
• Charonne
• l’exode
• la semaine des barricades
• l’OAS
• les accords d’Evian
• la politique de De Gaulle
• la rue d’Isly
• la résistance française à la guerre d’Algérie
• les luttes internes au sein du FLN

Qu’est-ce que vous avez appris cette année sur l’utilisation de la torture pendant la guerre d’Algérie?

Avez-vous examiné les événements suivants en cours? Si oui, qu’en pouvez-vous me dire?

• l’arrestation de Ben Bella

---

3 What is in brackets was possible follow-up material to be used depending on the answer given.
• Sakiet Sidi Youssef
• le 17 octobre 1961
• les harkis
• la censure

Que vous a-t-on dit en cours sur l’armée et le contingent? Est-ce que vous examiné le côté militaire de la guerre? Combien de Français ont fait la guerre d’Algérie?

Pouvez-vous me donner un bilan (économique/humain) de la guerre?

Est-ce qu’il y a d’autres choses que vous vous rappelez d’avoir vu en cours qui ne sont pas dans la liste ci-dessus?

3. Les interviewés


4. Les manuels, le baccalauréat et le programme

Avez-vous un manuel? Si oui, lequel? S’en servez-vous souvent, parfois, jamais? Si oui, quand et comment/porquoie avec quel but? Qu’en pensez-vous/Comment trouvez-vous ce manuel?

Parmi les moyens suivants, quels sont les moyens les plus utiles pour vous d’apprendre plus sur la guerre d’Algérie pour préparer le bac? Pour chaque moyen que je propose, veuillez me dire si c’est un moyen utile (ou non) et comment:
- les cours
- les manuels scolaires
- les livres parascolaires (i.d. Tous qu’il faut savoir...)
- les livres d’histoire
- la littérature
- les films
- les médias
- autres: ____________________________________________________

Cette année, pour préparer le baccalauréat, allez-vous réviser la guerre d’Algérie? Si, oui, pourquoi? Si non, pourquoi pas?

Est-ce que vous avez vu un film ou documentaire sur la guerre d’Algérie ? Si oui, lequel/lesquels et quand?

Avez-vous lu un livre/roman sur la guerre d’Algérie ? Si oui, lequel/lesquels et quand?

Pouvez-vous citer quelques films et livres/romans qui parlent de la guerre d’Algérie (même si vous ne les avez pas lus/vus).

Comment trouvez-vous le programme d’histoire en terminale? Avez-vous l’impression de pouvoir examiner en suffisamment de détail les différentes parties du programme?
Comment avez-vous le plus appris sur la guerre d’Algérie? Pour chaque moyen que je propose, veuillez me dire si c’est un moyen utile (ou non) et comment:
- par vos professeurs
- par votre famille:
  - par vos parents
  - par vos grands-parents
  - autres membres de la famille
- par la famille de vos amis/vos amis/amis de votre famille
- par les médias:
  - par les journaux
  - par les magazines
  - par la télévision
  - par la radio
- par le cinéma
- par les livres
  - romans
  - livres/revues d’histoire
  - manuels scolaires
- par les cérémonies/associations
- autres :

Que comprenez-vous par le terme “la mémoire de la guerre d’Algérie”? Comment percevez-vous la mémoire de la guerre d’Algérie? Quelles impressions en avez-vous? Entendez-vous souvent parler de la guerre d’Algérie? Assez?

Connaissez-vous les noms de quelques associations d’anciens combattants/rapatriés?
LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

1. Pupil Interviewees

Pupil 1 (a pupil of Teacher 7 in série L) is of Algerian origin: her grand-father was the son of a settler who left Algeria before the war. There is therefore a link to Algeria but much less than for certain others. Her family had no direct involvement in the war. She had received some information from her grand-mother, but the information transmitted had come originally from another source (a neighbour). However her mother had also talked of harkis to her when they passed in front of what used to be a bidonville. She is a pupil in a lycée in Décines on the outskirts of Lyons. A teacher in this school said that twenty per cent of the pupils in the school were of Maghrebian descent.

Pupil 2 (a pupil of Teacher 1 in série S) is of Algerian origin: she has family who still live in Algeria. These are especially her mother’s uncles and her grand-parents. She spends time in Algeria. Members of her family had been tortured. She talked of her uncle “collaborating” but her grand-father “resisting”. She had received a lot of information from the family especially in Algeria, since half of her family (on her mother’s side, most of whom live in Algeria) talk about the war a lot whereas the other half (father’s side in France) do not talk about the Algerian war. In France she had learnt nothing from her family. In Algeria she had learnt a lot, including, as discussed in the interview, about torture and forced relocation of populations to stop villagers helping Algerian nationalist fighters. She is a pupil in the same school as Pupil 1.

Pupil 3 (a pupil of Teacher 7 in série L) has no family links to Algeria. She is in the same school as Pupil 1 and Pupil 2.

Pupil 4 (a pupil of Teacher 1 in série S) has no family links to Algeria. Her grand-father interestingly had served in Indo-China. He did not talk much about this war. She is a pupil in the same school as the above pupils.

Pupil 5 (a pupil of Teacher 11 in série L; interviewed with Pupils 6 and 7) is of Algerian origin: her parents are from Algeria. She too has family who still live in Algeria. Her core family did not seem directly concerned by the Algerian war, given what she said in the interview, but she seemed interested by the subject since she stated that it was her country. Her father came to France as a manual worker, perhaps in the 1970s. She had not received much information from her family at all. This equated to sometimes looking at photographs with her mother and remembering people. She seemed quite interested in the interview, perhaps due to frustration at not getting information from other sources. She is a pupil in a school in Villeurbanne, which is very near Lyons. The school was a fairly typical school with quite a lot of Maghrebian children. Teacher 9
works in this school and spoke of an "intérêt visible des élèves d'origine maghrébine" in the subject of the Algerian war.
Pupil 6 (a pupil of Teacher 11 in série L; interviewed with Pupils 5 and 7) has an uncle who was in the contingent. She said that the Algerian war was a bad experience which he does not like to talk about. She has no other family links to Algeria. She is a pupil in the school in Villeurbanne.
Pupil 7 (a pupil of Teacher 11 in série L; interviewed with Pupils 5 and 6) has no family links to Algeria. She is a pupil in the school in Villeurbanne.
Pupil 8 (a pupil of Teacher 3 in série ES; interviewed with Pupils 9 and 12) is of Algerian origin: she did not give much detail of her family biography but has close contacts with Algeria and is of Algerian origin. She did not talk in the family about the war. She seemed however to talk about the present civil war situation in Algeria. She mentioned that her family would like to move back to Algeria but that this was difficult. She is a pupil in the school in Villeurbanne.
Pupil 9 (a pupil of Teacher 3 in série ES; interviewed with Pupils 8 and 12) is of Algerian origin: she did not mention much about her family history but has close contacts with Algeria and is of Algerian origin. She did not talk in her family about the war. She seemed however to talk about the present civil war situation in Algeria. In this respect she is therefore a lot like Pupil 8. She is a pupil in the school in Villeurbanne.
Pupil 10 (a pupil of Teacher 11 in série L) is the daughter of a man who did national military service. He died in 1998. She said he was involved in repatriation at the end of the Algerian war (although she was very unsure of dates). Apparently he had spoken to her about this. She mentioned a lieu de mémoire: a cemetery, since while visiting the grave of her father she had noticed graves of people, who had died during the Algerian war. She had no other family links to the war. Again, even though she is not of Algerian origin, her coming forward for the interview would seem to be motivated by a desire to know more about her family history (in the face of her father's death?). She is a pupil in the school in Villeurbanne.
Pupil 11 (a pupil of Teacher 7 in série L) is of Algerian origin: her grand-parents were concerned by the Algerian war, especially her grand-father with whom she talks about the Algerian war in France. This is therefore the only person to have gained significant information from the family in France (as opposed to Algeria). He lost members of his family including his brother during the war. She described him as being an Algerian resistance hero. He had been traumatised by the Algerian war. This pupil is also the only pupil to have seen a testimony given in class (in troisième) on the Algerian war, given by a pied-noir conscript. She is a pupil in the school in Décines.
Pupil 12 (a pupil of Teacher 3 in série ES; interviewed with Pupils 8 and 9) is of Algerian origin: his uncle, great-uncle and grand-parents were all directly concerned by the Algerian war. His great uncle had served five years of prison during the Algerian war and did not talk about it since it was too difficult. So this pupil talked a little with
his father who was not involved in the war. This pupil was the only boy to be interviewed. He attends the school in Villeurbanne.

2. Teacher Interviewees

A Sample

**Teacher 1** 40-50, agrégé. He has cousins who fought in Algeria, but relatively few acquaintances involved in the Algerian war. He works in a school in the suburbs of Lyons in which twenty percent of the pupils are of Maghrebian descent. He arranged for me to interview some of his pupils.

**Teacher 2** 40-50, agrégé. He was thirteen years old when the Algerian war ended so has some memories of the war. In the interview he mentioned a pied-noir colleague (Teacher 17) who never talks of the Algerian war but was on the forum in Algiers for de Gaulle’s speech “Je vous ai compris”. He also has a cousin who served in Algeria. This teacher previously worked in a school in which there were a lot of Maghrebian children which he said modified his approach to the Algerian war in class. He now works in a fairly typical lycée with quite a good reputation, but in which there are fewer Maghrebian children. Teacher 16, Teacher 17 and Teacher 18 also work in this school.

**Teacher 3** 30-40, agrégé. He has pieds-noirs friends. One of these friends was born in Algeria in 1948, whose mother he describes as still a defender of “Algérie française” ideas and who continues to believe de Gaulle betrayed them. He also has colleagues who were involved in the war, one of whom he mentions in particular. The person was a student at Aix-en-Provence who had described problems at the time with nationalist students. Apart from that he had no link to the Algerian war. He arranged for me to interview some of his pupils.

**Teacher 4** over-50, agrégé. He was a student at the time of the war. He knows lots of people who were involved in the war. He was one of the two teachers who had invited a veteran of the Algerian war to class. He works in a prestigious school.

**Teacher 5** 40-50, agrégé. This teacher spoke of two colleagues of his. One of these was a woman who was pied-noir (Teacher 6) and another was a man who had been a student at the time of the Algerian war. He qualified their reactions on the subject of the Algerian war as “réactions épidermiques ou passionnelles”. He described his own family, in metropolitan France, as very “Algérie française”. He works in a prestigious school (the same school as Teacher 4 and Teacher 6) in which he says the pupils are not concerned in their family history by the Algerian war.

**Teacher 6** 40-50, C.A.P.E.S. She lived in Mostaganem in Algeria. She claimed that her uncle had been killed on November 1, 1954, and was therefore amongst the first victims
of the war. Her father had also been killed by the F.L.N. in 1957. Her family lived in Algeria until Algerian independence in 1962, where they had a vineyard. They then fled Algeria. She spent significantly more time than her colleagues in class on the Algerian war.

**Teacher 7** 30-40, C.A.P.E.S. She said that her father-in-law had been a conscript in Algeria and that this was “un sujet dont il ne parlait pas énormément”. During the interview she mentioned interest in the Algerian war in class of pupils from pied-noir and maghrebi families. She works in the same school as Teacher 1 and said that there was “une communauté maghrébine assez importante”. She arranged for me to interview some of her pupils.

**Teacher 8** 40-50, C.A.P.E.S. She was young at the time of the war and remembers friends of her elder sister going to fight in Algeria.

**Teacher 9** 30-40, C.A.P.E.S. He spoke of an “intérêt visible des élèves d’origine maghrébine” concerning the Algerian war in class. In his private life he has an uncle who fought in Algeria and now supports the French National Front (the F.N.). He works in the same school as Teacher 3, Teacher 10 and Teacher 11.

**Teacher 10** 40-50, C.A.P.E.S. He said that he knew people at work and in his private life who had links to the Algerian war but said: “c’est des gens qui généralement n’en parlent pas”. He linked a “communauté maghrébine” to “classes demandeurs” on the subject of the Algerian war. This teacher talked me through a chronology from *Le Monde*.

**B Sample** (none of whom were asked the same direct question during the interview on whether they knew people in their professional or personal lives who had been involved in the Algerian war; a question that had been asked in the A Sample)

**Teacher 11** 40-50, C.A.P.E.S. She did not mention anybody in her life closely linked to the Algerian war. She insisted on the fact that the Algerian war was a very distant event for her pupils. This teacher arranged for me to interview some of her pupils.

**Teacher 12** 40-50, C.A.P.E.S. She works in the same prestigious school as Teacher 14. She did little on the Algerian war.

**Teacher 13** 30-40, C.A.P.E.S. This teacher’s family were involved in the Algerian war: his mother was a pied-noir; his grand-father was a pilot in Air Africa. Two of his uncles were in the O.A.S. He gave a presentation at university in the early 1980s on Alleg’s *La Question* which had led to strong reactions from other students. He was one of the three teachers of pied-noir origin to devote a lot of time to the Algerian war in class.

**Teacher 14** 30-40, agrégé. He had been at the I.E.P. in Lyons when a lecturer there, who had served in Algeria, had worked on the Algerian war using a film. He had also taught Didier Daeninckx’s *Meurtres pour mémoire* in French classes in the north of France
(before moving to Lyons and teaching history). He devoted little time in history to the Algerian war.

**Teacher 15** 40-50, agrégée. She had been in "coopération" in Algeria with her husband. Due to her age she said "je l’ai connue" concerning the Algerian war. She described how she had had a "mauvaise conscience" at the time. Although she is not of pied-noir origin, she did a lot on the Algerian war, perhaps reflecting her experience and her beliefs and interests.

**Teacher 16** over-50, C.A.P.E.S. She mentioned nothing on her family or acquaintances.

**Teacher 17** over-50, C.A.P.E.S. She was born in Algeria in the Oranie region. She also lived in Algiers, in Bab-El-Oued, so experienced first-hand the "semaine des barricades". Talking of May 1958 in Algeria she said "j’y étais!" She came to France in 1962, first to Nice then to Lyons. In the year 1998-99 she did significantly more than others because, despite the change in programme, she had not reduced the amount of time she spent on the Algerian war.

**Teacher 18** over-50, C.A.P.E.S. One of the two teachers who had invited a veteran of the Algerian war to class.
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