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Abstract: As a window into what happens when anthropology’s published and unpublished writing forms are measured together, this paper will review the personal correspondence of a mid-twentieth century American anthropologist, David Montgomery Hart, whose letters, totaling over 10,000 pages, were recently entrusted to the National Archives in Morocco. In particular, I highlight what the discussions that occurred in his letters reflect about racialized logics in academic research at the time, collaborations between anthropologists and colonial officials, as well as the dangers Indigenous field assistants could face as a result of their work. Throughout my paper, I will suggest how conceptualizations of race, particularly notions of whiteness as articulated in Euro-American writing from the nineteenth century forward, have shaped the field of Amazigh studies, as other scholars have noted. In combining analysis of Hart’s publications, personal correspondences, and my own interviews with his colleagues, I have two goals: first, to outline the processes by which twentieth-century anthropological research contributed to marking difference on a black-and-white color line in the region; and second, to suggest that ongoing discussions on the role of reflexivity in anthropology consider the importance of the discipline’s inward as well as outward-facing writing.

Keywords: Race, Amazigh, Coon, Hart, Letter-writing.

Introduction

As a window into what happens when anthropology’s published and unpublished writing forms are measured together, this paper will review the personal correspondence of a mid-twentieth century American...
anthropologist, David Montgomery Hart, whose letters, totaling over 10,000 pages, were recently entrusted to the National Archives in Morocco. Hart’s prolific letter writing was well known among scholars of North Africa, like for example, Ernest Gellner, who claimed that he “developed and perfected a distinctive literary form, the long ethnographic letter.” Hart’s other papers, including extensive photography and book collections, are also now housed in libraries throughout northern Morocco. These acquisitions come on the tail end of several international commemorations, in book form and otherwise, dedicated to Hart’s work, including most recently, long-form, high-quality Arabic-language translations of his seminal book on the ’Ayth Waryāghar by activists and scholars adjacent to the hirāk movement.

In this article, I will examine Hart’s living legacy alongside trends in the anthropology of North Africa during Morocco’s transition from the colonial period to independence. In particular, I highlight what the discussions that occurred in his letters reflect about racialized logics in academic research at the time, collaborations between anthropologists and colonial officials, as well as the dangers Indigenous field assistants could face as a result of their work. Throughout my paper, I will suggest how conceptualizations of race, particularly notions of whiteness as articulated in Euro-American writing from the 19th century forward, have shaped the field of Amazigh studies, as other scholars have noted. Patricia L. M. Lorcin, for example, has detailed how a network of military officials and physicians based in Algeria alongside social scientists based in France, developed the “Kabyle myth,” through which Kabyle and more broadly speaking, Amazigh, communities were differentiated from

---


Arabs on racialized terms. Similarly, Abdelmajid Hannoum traces the legend of Kahina through different invocations, finding that “French mythology” created rigid distinctions between Berber, Arab, and Jewish communities, defining the former as a “primitive” version of the French. More recently, Ramzi Rouighi elaborates the historical developments which led to diverse Indigenous inhabitants of the Maghrib being referred to under a single umbrella term of ‘Berber’ – a process he calls Berberization. Like Lorcin, Rouighi highlights that, beginning around the nineteenth century, scholars relied on philology, physical as well as cultural anthropology, and archaeology – not history – to define “Berbers,” enabling, in effect, their racialization under the terms at play during that period (i.e., white, black, Indian, primitive, etc...).

In combining analysis of Hart’s publications, personal correspondences, and my own interviews with his colleagues, I have two goals: first, to outline the processes by which twentieth-century anthropological research contributed to marking difference on a black-and-white color line in the region; and second, to suggest that ongoing discussions on the role of reflexivity in anthropology consider the importance of the discipline’s inward as well as outward-facing writing.

**Letter Writing, Fieldnotes, and Anthropology**

Hassan Rachik in his overview of anthropological studies in Morocco during the last century notes that it was not always clear whether anthropologists took the ideas of the communities they studied “seriously.” Thus, Rachik divides anthropologists’ relationships to the communities they studied in two – “theoretical” and “actual.” Since the latter is frequently “hidden” or “omitted” in anthropological writing, Rachik, when able, relied on texts that describe anthropologists’ fieldwork experience to fill in the gaps. For this paper, Hart’s letters will serve to demystify his relationship to the subjects he studied, alongside a talk he prepared wherein he describes his fieldwork experience in detail. Given that conceptualizations of anthropological validity are not singular, yet another underlying methodological anxiety arises – what does it mean to “write up” fieldwork? Where does anthropological writing
begin (and end)? How should we approach what anthropologists write and then conceal?

In the 1930s, Michel Leiris’ *Phantom Africa [L’Afrique fantôme]*, a daily account of the Mission Dakar-Djibouti, for which he served as “secretary-archivist,” began to shatter the distinctions between ethnographic, academic writing, and the rest. Brent Hayes Edwards, the book’s English-language translator, notes that the journal’s genre is hard to define: “it serves, above all, as a sort of counter-writing.” This becomes especially clear in the contrasting sentiments shared in Leiris’ letters to his wife, Zette, which have been included in posthumously published editions of the journal. One moment, Leiris will be critiquing ethnographic practice, “[w]e create a totally false notion of Negroes in judging them by what we know of their sculpture or by classic ethnography,” and yet, a few months later, Leiris unconditionally justifies their looting of sacred objects. These unexpected turns characterize the piece, representing as Edwards summarizes, “the common sense of ethnographic practice under colonialism: the moral sense of ‘mission’… and the stratagems of self-justification that underlay so much of what went on in the field.”

On a much smaller scale than *Phantom Africa*, this article attempts to demonstrate the unique insights that can be obtained through a multilayered textual analysis of ethnographic practice, under colonialism and beyond.

In order to recognize the full potential of past and future writing, we should bridge the gaps between field writing and the rest. In particular, we must question why fieldnotes include essential information, like transactional relationships with collaborators and the affective experiences that influence analysis, while other, more deliberately public-facing writing does not. Surely, researchers have included in their analyses the type of intimate details which are requested from collaborators, as exemplified in the work of Zora Neale Hurston, Ghassan Hage, Laurence Ralph, Haunani-Kay Trask,

13. The “Mission ethnographique et linguistique Dakar-Djibouti” was organized by the anthropologist Marcel Griaule to populate the collections at Muséum d’Histoire naturelle and Musée d’ethnographie du Trocadéro in Paris with funds from the French parliament, marking it is as the first of its kind for the African colonies controlled by the French. For more information see Brent Hayes Edwards, “Introduction to the English Translation,” in Michel Leiris *Phantom African [L’Afrique fantôme]*, 1934, translated with new introduction by Brent Hayes Edwards (Calcutta: Seagull Books, 2019), 1-3.
15. Ibid., 14.
18. Ibid., 210.
and other scholars of color, to name a few.20 One of the great advantages of anthropology vis-à-vis its sister disciplines is the implicit importance given to ethnographic encounters in analysis. Nevertheless, to me, it seems that the continued mystification of field writing practices, both within anthropological training as well as published writing, does not lend the discipline to harness, on a structural level, its full potential.

The Archive

Historian Ross Dunn, who first conceived of donating his collection of Hart’s letters to an archive, relayed in a recent interview with me that he began keeping his correspondence with Hart from the beginning.21 In 2016, as Dunn began to catalogue his letters, which, spanning from 1967 to 2001, likely total upwards of 10,000 pages, he contacted Hart’s potential correspondents, scholars from around the world. Although none of those who responded appear to have saved the same number of letters as Dunn, those who did have a sizeable collection (Edmund Burke III and Jacques Vignet Zunz) have donated theirs as well. The idea for creating a collection materialized after Dunn asked Aomar Boum to help find a home for Hart’s letters in Morocco “where they belong.” Over the past several years, the National Archives in Rabat have expanded their collections to include extensive material about the post-independence period in Morocco as well as regions historically marginalized in the country (i.e., the Rif).22 Thus, Hart’s letters, informative

---

20. See specifically, Zora Neale Hurston, Barracoon: The Story of the Last ‘Black Cargo,’ edited by Deborah G. Plant with a foreword by Alice Walker, (New York, NY: Amistad, an imprint of HarperCollins, 2018); Ghassan Hage, “Hating Israel in the Field: On Ethnography and Political Emotions,” Anthropological Theory 9, 1 (2009): 59-79; Laurence Ralph, Renegade Dreams: Living Through Injury in Gangland Chicago (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014); and Haunani-Kay Trask, From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai‘i, second ed. (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, [1993] 1999). Famously, Hurston’s entire book is in narrative form, revealing not only the content of the questions she asked her subject, Kossola, the last known person to have been enslaved and taken to the U.S. from Africa in the nineteenth century, but also her own emotional responses to their conversations and the, at times, rocky development of their relationship. Similarly, Ralph published his unedited fieldnotes throughout his ethnography, beginning each chapter with a note that relates to section’s theme. As is perhaps clear from the title of his work (“Hating Israel in the Field: On Ethnography and Political Emotions”), Hage makes his affective response to research (“anti-Israeli hatred and anger”) into the subject of his piece – “I will show how by reflecting on my own political emotions I began refining my analytical conception of what these emotions entail” (Hage, “Hating Israel,” 131). Likewise, Trask’s title (From a Native Daughter) and her writing are explicit in defining her relationship to the subject. Take for example a few lines in her introduction: “No matter what Americans believe, most of us in the colonies do not feel grateful that our country was stolen, along with our citizenship, our lands, and our independent place among the family of nations. We are not happy Natives” (Trask, Native Daughter, 2).

21. Information provided here I collected during an interview with Dunn on Zoom in June of 2020. Both Dunn and I were in Los Angeles at the time of the interview.

22. One notable recent addition was in 2017 when the archives of the Instance de Equité et Réconciliation [Equity and Reconciliation Committee] were entrusted to the National Archives. Additionally, the papers of General Varela, high commissioner of Spanish colonized Morocco, were recently acquired.
about a transitional period in Moroccan history, certainly seem to correspond with trends in the archive’s acquisitions.

**Methodology**

When I arrived at UCLA two years ago to begin a doctoral program in anthropology, my advisor, Dr. Boum, recommended I write about this newly created archive, for several reasons, including, perhaps most prominently, my long-term interest in Spanish-colonized Morocco. Since Hart’s research spanned the geographic boundaries of Spanish colonialism in Morocco, I happily took on the project.

Given that Hart’s letters (with Dunn alone) total over 10,000 pages of documents, for the purposes of this article, I was only able to survey this collection. In an attempt to be as representative as possible, I analyzed letters from every decade of the archive (60s, 70s, 80s, and 90s). I tried to read letters from both the beginning and end of the year, in hopes of catching a broader picture of important topics during that period. Whenever there was a topic that seemed particularly relevant to the focus of this paper, such as updates about field assistants, discussions of Ḥarāṭīn communities, or comments on books as well as conferences being organized in Hart’s honor, I would concentrate on several subsequent letters rather than jump around to another part of the year.

As mentioned above, the content of his letters is analyzed alongside published writing. Of course, it is impossible to cover the entire oeuvre of David Hart in a single article. Thus, to be as representative as possible, I have surveyed publications that span the almost five decades of Hart’s career as well as the three languages in which he published.

**Writing the Rif: From Coon to Hart and Beyond**

In their introduction to *Antropología y antropólogos en Marruecos: Homenaje a David M. Hart* [Anthropology and Anthropologists in Morocco: A Tribute to David M. Hart], Spanish anthropologist Ángeles Ramírez and historian Bernabé López García unequivocally attribute the revitalization of Spanish colonial ethnography to Hart: “If there is someone that rescued...”

---

23. Specifically, my dissertation research focuses on the history of racialized enslavement in the region and how processes of race-making shaped Black and Jewish Moroccan relationships over time.

24. Since Hart published widely in English, French, and Spanish, it is difficult to calculate his exact number of publications. As far as my calculations go, which are based on extensive bibliographies of Hart’s work that appeared in two books published in his honor, *Tribe and State: Essays in Honor of David Montgomery Hart* and *Antropología y antropólogos en Marruecos: Homenaje a David M. Hart* [Anthropology and Anthropologists in Morocco: Homage to David M. Hart], he published at least nine books and over thirty articles between 1954 and 2000.
ethnography of the colony, this person is Hart.” Likewise, more recently, in 2016, the Voice of Democratic Moroccans, a Dutch-Moroccan association based in the Netherlands, published a two-volume Arabic translation of Hart’s most extensive contribution to Moroccan ethnography – The Ait Waryagher of the Moroccan Rif: An Ethnography and History (1976). In the organization’s introduction to the Arabic-language edition, representatives Farid ‘Awlad Lahsan and Farid ben Qadur wrote from Alhuceima that “whoever reads this book profoundly will be like one who carries a candle in the middle of a storm or in the dark corridors of our contemporary history.” Despite having “recovered” Spanish colonial ethnography, Ramírez and López García note that Hart was not part of what could be considered mainstream anthropology of North Africa. In the translators’ introductions to Hart’s thesis, a spectacle in its own right (with nearly 1,000 pages, published on high-quality laminated paper to showcase the work’s extensive photo collection), Mohammad ‘Awniyya, ‘Abdel-Majid Al-‘Azuzi, and ‘Abdel-Ḥamid Errayis, all university professors based in Morocco, are quick to caution for care when commending Hart’s academic footprints. Specifically, they highlight how Hart benefitted from critiques of his work, noting that historian Germain Ayache questioned Hart’s insistence on the existence of a firm divide between bled es-siba and bled al-makhzen.

In order to better understand the complexities of Hart’s legacy, we must first trace his academic career. After completing a degree in ethnology at Princeton University, he worked for a subsidiary of Aramco in Saudi Arabia, an experience that comes up frequently in his letters, especially as

30. Specifically, Tapline, in their Department of Local Governmental Relations.
a point of comparison with Morocco. Hart would begin his over ten-year residence in Morocco while completing his graduate studies in anthropology at the University of Pennsylvania, under the guidance of Dr. Carleton Coon, a physical anthropologist perhaps best known today for racial scientism and funding his fieldwork by working as a spy for the U.S. government during World War II. Although there is no evidence that Hart was employed as an informant for the U.S. government, he did work closely with an interventor [Spanish colonial military officer], Captain José Rodríguez Erola, who invited Hart to follow him into ’Ayth Waryāghar territory. Certainly, anthropologists conducting research alongside the military has been a common phenomenon since the discipline’s beginning. Additionally, during World War II and immediately after, linguists and other social scientists were frequently embedded with the military. Nevertheless, the degree of collaboration definitely varied on an individual basis. In a speech given towards the end of his life, Hart states in no uncertain terms that, with the access Erola was able to provide, as the one in charge of the entire region, Hart was able to “fill in” voids within his “ethnographic data.”


33. Racial scientism is a term thrown out frequently but rarely defined. As I understand it, scientism refers to “the belief that the methods of natural science, or the categories and things recognized in natural science, form the only proper elements in any philosophical or other enquiry,” as defined by The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy in Simon Blackburn, The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy, 3rd ed., (Oxford: Oxford University Press, [1996] 2016), s.v. “scientism.” Racial scientism, in my usage, means the application of natural science methods to the study of a category that I understand to be completely socially constructed – race. This appears to be the implicit meaning used in several academic articles on the subject of racial scientism and eugenics, such as, Marius Turda, “‘A New Religion’? Eugenics and Racial Scientism in Pre-First World War Hungary,” Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions 7, 3 (2006): 303-25, and Attila Kund, “‘Duties for Her Race and Nation’: Scientistic Racist Views on Sexuality and Reproduction in 1920s Hungary,” Sexualities 19, (1-2) (2016): 190-210.

34. For more details about his experience as a spy see Carleton Coon, A North Africa Story: The Anthropologist as OSS Agent 1941-1943 (Ipswich: Gambit Press, 1980).

35. Susan Sylomovics, “‘The Ethnologist-Spy Was Hanged, at That Time We Were a Little Savage’: Anthropology in Algeria with Habib Tengour,” b2o 3, 4 (December 2018): 6 (of downloaded PDF); Lorcin also speaks to the imbrication of military activity and social sciences in Algeria from the beginning of colonization: “Military personnel acted as scouts and gatherers of material, which then found its way into the hands of scholars in France for use for their own ends, or they research and produced works of their own (…) The relationship between military men and scholars and academics in France was, therefore, often a close one. The anthropologist Quatre-fages, one of many academics to do so, testified to this effect in 1867 (…) ‘The scholar,’ he wrote, ‘walked alongside thee soldier, and the alliance had been fruitful (…)’” See Lorcin, Imperial Identities, 118.


the type of influence Captain Erola played not only in Hart’s securing his young informant, a 22-year-old, with extensive family obligations, but also in the participation of others within Hart’s study. Since Hart’s published writing did not detail a lot about these relationships, his letters serve as an important counterpoint. Lastly, his collaboration with Erola even extended into publishing an article together on “Rifian morals” (although they had intended to write an entire book, as well).

Most anthropologists, until rather recently, were trained in physical anthropology, the ideological foundations of which, as Michael L. Blakey notes, were firmly entrenched in notions of racial superiority, finding “biological justifications for social inequality.” Coon’s academic focus on race interlaced with his personal convictions, namely, his close relationship with eugenicist organizations and segregationists in the U.S. Crucially, Hart never publicly disavowed Coon’s beliefs, to my understanding, and continued use of his supervisor’s theoretical and ethnographic data without acknowledging racialized assumptions therein throughout his career. In

38. Hart reports that ‘Amar Uzzugwagh, his informant’s father, had been ḍibā (under ‘Abd al-Krim and during the Spanish Protectorate period), but had died before they met. Uzzugwagh already had three wives and at least a few children. Hart, “Conferencia inaugural,” 96.
41. Through a close reading of Coon’s private papers and correspondence, John P. Jackson, Jr. reveals “voluminous correspondence” with, above all, “businessman-turned-segregationist-pamphleteer Carleton Putnam,” who also happened to be a cousin and used racial scientism, including Coon’s work, to justify his racist ideas [John P. Jackson Jr., “‘In Ways Unacademical’: The Reception of Carleton S. Coon’s The Origin of Races,” Journal of the History of Biology 34 (2001): 250]. In fact, Coon was invited to join the International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics officially twice, and only declined due to fear of retribution, not, importantly, because he fundamentally disagreed with the racist, sexist, and ableist presumptions of eugenics (Coon to Robert Gayre, 6 November 1962, Box 11, Folder “A-G, 1962,” and Gayre to Coon, 13 January 1960, Box 9, Folder “E-K, 1960,” and Gayre to Coon 29 October 1962, Box 11, Folder “A-G, 1962,” Coon Papers, quoted in Jackson Jr., “ʻIn Ways Unacademical,’” 254).
42. In an interview with Rifian author Rachid Raha (also a close colleague of Hart’s) and the Spanish anthropologist José Antonio González Alcantud, Raha asked Hart directly, “why did you change from physical anthropology to social?” (José Antonio González Alcantud, “Saber antropológico y resistencias culturales: David Montgomery Hart [Anthropological knowledge and cultural resistance: David Montgomery Hart] in Las palabras y las culturas: catorce diálogos humanísticos en clave antropológica [Words and Cultures: Fourteen Humanistic Dialogues in Anthropological Code], edited by José Antonio González Alcantud, (Granada: Universidad de Granada, 2007), 94). Hart corrects Raha and says he never was ‘in’ physical anthropology: “I was studying only in the sociocultural sense with Coon, not in the proper sense of physical anthropology.” Nevertheless, González Alcantud does not drop the subject, bringing up that “in Berberology [berberología] (…) physical anthropology plays an important role, in that, it [Berberology] has always wanted to establish physical links between certain European populations, like the Basques, and the Berber world.” González Alcantud then asks Hart to comment on the importance of this legacy from physical anthropology in a contemporary context. In Hart’s response to González Alcantud we see that he holds in that moment, to certain extent, some
fact, the two maintained a close relationship until Coon’s death, as can also be elucidated from Hart’s letters. 43 For example, on September 10, 1973, Hart acknowledges the validity of Coon’s argument as to the ‘impurity’ of Ḥārāṭīn communities, relying on the assumption that the socially constructed category of race can be proven by measuring physical markers, similar to his answer for González Alcantud, cited above: “Coon thinks they are the result of mixture between a very old strain and very recent one: proto-Bushman going back probably to the Paleolithic and modern negroes (...). I think we all agree (…) that the Ḥārāṭīn are by no means pure blacks.” 44

In Hart’s published writing, Coon was present in multiple ways, writing the forward for Hart’s Ayth Waryāghar tome and his later ethnography on the ’Ayth ‘Aṭṭa. 45 References to Coon’s work also take the shape of orienting the reader to Hart’s racial-evolutionist profile of the subjects under study. Take for example the following comments in The Ait Waryaghar: “At least one part of the substance of the findings of Carleton S. Coon on Berber origins is that the blue eyes and the occasional freckles, red hair, square jaws and long ‘Irish’ upper lips of many Central Rifians cannot at all be explained by the arrival of peoples as late in time as the Vandals.” 46 He then goes on to quote “in extenso” Coon’s perspectives on North Africa’s ecological environment starting around 10,000 BCE, in which Coon states unconditionally that Amazigh communities are related to (white) Europeans: “At that time, a new kind of man appeared in North Africa. He was of European type (Caucasoid) and one of the ancestors, perhaps the principal one, of the Berbers.” 47 This “type” was differentiated from the “Mediterranean” (read “Arab,” and/or beliefs borne from physical anthropology in its division of the world into biological races: “That the Rifians are the ones that have the highest percentage in all of Morocco of possessing blond hair (...) and light eyes. These characteristics exist throughout Morocco, but are concentrated in the Rif, and, to a secondary extent, in the Kabyle region of Algeria,” (González Alcantud, “Saber antropológico,” 94). 48


44. David M. Hart to Ross Dunn, 10 September 1973, Private Collection.


46. Hart, Ait Waryaghar, 342.

47. Ibid.
“Jewish”) and “Hamitic” (read “Black”) using phrenologically inspired data. Hart notes greater variability in “blondism” than Coon, and ultimately agrees that “many Rifians do undeniably look ‘Irish’: and like the Irish, Rifians are extremely pragmatic, argumentative and quarrelsome.”

There are also examples of Hart adopting Coon’s frameworks for Riffian political systems, not just their supposed racial makeup. Later in life, after becoming disillusioned with anthropology, Hart references Coon directly when arguing that good ethnography could only be conducted among static communities. What seems clear throughout Hart’s references to Coon’s work is a shared vision of Riffian (and perhaps, broader Amazigh) communities as racially, socio-politically, and genealogically uniform.

Importantly, there exists a long genealogy of Euro-American interest in Amazigh communities premised upon perceived social, political, and racial affinities with groups considered white. For practitioners of racial scientism like Coon and his advisor, Earnest Hooten, research on these communities was predicated on a desire to explain theories of racial evolution based on

48. Specifically, he notes: “These skeletons [of the European type in North Africa] show a tall, bony, muscular people with large braincases, heavy browridges, flat faces and prominent chins. Their type can be seen in Berbers living today” (Hart, Ait Waryaghar, 342). The “time” being referred to also appears to be 10,000 BCE.

49. Hart, Ait Waryaghar, 343.

50. For example, Hart begins affirms that his advisor’s sketch of the region’s political system remains valid: “In accordance with the model established by Coon for the political system of the tribes of the Central Rif in general, the (...) representative council was, during the Republik, the body politic, a three-tiered institution existing at once at the level of the local community (...); at that of the clan or ‘fifth,’ (...); and finally at that of the tribe as a whole” (Hart, Ait Waryaghar, 283). Similarly, many years later, Hart would also reaffirm that Coon’s work on Riffian genealogies remained “sound” [David Hart, “Origin Myths, Autochthonous and ‘Stranger’ Elements in Lineage and Community Formation, and the Question of Onomastic Recurrences in the Moroccan Rif,” The Journal of North African Studies 4, 2 (1999): 132]. In particular, Hart highlights the following: “Each [Riffian] tribe was composite, with a greater or lesser number of elements of ‘stranger’ accretion, but each also had a well-defined local and autochthonous core” (Hart, “Origin Myth,” 132). Both Hart and Coon appear to agree that Riffian tribes “are unquestionably among the oldest in the country” (Hart, “Origin Myth,” 132).

51. Hart says specifically: “(...) for an investigator to produce a half-decent ethnography a certain stillness is necessary within the society under study, that is, [it needs] to be studied while it is temporarily ‘at rest’ ” (Hart, “¿Luchas hereditarias (…),” 165-66). The original passage in Coon’s Caravan: The Story of the Middle East is as follows: “We cannot learn it [Middle Eastern civilization] very well, or very quickly, if we concentrate on the complexities of Rashid Street in Baghdad, or the Gezirah section of Cairo, or the Place de l’Horloge in Casablanca. We must get off the paved street with its honking automobiles and movie theaters and head for the depths of the bazaar, and even better, wander into a rural village away from the road, a tenting ground of shepherds in the high meadows, or a Bedawin camp. But even these have been affected to some extent. We must do more, we must go backward in time. A culture in transition is hard to describe and harder to understand; we must find some period of history when the culture was, relatively speaking, at rest. Then when we know the background we can bring in the automobiles and the movies and the parliaments and the radio broadcasts; and the presence of these bits of plastic and broken glass in our mosaic will no longer obscure the plan of the picture” [Carleton S. Coon, Caravan: The Story of the Middle East (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958), 7-8].
the assumption that race is a biological concept instead of being socially constructed. In the preface to *A North African Story*, Riffians are described as a “scientific” problem for a largely Euro-American audience that racialized the entire African continent as Black: “(...) in the early twenties (...) he [Coon] became intrigued, as did Professor Hooten, by reports of supposedly Nordic African tribes (...). Coon determined that he would solve the scientific problem of the Riffians.” In fact, this trend of racializing Amazigh communities as white predates both Coon and Hooten. Beginning in the early nineteenth-century, Americans began to input a color logic, evocative of the U.S.’s own racially stratified settler society, within North African contexts. Rouighi notes that William Shaler, then American Consul General in Algiers, would claim Berbers as ‘white’ in his book *Sketches of Algiers* (1826): “(...) Berbers (...) are a white race of men,” to which Rouighi adds, “Shaler meant that the Berbers were not Negroes.” According to Rouighi, “Khaldunization of the terms of knowledge on the Maghrib” spread this racializing narrative. Essentially, Khaldunization is the process by which Ibn Khaldūn’s writing became the sole authoritative texts for the study of medieval North Africa. This began with nineteenth-century translations (first by French orientalists), which domesticated Khaldūn’s writing by reducing the complexity of genealogical terminology used to ‘race’ and adding translator notes that inserted race where it had not previously existed.

---

54. Rouighi, “Race on the mind.”
56. Ibid., 10-11.
57. I am using Lawrence Venuti’s definition of ‘domestication’ in translation: “The aim of translation is to bring back a cultural other as thee same, the recognizable, even the familiar; and this aim always risks a wholesale domestication of the foreign text, often in highly self-conscious projects, where translation serves an imperialist appropriation of foreign cultures for domestic agendas, cultural, economic, political” See Lawrence Venuti, “Translation as Cultural Politics: Regimes of Domestication in English,” *Textual Practice* 7, 2 (1993): 209.
58. Such as, *ṭabaqa*, *umma*, *jīl*, and *jins*.
59. For example, arguing that “ghulām” refers to “young white slave,” emphasis mine, Rouighi, “Modern Medieval Berbers,” 146-8. Interestingly, Hart himself also noticed the anachronistic translation of one French orientalist, de Slane, who published the first partial translation of *Kitāb al-‘ibar* in French (1856), which he criticized for his “triangular and pretty arbitrary classification... of all the Berbers in Africa in the ‘races’ of the Masmuda, Sinhaja and Zanata” in David Hart “Ibn Jaldún y Evans Pritchard: La solidaridad agnática y la segmentariedad en la teoría y la práctica de la antropología sociocultural del mundo islámico [Ibn Khaldūn and Evans Pritchard: Agnatic solidarity and segmentarity in theory and practice of sociocultural anthropology in the Islamic world],” in *La Sociedad bereber del Rif marroqui: sobre la teoría de la segmentariedad en el Magreb [Berber Society in the Moroccan Rif: On Segmentary Theory in Morocco]*, eds. by David M. Hart and Rachid Raha (Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada, 1999), 13. Although here, Hart appears to take issue not with the use of the word ‘race,’ but instead the idea that Berbers were not one race.
Formal anthropological research in North Africa would reinforce this racialization, upholding the notion that Berber, Arab, and Black communities constituted separate races, as Lorcin has also noted. In particular, she traced this racializing process not only through attempts at cataloguing physical distinctions, using phrenology among other methodologies, but also in evaluations of Berber culture through an evolutionary lens. Repeatedly, Berbers were attributed with an “industrious” or “honorable” character which supposedly made them “predisposed” to French civilization in comparison to their Arab (and Black) neighbors. Likewise, scholars (military and otherwise) “were quick to see rudimentary republican democracy” in what were considered uniquely Berber leadership structures. As will be discussed more in detail below, similar patterns — strictly separating Amazigh from Black communities using physical characteristics and positively valorizing sociopolitical organizations considered uniquely Amazigh for their alleged egalitarianism — can be observed in Hart’s research.

Working within an International Network

In contrast to Coon, characterized by writing polemics on North African groups for an American (at times, non-academic) audience, Hart published more extensively for an international (largely, academic) audience. Emblematic

60. Lorcin, Imperial Identities, 124. By way of example, Dr. Eugène Bodichon argued that “Kabyles had an honour, honesty and integrity unknown among African nations” (Lorcin, Imperial Identities, 122). Regarding physical characteristics, Dr. Gillebert d’Hercourt in his Etudes anthropologiques sur soixante-seize indigènes de l’Algérie (1865) argued that “both Kabyles and Arabs were generally dolichocephalic, but… that tribal Arabs were much closer to the blacks than were the Kabyles.” See Lorcin, Imperial Identities, 156. Similarly, Lorcin points out that the blondness of certain Berber communities occupied the pages of several different research initiatives. See Lorcin, Imperial Identities, 133 and 155.

61. Lorcin, Imperial Identities, 134. For example, speaking about the work of General L. J. Adolphe C. C. Hanoteau, Lorcin notes: “Hanoteau dwelt at length on the Kabyle village, on Kabyle democracy and on Kabyle law (to which he devoted over 400 pages)” and for him, “[t]he political and administrative organization of the Kabyle people was among the most democratic and straightforward imaginable (…).” See Lorcin, Imperial Identities, 139. Similarly, Camille Sabatier, who Lorcin describes as a “colonial administrator who took anthropology seriously,” would also argue that “[t]he qualities of freedom, equality, an elevated morality and anticlericalism were embodied in their institutions and were thus inherently Kabyle.” See Lorcin, Imperial Identities, 160.

62. For example, Coon’s The Riffian (1933), Caravan: The Story of the Middle East (1951), and The Hunting Peoples (1971).

63. Specifically, Hart used his advanced proficiency in Spanish and French to write for Moroccan, Spanish, and French publications, which may also have been facilitated by his being based in Spain for most of his life after leaving his graduate studies. Vicente Moga Romero in his contribution to Anthropology and Anthropologists in Morocco: Homage to David M. Hart, includes a detailed bibliography of Hart’s publications in European and Moroccan presses, citing specifically Revue de l’Occident Musulman et de la Méditerranée (Aix-en-Provence), Awraq: Estudios sobre el mundo Árabe e Islámico Contemporáneo (Madrid), Aldaba (Mellilia), and Dossier Amazigh (Granada) [Moga Romero, Vicente, “La Obra de David Hart en España [The work of David Hart in Spain]” in Antropología y Antropólogos en Marruecos: Homenaje a David M. Hart [Anthropology and Anthropologists in Morocco: Homage to David M. Hart], eds. Ángeles Ramírez and Bernabé López García (Barcelona:
of his continued relevance in the Western Mediterranean today, Rachid Raha, founder of several international organizations focused on Amazigh studies, journalist for *Amadal Amazigh*, and (co-)editor with Hart on one of the last volumes he published, recently established the Mediterranean Foundation “David M. Hart” for Amazigh and Moroccan Studies. The Foundation has its own archive, which includes Hart’s extensive photography collection, and most recently, partnered with BMCE Bank to open a brand-new library, named “Terra,” in ‘Ayth En-nsār, filled with Hart’s books. Raha met Hart while organizing a conference on the Rif that was held in Melilla in the early 1990s and their professional relationship continued as Raha began to establish associations on Amazigh culture in Spain and France. Eventually, to show appreciation for Hart’s work on the Rif, Raha organized an homage in Nador, which attracted some 700 attendees.

The Voice of Democratic Moroccans in the Netherlands, which published the translation of Hart’s *Ayth Waryāghar* tome in Arabic, is also heavily engaged in supporting research on the Rif. In the publisher’s note introducing the translation, Lahsan and Ben Qadur conclude by stating unequivocally that this project was part of the organization’s original mission: “to defend researchers of the Rif (…), and to work (…) in the interest of preserving the collective memory of the Rif and to save it from loss, eradication, and distortion (…)” Here, it is not difficult to see renewed interest in Hart’s work as perhaps a complimentary development to recent activism in the region, such as the ḡirāk movement. Hart’s letters demonstrate that towards the end of his life, he himself became more politicized on Amazigh issues, as noted explicitly in a letter to Edmund Burke III, dated November 23, 1995: “I am finally joining the ranks of the Berber regionalists, if not nationalists.”

Being based in Spain for most his life and never formally completing his graduate studies nor holding a faculty position, placed Hart relatively
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64. Including Congrès Mondial Amazigh (Saint Rome de Dolan, France), Asociación de Cultura Tamazight (Grenada, Spain), and Colectivo de Documentación y Estudios Amazighs (University of Granada, Spain).
65. La Sociedad bereber del Rif marroquí: sobre la teoría de la segmentariedad en el Magreb [Berber Society in the Moroccan Rif: On Segmentary Theory in Morocco], eds. by David M. Hart and Rachid Raha (Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada, 1999).
66. Also referred to as Beni En-nsār.
67. The Minister of Culture and Communication, Mohamed Laaraj, stated that the library is part of “efforts (…) in partnership with the private sector to promote the cultural sector, create cultural centers, and encourage a program of cultural development founded upon the idea of proximity,” (http:// amadalalamazigh.press.ma/fr/?p=2113).
68. The following information I confirmed in an interview with Raha in the summer of 2019 in Rabat.
69. Confirmed in an interview I conducted with Raha in the summer of 2019.
70. Lahsan and Ben Qadur, *Taqdim jamʿiyat*, VIII.
outside the ‘American mainstream.’ This location was also due, in part, to his theoretical orientation within the structural-functionalist school of British anthropology, specifically, as an adherent to segmentary lineage theory, until he concedes, at least partially, its irrelevance later in his career, after several high profile critiques from Abdellah Hammoudi and Henry Munson, Jr. For Hart, the theoretical backbone of segmentary theory can be traced to Ibn Khaldun for his description of ‘aṣabiyya, which Hart, following other scholars, defines as agnatic solidarity. Evans Pritchard would solidify the meaning of segmentation, claiming that patrilineal lineage creates “a series of segmentary levels (...) with balance and opposition between the segments.” This idea leads Hart (and others, like Gellner and Evans Pritchard) to argue that segmentary societies have “a strong ideology of equalitarianism and little or no social stratification” except, as Hart notes only in parenthesis, for “social groups that form [part of] ethnic-occupational categories, that are spurned by the majority.” Here, he points out that for the ’Ayth ‘Aṭṭa, these ‘spurned’ groups include “blacksmiths and potters, who are also black, besides the more (...) numerous Ḥarāfīn, date cultivators in the oases, who are also black.”

Frequently, Hart’s work is considered alongside Ernest Gellner, having both written books on segmentation within ’Ayth ‘Aṭṭa communities, and, perhaps most importantly, because each worked closely with Youssef Hazmaoui in Morocco. Certainly, from Hart’s letters, we see that he maintained contact with Gellner, particularly during the height of both their
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78. Ernest Gellner, Saints of the Atlas (Worcester and London: The Trinity Press, 1969), 54-5. See, in particular, footnote 3, where Gellner cites Evans-Pritchard (“The tribal system (...) is a system of balanced opposition (...)”). See also where Gellner describes saints as “necessary ‘artificial foreigners’ ” for “many societies, consisting of balanced and mutually jealous parts, need foreigners either to rule them or to arbitrate between them.” See Gellner, Saints, 299-300.
80. Ibid.
81. I write Youssef’s name using the spelling I saw him use. You will note that in Hart’s letters his name is spelled in a number of ways including, “Yusif,” “Yussif,” “Youssif,” and “Youssef.” In general, Hart’s handwriting was difficult to read, so it is hard to decipher the different spellings of names that he may have been using.
careers in Morocco (namely the 60s). However, as Rachik aptly notes, Hart’s comprehensive monographic style, perhaps the last of its kind, means that he does not hesitate to report instances where ethnographic data does not line up with theoretical considerations, unlike Gellner whose data tended to be rather sparse. Furthermore, towards the end of his life, Hart concedes that, “I can’t share Gellner’s opinion (...) that even a bad model is worth more than none.” This aligns with sentiments expressed in a letter from June 1989, when Hart writes that “[t]ypologizing, model-making, and label-pinning, I may to some extent have been guilty of in the past, but not, I think, to excess, and shy away from all of it even more today.” On the one hand, Hart agreed with Munson Jr.’s critique of segmentary theory in the Rif, conceding that his own ethnographic data had too many exceptions to the rules of segmentation to confirm its existence. Interestingly, however, Hart wrote much more publicly in response to Munson Jr. than Hammoudi, who specifically


86. “We must admit, honestly if grudgingly, that Munson is almost certainly fundamentally correct in his assessment of our analysis of ‘Aith Waryaghar society (though not of their ethnography): the lif of faction certainly took precedence of the dharjūth or partilineage-which, unlike the ‘classical’ definition was not corporate or even truly segmentary (...)” [David M. Hart, “Rejoinder to Henry Munson, Jr. ‘On the Irrelevance of the Segmentary Lineage Model in the Moroccan Rif,’” American Anthropologist 91, no.3 (1989): 768-9].

87. Hart, “Luchas hereditarias,” 166. Here, he says in no uncertain terms “(...) from our point of view, ethnography is or was the real heart of sociocultural anthropology and, now this heart has stopped beating. Anthropological theory is only a façade...in comparison to the ethnographic facts, particularly if it is proven that, which frequently seems to occur, that it [anthropological theory] does not function in the majority of cases.” Sections from this chapter appeared in “Rejoinder to Henry Munson, Jr. ‘On the Irrelevance of the Segmentary Lineage Model in the Moroccan Rif.’” American Anthropologist 91, no.3 (1989): 765-9, excerpted from a longer article of the same title as the Spanish-language chapter that was meant to appear in The Aith Waryaghar and Their Rifian Neighbors (Menas Press), which appears to have never made it to final publication.

88. Although Hart does not explicitly address Hammoudi’s critique, he lends eight pages in a postscript to his book on the ‘Ayth ‘Atta to discuss Ḥarāṭīn as well as other socially stratified groups
highlighted that to claim ‘Ayth ‘Aṭṭa segmentary egalitarianism ignores the summary exclusion of groups like the Ḥarāṭīn. Furthermore, the degree of Hart’s theoretical shift is more difficult to decipher when one considers that years after his response to Munson, Jr., in a piece published in Spanish, Hart proposed “anti-segmentarity,” which affirms that the “segmentary ideal” existed in Rifian “minds,” but was not always implemented.  

**Indigenous Research Collaborators**

As Rachik has noted, non-Moroccan anthropologists working in Morocco generally had (and may still have) to contract “regular collaborators” in order to conduct their research, for linguistic as well as cultural reasons. Although Hart’s linguistic capabilities were perhaps more advanced than some of his peers, he himself notes their limitations on various occasions and thus, was no exception to the general rule. Hart’s two closest collaborators, who he refers to interchangeably as “tarjman,” “informant,” and “field assistant,” both in his letters and his published writing, are ‘Amar Uzzugwagh and Youssef Hazmaoui. As mentioned above, Hart first met Uzzugwagh while conducting preliminary field research in the Rif in 1953. In Hart’s published writing, he thanks the communities he works with, including his research assistants, regularly mentioning Uzzugwagh by name in his book on the ‘Ayth Waryāghār, whereas Hazmaoui remained mostly anonymous (which was likely his desire).


93. Hart admits to having studied only two years of classical Arabic before beginning his fieldwork when he began learning *darija* and *tarifī* (Hart, “Conferencia Inaugural,” 85); Nevertheless, he notes that his attempts to speak *Tariif* were appreciated by people he worked with in the Rif (Hart, “Conferencia inaugural,” 87).

94. Uzzugwagh and his family’s experiences were also sometimes ethnographic data that Hart included, see for example Hart, *Ait Waryaghār*, 87, 105-6, 221, 330-2, and 334 -6.

95. As will be discussed below, Hazmaoui became especially weary of being named after John Waterbury’s book was censored in Morocco.
directed the questioning." From such references, it is difficult to know the exact nature of an anthropologist’s relationship to research collaborators and their own relationship to the work. Hart’s letters, by contrast, highlight the transactional nature that these types of relationships between foreign and Indigenous collaborators frequently took (and perhaps, still take). Unlike with Hazmaoui, Hart sponsored Uzzugwagh’s passport application to help him leave Morocco, as detailed in a letter dated August 4, 1968: “I shot my wad getting passports for ‘Amar Azzuguragh’ and for our maid, so somebody else will have to carry the ball on this. What [Youssef] needs is a sponsor or a work contract to get the passport. He could come over as Gellner’s chauffeur, for example, that’s how ’Amar came over, in my case!”

As it turns out, Coon had also petitioned for one of his informants, Muhammad l-Mnebhi, to accompany him and his wife back to Cambridge, Massachusetts after writing his ethnography, *Tribes of the Rif* (1931). Apparently, Coon used the experiences of l-Mnebhi to write one of his first novels. Most tragically, l-Mnebhi was apparently murdered after returning to Morocco “in mysterious circumstances, but as it appears, with the tacit consent of the French authorities,” according to Hart. This highlights to an extreme, the risk which informants who worked with Euro-American anthropologists during, at least the first half of the twentieth century, could face.

I was fortunate enough to have met and spent a very brief amount of time with Youssef Hazmaoui before his passing in October 2018. Even in his advanced age, Hazmaoui continued to work every day at his repair shop in Sidi Youssef Ben Ali, a rather underserved neighborhood in Marrakesh, the exact place where many Euro-American scholars would meet him to
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97. I believe he is referring to Uzzugwagh here, but it is difficult to decipher original spelling. As with Youssef’s name, that appears in different spelling throughout the letters, I have maintained the variant spelling of Uzzugwagh’s name as well in Hart’s letters.
98. Her name is Hashuma.
101. In the novel’s forward, written by Coon’s former advisor Earnest Hooten, he writes, “[Berbers’] sanguinary sociology, blue eyes, blond hair, and scorn for Europeans fired the imagination of at least one young anthropologist seeking for kindred spirits among the wilder whites” in Earnest Hooten, “Foreword,” in *Flesh of the Wild Ox: a Riffian Chronicle of High Valleys and Long Rifles*, by Carleton Stevens Coon (London: Jonathan Cape, 1932), 9. Hart would praise Coon’s novels years later, saying “they gave quite a bit of life” to his ethnographic work (Hart, “Conferencia Inaugural,” 81).
103. During the summer of 2018 in Sidi Youssef Ben Ali at Youssef’s shop and family home, both in the same neighborhood of Marrakesh.
104. I am happy to share notes and recordings from these interviews for people who are interested. This meeting was made possible by my advisor, Aomar Boum. We agreed that Youssef should be compensated for his time, and thus, I gave him 2000 dirhams before leaving Marrakech.
begin their research over the years. During my visit, Hazmaoui shared rather extensively about the beginning and content of his relationship to Gellner and Hart, noting that he considered the two, and Dunn, his friends, maintaining contact with them throughout the years. After finishing all the schooling that was available to him, Hazmaoui began teaching younger children. One day the local bureau chief asked Hazmaoui to follow him. Sitting in his office was Ernest Gellner and his wife. Ernest explained he wanted to write a book about Hazmaoui’s home. Having come prepared, Gellner already possessed the necessary research authorization so, the qāʿid was called. Hazmaoui translated between him and the official (not a speaker of Tshilḥit) to organize the details of Gellner’s stay. Specifically, Hazmaoui mentioned the official directing the qāʿid to find Ernest and his wife a place to live and to answer the questions he asks. I proceeded to ask Hazmaoui if he had prepared at all for this job, he responded, with a laugh, noting “I just started like this.” After an initial research trip, Gellner returned a second time because, Gellner said, his previous work wasn’t quite right. At that time, Hart was in the Rif, and when he came to visit Gellner, he told him “leave me, Youssef.” Hazmaoui noted that after Ernest’s book was released, “the others came running.” He also confirmed that with every job he made sure researchers had the appropriate authorization. I did not ask if this was related to his experience working with Waterbury, whose book The Commander of the Faithful: The Moroccan Political Elite – A Study in Segmented Politics (1970), was censored in Morocco. When I pressed about methodology, asking how does one who works with anthropologists prepare, Hazmaoui noted that he would, at times, indicate to his colleagues, what was or wasn’t correct in

105. Having not surveyed Hart’s letter archive entirely at that time, I kept my questions pretty vague, asking about how he met Ernest Gellner; what his experiences were working with various scholars (I explicitly asked about Gellner and Hart, however, others also came up in conversation); and generally listening to anything he wanted to tell me about his life. Our interview was conducted mostly in darija, with me speaking northern dialect (which is the only one I know), and Youssef speaking Marrakeshi darija. At times, a few phrases in French or English were referenced, but very infrequently on my part, due, largely, to my abhorrent French accent. Although I likely would have felt uncomfortable bringing this up, I wish I had come across the letters in which Hart mentions how much he paid Hazmaoui before our meeting. Likewise, I might have mustered the courage to ask if Hazmaoui knew that Hart had gotten visas/passports for Uzzugwagh and Hashuma. From my vantage point, this differing degree of material compensation for the work of informants reflects frequently troubling ethical quagmires that may arise in ethnographic work that requires such close relationships with Indigenous collaborators. However, of course, I cannot speak for the experiences of Hazmaoui, Uzzugwagh, and Hashuma, themselves. Furthermore, instead of focusing so greatly on Gellner and Hart, I wish I would have asked more about Hazmaoui’s experience with other researchers. As one of my committee members noted to me, I should have done a project centered on him, delving deeper into each relationship with his Euro-American colleagues and conducting interviews with all who he wished to comment upon. See also Rachik, who in talking about his own experience conducting fieldwork notes: “Having a large and less intense network of relationships, diminishes the tensions and makes the moral dilemmas less dramatic” (Rachik, Le proche, 243).

106. Youssef referred to him in Arabic as “qubṭān” and in French as “chef du cercle.”
the data they collected from (other) “informants.” He also remarked that Hart and Gellner would always ask the same type of questions, prompting me to think about a joke Dunn told me: another scholar who once worked with Hazmaoui wondered, if one was to examine the writing of all his colleagues would they each reflect the “Hazmaoui thesis”?

In his letters, Hart frequently mentions Hazmaoui’s ability to complete all the necessary tasks of a researcher, from translation to data collection and analysis. In a letter from May 8, 1967, Hart introduces Hazmaoui to Dunn as “my Berber interpreter (…) originally trained by Gellner (…) who is an extremely good man.” In that same letter, Hart lays out Hazmaoui’s “fee” of 75 dirhams per week in addition to what he calls “fabor,” which can include foodstuffs. Importantly, the only mention I saw in any of Hart’s published writing about the material transactions between himself and informants appeared in the methods’ section of his tome on the ’Ayth Waryāghar. Explicitly, he noted that payment in cigarettes or small presents of tea, sugar, and other necessities to those “whose worth and reliability had already been proven.” However, he did note that his top field assistant, Uzzugwagh, I presume, “was merely given larger presents than anyone else.” Throughout the archive, Hart mentions coordinating potential jobs and providing financial as well as other forms of aid for Hazmaoui. In the 1970s, when a few academics had their books censored in Morocco, Hart’s comments on Hazmaoui’s precarious situation reveal again the increased dangers for field assistants who worked with foreign scholars. For example, in a letter dated September 2, 1970, Hart mentions Waterbury’s book being banned and concludes, “this I gather is one of the things which has made Yussif so apprehensive.” He adds later on, “Yussif just wants out.” A day earlier, Hart said clearly that although he wanted Hazmaoui’s help on a

108. Ibid.
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research matter, “I certainly don’t want him to get himself in any danger on my account.” 113 Clearly, Hart maintained close contact and attempted to provide assistance to Hazmaoui throughout his life. Nevertheless, it is interesting to consider that even while having explicit knowledge of the extreme danger that can face field assistants, Hart doesn’t appear to question, in the personal correspondence and published writing surveyed for this article, the practice of contracting Indigenous research collaborators despite the potential risks.

Racial Legacies

Hart’s “postscript” in his book on the ’Ayt ‘Aṭṭa likely represents one of the few pieces in which he almost exclusively focused on Black communities in Morocco. In it, he differentiates three groups that composed the “lower social strata” for the ’Ayt ‘Aṭṭa – “Jews, the non-Ḥarāṭīn blacks and hṛar or freedmen, and, most importantly, the coloured Ḥarāṭīn proper.” 114 It is unclear from his chapter, if this differentiation is his own or that of his informants. He further delineates “non-Ḥarāṭīn blacks” as “pure black slaves, ex-slaves” whereas “ḥṛar” are “‘free men’, who are nonetheless socially and by extension ranked with Ḥarāṭīn as ‘second-class citizens,’ in the Dra where they tend to be black and as qbara, ‘southerners,’ in the Tafilalt, where they are often white (...).” 115 It seems that Hart’s own ability to ‘see’ difference may have influenced these designations as he adds that the “ḥṛar (...) have often become assimilated by the Ḥarāṭīn, from whom most of them are physically indistinguishable, at least in the Dra, which is much blacker.” 116

The use of visual appraisal to determine the relationship of communities to each other and their lineages occurs in several of Hart’s letters, as well. In a letter dated, August 18, 1970, he notes that the ‘Ayt Sukhmān “say they’re descended from a negro slave of Mulay ‘Abd l-Qadir l-Jilali, and don’t look it in the least!” It appears that Hart is operating under two assumptions: 1) that those descending from enslaved Black people should share a particular degree of Blackness; and 2) that an observer can see and characterize all manifestations of Blackness. As mentioned above, Hart also commented in his letters about Ḥarāṭīn communities not being “pure blacks” on the basis of their appearance. 117 Certainly, there is no inherent issue in simply noting the skin color of a particular community, but one must be alert to any potential biologizing of behaviors, and most importantly for this paper, naturalizing one group’s subjugation of another.

Hart claims having spoken to various Ḥarāṭīn informants, both in his “Postscript” and in letters, yet despite his years of research in Morocco, he

114. Hart, Dadda, 211.
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117. Cite footnote.
never mentions establishing a close working relationship with a Ḥarāṭīn field assistant. Instead, Hart seems to have conducted most research with Hazmaoui, who, at least for part of his life, held strong biases against black people. For example, Hart remarks, “I just had a letter from [Hazmaoui] saying (…) he’d need Uncle Tom’s Cabin and had begun to sympathize with the Ḥarāṭīn!!”

Almost twenty years later, Hart notes “Youssif’s attitude about Ḥarāṭīn and blacks seems to have mellowed a lot over the last decade,” adding that Hazmaoui claims to be “changing with the times.”

Given Hart’s awareness of Hazmaoui’s biases, it seems like an oversight not to contract a Ḥarāṭīn field assistant. In one of Hart’s letters, responding to Gellner’s hesitation about any assertion that Ḥarāṭīn communities are not “tribally organized,” Hart claims that talking to Ḥarāṭīn community members is a futile exercise:

“Sure the Ḥarāṭīn have lineages (…), but I am convinced they must be shallower (…) than the ‘Aṭṭa ones despite the fact that the Ḥarāṭīn unquestionably represent a far older element in the population (…) (Ḥarāṭīn in any case are hard to interview because of their essentially “subservient mentality”: either they evade the issue entirely, or play dumb, or tell you what they think you want to know).”

Instead of positing that difficulty in speaking with Ḥarāṭīn informants might have been due his relationship with the ’Ayth ‘Aṭṭa, who he describes on numerous occasions as despising, at the very least, Ḥarāṭīn communities, Hart assumes that it is a generalized behavior (or “mentality”) among Ḥarāṭīn that made fieldwork difficult. Furthermore, given that Hart admits to not succeeding in interviews with Ḥarāṭīn informants, his knowledge of their genealogies is likely too scant to establish any argument on the issue. Knowing Hart’s views on the inauthenticity of the apparently limited information he gathered from interviews with Ḥarāṭīn, I am left wondering how community members themselves imagined their histories and identities.

Nevertheless, Hart assesses rather thoroughly ’Ayth ‘Aṭṭa perceptions of Ḥarāṭīn (and black) communities, writ large. Specifically, Hart designates five “dimensions,” that define Ḥarāṭīn communities, from a supposedly ‘Aṭṭa standpoint, although these designations are not clearly attributed to specific informants: skin color, “‘habitū or frequenter of markets’ implying inferior status both through shamelessness and through lack of ancestry,” patron-client relationship, otherwise known as “raʻaya,” labor status of “sharecropper,” and homeland, i.e., originating in the Dra‘ valley. Throughout the book, Hart notes other ways in which Ḥarāṭīn (and other “despised socio-occupational
groups” are marginalized within ’Ayth Ḍḥṭṭ political systems, including, not bearing arms, not being able to serve as jurors, and being excluded from delineation of ra’yān. At this point, I think it is important to examine further one of Hammoudi’s central arguments against Hart and Gellner’s use of segmentary theory, which is supposedly egalitarian, to describe ’Ayth Ḍḥṭṭ political structure, contending that no such claim can be made if one considers the exclusion of groups like Ḥrāṭān communities from political representation. Specifically, Hammoudi argues that the nomination of a chief is intrinsically a practice that reinforces very selective representation since “[a]ll those who are not members of the founding core must be excluded, i.e., clients, descendants of fugitives who were integrated in the accepted manner by sacrifice, Ḥrāṭān, slaves, etc…” Significantly, in the Pakistanti context, Hart would argue that the very existence of communities subjugated by a segmentary society is a marker of the system’s structural affinities across the Muslim world: “As with the ’Ayth Ḍḥṭṭ, pakhtun tribes also had their own Ḥrāṭān, under the form of client Sikhs and Hindus, peaceful sharecroppers, called Ḥamsāya (…)”.

Few critiques I have seen of segmentary theory refer, like Hammoudi, to the idea that this model was applied selectively, ignoring the social stratification upon which communities like the ’Ayth Ḍḥṭṭ appear to have been built. How and why was this seemingly obvious inequality not given analytical weight? I imagine, that in some respects, scholars of the period, especially those from Western Europe and the U.S., were not surprised by the apparent subjugation of communities with a darker skin color. Perhaps, it was easier for them to understand the region through direct analogy, which may in some respects, still be useful, especially when considering, as Chouki El-Hamel has, the local histories of racialized enslavement. Nevertheless, the task of scholars is to contextualize these understandings. Responding to Hart’s pithy article title “Scratch a Moroccan, Find a Berber,” Ramzi Rouighi
posits, “[p]erhaps, but thinking in this particular way is not natural... Instead, thinking historically about social categories – how they become ordinary, and how people use them to order their world – situates them in relation to both modern and premodern ideologies and scholarly crochets.”

In the “Postscript,” Hart doesn’t exactly begin to sketch how Ḥarāṭin-‘Aṭṭa dynamics came to being, but he does highlight several points of contention regarding the nature of supposed clientage between the ’Ayth ‘Aṭṭa and Ḥarāṭin. He argues that all ’Ayth ‘Aṭṭa claim to “protect” Ḥarāṭin and questions not only whether the ‘Aṭṭa were “invited” into the Dra Valley, but also whether their relationship to the Ḥarāṭin is not purely “economic” (i.e., to extract labor). Then, to elucidate Ḥarāṭin perspectives, Hart provides details of a meeting he appears to have organized between ’Ayth ‘Aṭṭa and Ḥarāṭin community leaders. As he narrates it, when the Ḥarāṭin sheikh participating affirmed that their community had a chief “elected through rotation and complementarity in the ‘Aṭṭa manner,” the “‘Aṭṭa mqaddim” denied this claim wholeheartedly. Events continued to worsen when the Ḥarāṭin sheikh “claimed that they had always been their own masters and that the ’Ait ‘Aṭṭa did nothing but sit around and clean their guns.” After the Ḥarāṭin sheikh claimed that they were able to bear arms in the “pre-‘pacification’ times,” the meeting escalated into physical violence. Hart notes that nothing more, unsurprisingly, came of the meeting and that subsequently, both the “mkhazni” that was present and the “‘Aṭṭa mqaddim” remarked to Hart in private about “their detestation of Ḥarāṭin – who in the Taghbalt contest had gradually become more affluent.”

Even Hart’s other texts contain moments like these that beg the question, for me at least, as to what were the historic conditions that could have led to such apparent disdain, at the very least, and perhaps outright subjugation, at the most, between communities considered Berber and Black. For example, in his tome on ’Ayth Waryāghar, Hart begins by noting that because Evans-Pritchard honed his theory of segmentation using fieldwork from “black Africa,” it must be modified for the Riffian context, presumably because the population is not black. However, Hart notes throughout his book the existence of Black people and anti-Blackness among the ’Ayth Waryāghar,
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thus bringing into question where “black Africa” begins and ends. For example, he notes a “widespread Berber belief, which has absolutely no foundation whatsoever in the Shari‘a, although Rifians nonetheless insist that it has: the notion that a man may have as many wives at a time as he wishes provided that every fifth wife is a black.”

Hart also goes into greater detail about ’Ayth Waryāghār perceptions of Black people and Jews in his fascinating section, “Low-Class Specialists and Social Stratification.” As in Dadda ‘Atta, Hart does not delve deeply into the historical relationship between ’Ayth Waryāghār and “blacks” besides noting (without reference to a citation or a particular informant) that they “are all, without exception, the descendants of freed slaves.” Likewise, he remarks that Black people (and Jews), “sought safety in humility,” thus never bearing arms.

Hart also adds, again with no direct citation to another scholarly work or informant that, ’Ayth Waryāghār hatred towards black people can be “readily gauged from the fact that the reason the tribe collectively decided to oppose the pretender Bu Hmara (...) was (...) because Bu Hmara’s general who led the invasion, Jilali Mul l-Wudu’, was a black and a slave. This they would not tolerate.”

Perhaps most interesting, in his sub-section about lower-class groups, entitled “The Despised Minority from the Axt Tuzin: Occupational Or Racial?,” Hart again states unequivocally, that for the ’Ayth Waryāghār and other neighboring tribes, the Axt Tuzin is disparaged not only due to their association with “base professions” due to “base origins,” but also because of their “different and darker-complexioned ‘race’.”

Hart caveats this latter point saying that he had seen at least two blue-eyed boys (one even red-faced) among the Axt Tuzin, though the latter’s complexion “may have been due to his Aith Turirth mother.” These tidbits spark for me, a desire, on the one hand, to hear from those considered Black, and, on the other hand, to understand the ways in which ’Ayth Waryāghār and other Rifian communities define Blackness. Certainly, in the way Blackness is sketched by Hart here, so many parallels could be drawn to the U.S. context. However, keeping Rouighi’s words in mind, why does Hart not explain under what ideological precepts
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all Black people in the region were formerly enslaved,146 or, at the very least, why Blackness continues to be disdained by the majority? Furthermore, can he still affirm his central thesis that “a virtually complete egalitarianism” existed in “Berber political systems in the mountainous areas of siba”147 if these communities’ marginalization is given analytical weight, or in other words, not considered ‘normal’?

In some ways, Hart’s letters complicate matters further. Consistent with his written work, Hart affirms that Amazigh belief systems do not consider “minorities” as equals in law: “Berber egalitarianism, always based on principle that the majority (Imazighen) are more equal than the minority (e.g., l’araben and despised occupational groups, blacksmiths, Ḥarāṭīn, whatnot).”148 Furthermore, Hart’s own humor makes light of the subjugation of Black people on various occasions, including when he compares his wife, Ursula, and her sister’s preparing their new bar to “working like Ḥarāṭīn.”149 Similarly, in a letter to Emilia Blanco, the daughter of Emilio Blanco Izaga, an interventor whose work Hart translated into English,150 he notes “I am working like a black [man],151 but the most difficult part has already passed.”152 Also, while admonishing scholars who critique the now infamous divide of bled es-siba from bled el-makhzen, Hart retorts, “they dismiss it as a colonialist intrigue just prior to the Protectorate, which is simply their pot calling Terrasse’s kettle a ḥartānī.”153 Relatedly, while he maintained friendly relationships
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153. David M. Hart to Ross Dunn, 9 November 1967, Private Collection. Hart does not elaborate here on his reasons for referencing Terrasse, specifically, when replacing the proverb’s usual “black” with “hartani.” Perhaps relatedly, however, Terrasse, in his tome Histoire du Maroc: des origines à l’établissement du Protectorat français [History of Morocco: The Origins of the Establishment of the French Protectorate], firmly divides, on racialized terms, Ḥarāṭīn (and those “of color,” more broadly) from Amazigh communities: “However, in the border oases of Morocco, Berbers were in contact with a very ancient population of color: the Ḥarāṭīn, who, up to the conquest of the desert by the white Berbers and the introduction of numerous blacks, seem to have settled [in] the Saharan oases (…). It has been asked if these ancient Ḥarāṭīn come from an old and fixed mix, in which they formed another race (…). They do seem to form an actual race, even in the physical sense of the word (…). Populations of southern Morocco must have contaminated with these elements of color… However, the mass of white Berbers of Morocco were not changed by these initial mixes with a colored race” in Henri Terrasse,
with several Jewish scholars, including Germain Ayache and Ernest Gellner, when his temper flared, prejudices, sometimes, would reveal themselves. For example, when Ayache contacted Hart asking him to contribute to an upcoming journal issue, Hart remarks “being Jewish, he always wants something for nothing.”154 This comment may seem to contrast sharply with Hart’s earlier impression of Ayache in 1969, when he wrote, “Ayache is a very pleasant guy (…) a prodigious worker,” mentioning that Ayache is “that rarity, a Jew who returned to Morocco.”155 I highlight these moments because, as Boum notes in his research on memory in southern Morocco, humor can reveal “underlying ideologies.”156 Dennis Howitt and Kwame Owusu-Bempah specifically elaborate the relevance of humor to understanding how race functions in society, noting that “[t]he existence of jokes about racial categories is testament to the importance of these categories.”157 Certainly, Hart’s worldview was likely not uncommon for the time period and his social milieu. Nevertheless, the racial categorizations that populate the humor in Hart’s letters are reinforced in his publications, thus meriting note, at the very least.

Interestingly, Hart repeatedly draws comparisons between Moroccan Jews and Ḥarāṭīn communities throughout his letters. For example, on August 5, 1970, Hart considers “structural affinities” between Ḥarāṭīn and Jewish communities, claiming, as mentioned in other letters cited above, that the former does not have any tribal structure.158 The questioning of any tribal structure among Ḥarāṭīn communities also occurs in Hart’s published writing.159 Again on August 18, 1970, Hart brings up the issue, pointing out that “Gellner has made no more noise on the subject of Ḥarāṭīn non-tribalism being a ‘stereotype.’”160 Of course, it is not possible to know exactly what

Gellner said to Hart on the issue, but I wonder if he cautioned any assumption that the sociopolitical structure of a community racialized as Black would be any less complex than that of the 'Ayth 'Aṭṭa or other communities associated with whiteness. Hart does concede that “what’s needed is good solid fieldwork,” yet he affirms that “in the absence of it [fieldwork] and on the basis of available evidence, I stick by my guns on this one.”161 He then says he will consult Youssef Hazmaoui for “[c]ould easily be he remembers some crucial point which I forgot to note down.”162 Later in that same letter, he notes that another researcher, Briggs (likely Lloyd Cabot Briggs, Jr.), could shed some “Algerian light” on the “structural parallels” between Ḣarāṭīn and Jewish communities.

Importantly, Hart alludes to the racialized logics that likely impacted why more research has been done on Moroccan Jews than Ḣarāṭīn: “I’d say we are considerably better documented then we are on the Ḣarāṭīn, simply because everyone has always thought of these Jews as ‘interesting’ whereas the Ḣarāṭīn are just ‘there’ – if you follow me.”163 Hart seems to be pointing out that white Euro-America was likely surprised to learn that Jews have lived in Africa for centuries due to set of important assumptions that characterize dominant racialized logics common at the time; 1) that Jews are a Semitic people residing primarily in largely European (read “white”) contexts; 2) that Africa, aside from the far north, is home to non-white, non-Semitic, black communities only; and 3) that Jews are not brown and Black in the same way as African communities. The similar experiences of Moroccan Jewish and Ḣarāṭīn communities would continue to occupy Hart’s thoughts long after these letters are written.164

Conclusions

Perhaps unsurprisingly, Hart’s extensive corpus of published writing and private correspondence sheds important light on numerous unresolved themes in the anthropology of North Africa, such as the need for additional research contextualizing historic entanglements between Amazigh and
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164. For example, in “Right and Left in the Atlas Mountains: Dual Symbolic Classifications among Moroccan Berbers,” Hart affirms that there are a set of “terms,” including “Jew” and “Hartani or black,” which “are highly repugnant (…) to Central Atlas Berber notions of what constitutes ‘right thinking’ about human behavior” (Hart, David, “Right and Left in the Atlas Mountains: Dual Symbolic Classifications among Moroccan Berbers,” Journal of North African Studies 4, 3: 36). Again, lacking information on exactly what the informant or set of informants from whom Hart gathered these terms specifically said, his comments leave me, and perhaps other scholars, eager to examine further the notion of difference among North African communities, writ large.
Black communities in Morocco. As other scholars have noticed, the voices of communities racialized as Black in Morocco are largely missing in contemporary scholarship. Recent publications and conferences offering a critical perspective on race in North Africa certainly bode well for filling this void in the field.

Just as Edwards described Leiris’ *Phantom Africa* as a window into “the common sense of ethnographic practice under colonialism,” I consider Hart’s entire oeuvre, including his personal correspondence, an important perspective on the common sense of ethnographic practice under transition. Of course, one lone study cannot illuminate the full range of anthropological practice during this period, thus I hope to see additional research on his archive, among others, as they become available. Surely, a multilayered approach to writing, including both its inward- and outward-facing forms, can help broaden our understanding of the changing dynamics in anthropological practice over time.
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La “Lettre ethnographique”: L’ethnographie nord-africaine de David Hart revisitée

Résumé: Comme une fenêtre sur ce qui se passe lorsque les formes d’écriture publiées et non publiées de l’anthropologie sont mesurées ensemble, cet article passera en revue la correspondance personnelle d’un anthropologue américain du milieu du XXe siècle, David Montgomery Hart, dont les lettres, totalisant plus de 10.000 pages, ont été récemment confiées aux Archives nationales du Maroc. En particulier, je souligne ce que reflètent les discussions qui ont eu lieu dans ses lettres sur les logiques racialisées dans la recherche universitaire de l’époque, les collaborations entre anthropologues et fonctionnaires coloniaux, ainsi que les dangers auxquels les assistants de terrain autochtones pourraient être confrontés du fait de leur travail. Tout au long de mon article, je suggérerai comment les conceptualisations de la race, en particulier les notions de blancheur telles qu’articulées dans l’écriture euro-américaine à partir du XIXe siècle, ont façonné le champ des études amazighes, comme d’autres chercheurs l’ont noté. En combinant l’analyse des publications de Hart, des correspondances personnelles et mes propres entretiens avec ses collègues, j’ai deux objectifs: premièrement, décrire les processus par lesquels la recherche anthropologique du XXe siècle a contribué à marquer la différence sur une ligne de couleur en noir et blanc. la région; et deuxièmement, suggérer que les discussions en cours sur le rôle de la réflexivité en anthropologie tiennent compte de l’importance de l’écriture de la discipline aussi bien vers l’intérieur que vers l’extérieur.
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