



HAL
open science

Archaeology in the reign of Amanullah: the difficult birth of a national heritage

Annick Fenet

► **To cite this version:**

Annick Fenet. Archaeology in the reign of Amanullah: the difficult birth of a national heritage. Green, Nile. Afghan history through Afghan eyes, Hurst Publishers, pp.131-160 et 297-301, 2015. halshs-01566836


HAL Id: halshs-01566836

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01566836v1>

Submitted on 21 Jul 2017

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



AFGHAN
HISTORY
THROUGH
AFGHAN
EYES

Edited by NILE GREEN

NILE GREEN
(*Editor*)

Afghan History
Through Afghan Eyes

HURST & COMPANY, LONDON

CONTENTS

<i>List of Illustrations</i>	ix
<i>Notes on the Contributors</i>	xi
<i>Preface and Acknowledgements</i>	xv
Introduction: A History of Afghan Historiography <i>Nile Green</i>	I
1. Afghan Politics and the Indo-Persian Literary Realm: The Durrani Rulers and Their Portrayal in Eighteenth-Century Historiography <i>Christine Noelle-Karimi</i>	53
2. <i>Tarikh-i Ahmad Shahi</i> : The First History of 'Afghanistan' <i>Amin Tarzi</i>	79
3. 'The Bottomless Inkwell': The Life and Perilous Times of Fayz Muhammad 'Katib' Hazara <i>Robert D. McChesney</i>	97
4. Archaeology in the Reign of Amanullah: The Difficult Birth of a National Heritage <i>Annick Fenet (translated by Nile Green)</i>	131
5. From Patriot to Port-City Poet: Mahmud Tarzi in Istanbul <i>Thomas Wide</i>	161
6. Writing National History: Afghan Historiography in the Twentieth Century <i>Senzil Nawid</i>	185
7. Reclaiming the Past: The <i>Tawarikh-i Hafiz Rahmat Khani</i> and Pashtun Historiography <i>Robert Nichols</i>	211
8. Uzbek Oral Histories of Migration and War: Remembering the Early Twentieth Century in Northern Afghanistan <i>Ingeborg Baldauf</i>	235
Afterword <i>Farzín Vejdani</i>	257
<i>Notes</i>	263
<i>Index</i>	321

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Fig. 1: The Inheritance of Loss: Memoirs from Exile of Shah Shuja' Durrani	11
Fig. 2: War Ballads: Afghan Historical Society Edition of Muhammad Ghulami's <i>Jang-nama</i>	21
Fig. 3: The Iron Amir's Autobiography: Lahore Edition of <i>Taj al-Tawarikh</i> (1901)	23
Fig. 4: Writing Afghan History in Cairo: al-Afghani's <i>Tatimmat al-Bayan</i> (1901)	25
Fig. 5: From Urdu to Persian: Kabul Edition of Shibli's <i>Shi'r al-'Ajam</i> (1925)	32
Fig. 6: The Sufi Shrine as Memory Space: Ibrahim Khalil's <i>Mazarat-i Shahr-i Kabul</i> (1961)	39
Fig. 7: A Socialist Historiography: Hasan Sharq's <i>Karbaspush-ha-yi Birahna Pa</i> (1994)	43
Fig. 8: History as Bloodline: Genealogy of the Abdali Afghans according to Imam al-Din Husayni	59
Fig. 9: The Saint and the Emperor: Painting by 'Abd al-Ghafur Breshna (1907-74) of Sabir Shah crowning Ahmad Shah Durrani	69
Fig. 10: Commemorating Durrani Rule: Mausoleum of Timur Shah (r.1772-93) in Kabul	85
Fig. 11: The First Modern Historian? Photograph of Fayz Muhammad Katib (1862-1931)	99
Fig. 12: Ruler, Patron and Editor: Portrait of Amir Habibullah Khan (r.1901-19)	115

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

- Fig. 13: Archaeological Labours: Photograph by André Godard of Afghan Excavation Workers (c. 1923) © Musée Guimet, Paris 144
- Fig. 14: A National Patrimony? Cover of *Kabul Magazine*, official journal of the Kabul Literary Society (1932) © Société Asiatique, Paris 153
- Fig. 15: Royal Pursuits: Photograph by Alfred Foucher of Amir Amanullah's Hunting Party at Bamiyan (1922) © Société Asiatique, Paris 157
- Fig. 16: Versifying History in Exile: Mahmud Tarzi (1865–1933) 165
- Fig. 17: *Pazhmurda* ('Withered'): Mahmud Tarzi's Istanbul-Printed Anthology (1933) 172
- Fig. 18: An Afghan Istanbul: Afghan Students at the Tomb of Jamal al-Din Afghani (c.1935) 181
- Fig. 19: Official Organizations: Members of the Anjuman-i Adabi-yi Kabul (founded 1931) 190
- Fig. 20: Imported Concepts: 'The Afghan Race' (*Nizhad-i Afghaniyan*) from *Kabul Sal-nama* (c.1935) 201
- Fig. 21: Afghan History from Across the Frontier: An Urdu *Tarikh-i Pishawar* (1869–74) 218
- Fig. 22: Claiming the Past for the Present: Poster Linking President Karzai to Former Rulers (2011) 237

NOTES ON THE CONTRIBUTORS

Ingeborg Baldauf is Professor of the Languages and Cultures of Central Asia at the Humboldt University of Berlin. A turkologist by training, she holds a PhD from the University of Vienna. She works primarily on literary, folkloric, linguistic and ethnographic issues. Her research in Afghanistan had an early phase (in the late 1970s, working on the folklore of the Uzbeks), a middle phase (in the late 1990s, working on issues of local Islam) and a recent phase (since 2002, working on Uzbek dialects and oral histories). Along with dozens of articles, she has co-edited several volumes, including *Bukharan Jews in the 20th Century: History, Experience and Narration* (2008), and translated books, including *Shukrullo: Die ohne Leichentuch Begrabenen: Erinnerungen und Gedanken eines verfolgten Dichters* (Wiesbaden, 2005). She has also authored a monograph on language reform among the Muslims of Soviet Central Asia, entitled *Schriftreform und Schriftwechsel bei den muslimischen Russland und Sowjettürken (1850–1937)* (Budapest, 1993).

Annick Fenet holds a PhD in the History and Archaeology of the Ancient World from Paris X-Nanterre University. She has carried out research missions at leading French universities and research institutions, including the CNRS, Institut de France, EHESS, Société Asiatique and the Sorbonne Library. A member of the research unit Archéologie & Philologie d'Orient et d'Occident at the CNRS and the École normale supérieure, she works on the history of archaeology and scientific orientalism. In collaboration with the Délégation Archéologique Française en Afghanistan, and with the support of the Labex (Laboratoire d'excellence), she has published a pioneering book on the beginning of archaeology in Afghanistan, entitled *Documents d'archéologie militante: la mission Foucher en Afghanistan (1922–1925)* (Paris, 2010).

ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE REIGN
OF AMANULLAH
THE DIFFICULT BIRTH OF A NATIONAL HERITAGE

Annick Fenet

(Translated by Nile Green)

Introduction

On 25 January 1928, a year before his abdication, Amir Amanullah of Afghanistan found himself at an official banquet at the Elysée Palace in Paris. The Afghan ruler responded to a speech by the President of the Republic, Gaston Doumergue, with these words:

Mr President, I am very happy to hear the declarations that you have kindly made concerning the development of Franco-Afghan relations and the collaboration of our two countries in the realm of culture and archaeology.... The collaboration provided by France is already as important in the realm of

*I would like to acknowledge Nile Green, Touraj Daryaei, Nick Menzies and Elizabeth Leicester for their hospitality in Los Angeles.

culture as it is in the reconstitution of our historic past. I am delighted to proclaim my great satisfaction with the positive results.... And I am particularly happy to express publically the admiration I have always had for the beautiful country of France, which is so rich in its civilization...¹

Amir Amanullah went on to make reference to the Franco-Afghan high school founded in Kabul in 1923; to the Franco-Afghan archaeological convention of 1922; and to the first excavations of the *Délégation Archéologique Française en Afghanistan* (DAFA). At face value, his words suggest the affirmation of a national history by newly-independent Afghanistan's head of state and the launch of a cultural policy under the aegis of a France conceived as a model. The creation of DAFA—today over ninety years old and still active on the ground in Afghanistan—in effect marked a clear break with the few excavations carried in the nineteenth century by such foreign adventurers and amateurs as Johann Martin Honigberger (1795–1869) and Charles Masson (1800–53). With DAFA, there began in the Afghanistan of the 1920s an archaeological project that was supported by an official cadre at the heart of the Afghan state, with the signature of a thirty-year bilateral accord between two independent states, and a scientific cadre, involving the creation of a new archaeological institution under the leadership of reputed scholars from Europe. The actions of DAFA survived the fall of Amir Amanullah in 1929 and continued under the protection of Nadir Shah, who during the reign of his predecessor had served as minister of war (1919–24) and, moreover, as ambassador to France (1924–6). Though there was clearly a political will behind the archaeological exploration of the country, we must nonetheless investigate the practical scope that such a program could have had during the reign of Amanullah. Could archaeologists realistically work under the country's conditions? What actions were effectively carried out on the ground? With which 'historic past' were they concerned, Islamic and/or pre-Islamic? How were the archaeologists and their activities perceived by the local population? And what limitations were placed on the archaeologists by the amir's affirmation of Afghan patrimony within the confines of his project to create a modern nation-state?

While this chapter does not directly address the writings of Afghan historians, it does address the crucial issue of historiographical interaction by showing how the activities of non-Afghan scholars presented Afghans with radical new tools, concepts and chronologies of their past.

The issue of how Afghan historians subsequently deployed these archaeological problems and findings is dealt with in the later chapters of this book. What we will see here is something of a division of labour, in the 1920s at least, in which literary and historical texts were written by erudite Afghans while archaeology and the preservation of heritage were delegated to foreigners, not least for technical and capacity reasons. This question of 'delegating' poses the problem of the implications that archaeological work had for the Afghans of the period (or the contrary issue of their detachment from it), along with the related issue of the appropriation of heritage, whether by foreigners or the Afghan state. At present, it remains very difficult to find Afghan testimony regarding the beginnings of archaeology during the 1920s.² Since the early years of Afghan archaeology were dominated by French actors, this chapter therefore relies mainly on French and to a lesser extent other European sources which do nonetheless report Afghan attitudes towards the early archaeological investigations. In this way, through their diversity and direct contact with the time and place, these materials constitute rare sources for understanding the evolution of Afghan historiography through the arrival of foreign archaeologists.

The sources used for this chapter comprise printed works, administrative archives conserved in various ministries and several personal archives, notably the diary of the architect André Godard and the considerable collection of papers belonging to the archaeologist Alfred Foucher.³ These diaries and private records allow us to complete and add nuance to official reports and correspondence with institutions, which did not give an exact account of the reality on the ground. All of these European voices from the reign of Amanullah drew on subjective judgements which were not devoid of prejudice and also often drew on comparisons with the French scholars' earlier experiences in India, Southeast Asia or Iran. Since the history of Afghan historiography and archaeology is a new research field, we can only hope that one day Afghan, Iranian and Indian sources will help complete this panorama and correct its overly Western points of view.

Behind the Scenes of the Franco-Afghan Archaeological Convention

At an international level the Franco-Afghan archaeological convention of the 1920s took place in a political context in which archaeology had,

since the nineteenth century, constituted an instrument for serving the 'influence' of European nations in Asia and North Africa. The end of World War I, which marked the dismantling of the Ottoman Empire and the aspirations of various peoples for their independence, revived European appetites and scientific projects regarding the rich patrimony of Asia. The beginning of diplomatic relations between France and the new Afghan state thus resulted in a common will for archaeological exploration and the valorization of historical sites and objects, albeit a common will in which each party pursued their individual interest at the same time as affirming their international position.

From the Afghan side, Amir Habibullah was probably inspired to include this archaeological component among his reforms by his son-in-law, Mahmud Tarzi (1865–1933), who is the focus of Thomas Wide's chapter in this volume. As an enthusiast for literature and history, since 1911 Tarzi had been publishing his progressive newspaper *Siraj al-Akhbar* ('Torch of News'), which provided information on intellectual and scientific life in the West. Among its news reports, the newspaper also included articles on history and archaeology; at the same time it contributed strongly to the emergence of the Young Afghan movement, which in turn encouraged history-writing in order to develop nationalism.⁴ Moreover, a letter written by Tarzi on 15 September 1920 shows that by this date Amanullah and his son-in-law were already aware of the archaeological potential of their country. This was thanks to a proposal submitted in vain to the Indian and Afghan authorities several years earlier by the Anglo-Hungarian explorer Aurel Stein (1862–1943), who hoped to undertake an archaeological survey of Afghan Turkestan.⁵ For Amanullah's part, from 1921 onwards he entered close political relations with Iran and Turkey, with whom he signed treaties of alliance and to whom he offered half of a plot of land that belonged to him in Kabul.⁶ The prestige that these two countries had earned through their antiquities apparently inspired the young amir to make plans for the similar archaeological development of Afghanistan.

Although Britain had developed an efficient antiquities administration in neighboring India, having declared Afghan independence from the British Empire in 1919 Amanullah rejected any idea of British interference in Afghanistan, including in matters of archaeology. France meanwhile had been carrying out excavations in Iran as part of an exclusive Franco-Iranian convention that dated to 1895. The stability of this

accord probably explains the Afghan decision to sign a similar accord in the years after World War I. After all, there were several other possibilities that Amanullah and his advisors could have explored for the development of archaeology in Afghanistan. For example, there was the Ottoman Empire, which since 1884 had adopted laws protecting any antiquities found in its territories and, before World War I, had granted the French missions the same rights as other European and American missions in having to negotiate and authorize excavation site by site.⁷ But with the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire after World War I, the archaeological situation no longer appeared clear in the new Turkish Republic of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk with which Amanullah had allied Afghanistan. By comparison, France had many effective state patrimonial institutions that had been securely established since the first half of the nineteenth century. Moreover, France had established and helped manage several archaeological services in Muslim countries, such as in Egypt since 1859 (where till the middle of the next century its successive directors were all French); in Tunisia since 1885; and in Morocco since 1920.⁸ The archaeological service being put in place in Syria, which had only recently come under the French mandate, was struggling in the 1920s and so could hardly have served as a point of reference for the Afghans.

As a result, it was France rather than either Britain or Turkey that was chosen as the chief archaeological actor in Afghanistan, along with the model of the Franco-Iranian convention. Not least of the factors was that the Afghan government could not hope to spend any money of its own on such activities.⁹ The signing of the Franco-Afghan convention on 9 September 1922 was, however, an extraordinary affair. For the French emissary, Alfred Foucher, the adventure began in the spring of 1921 in Calcutta, where he received a telegram from the French foreign office. Keeping his final destination secret, including to his colleagues at the Archaeological Survey of India with whom he had worked since 1918, Foucher had to make a long detour via Iran under the cover of undertaking a new scientific mission. Foucher was a specialist on Gandharan art and a former director of the *École française d'Extrême-Orient* (in 1901 and 1905–7), who had taught at the Sorbonne since 1907. As such, he possessed scientific and pedagogical skills, direct experience of Asia, knowledge of international relations and the necessary level of maturity and fame to lead the project.¹⁰ For the initiators of Franco-Afghan relations, he was the ideal man on the ground.

Once in Afghanistan, Foucher set up office as both diplomat and general expert, notably in the domain of education. In accordance with the Afghan government's wishes, he worked at the same time on the foundation of a French college in Kabul; on the organization of a national museum; and on the negotiation of an archaeological treaty. Before beginning his discussions with the Afghans, Foucher had closely studied the earlier Franco-Iranian treaty. Fresh from his observations of sites in Iran and faithful to his quarter-century friendship with the Anglo-Hungarian archaeologist Aurel Stein, Foucher had decided to delete from the text of the new treaty its exclusivity clause that would have made Afghanistan a French archaeological monopoly. But despite all his efforts, he was not listened to: the Afghans were determined to maintain the clause in order to keep the British at bay.

The text of the treaty contained a number of restrictions, not only financial but also human (limiting the number of archaeologists to ten) and material (dividing all discoveries with the exception of precious metals).¹¹ It is worth drawing attention to Article 2 of the treaty, which related to the religious practices of the country without specifying the limits that these practices practically set. In the words of the treaty, 'Not included in these privileges are all of the sacred and venerated sites, such as mosques, cemeteries etc. The French delegates in charge of the excavations must respect the laws, the habits, the customs and the mores of the country and do nothing that is contrary to them.' Despite these religious provisos, the treaty did not make any restrictions in terms of chronology or civilization. Indeed, the treaty only spoke of 'excavations' and 'objects' and in no way discussed larger questions of patrimony or a general survey of monuments.

Although since the end of the nineteenth century archaeological missions had expanded from West Asia to East Asia, European archaeologists had to wait to be allowed to explore the territories of Afghanistan from which they were long forbidden. In their eyes, Afghanistan had become the 'the missing link of the long chain of transmission which had carried Buddhism and Greco-Buddhist art in their conquest of the whole of Eastern Asia as far as China and Japan'. From the French side, this interest in Afghan antiquities was widespread in the Third Republic's social networks through which intellectuals gathered with enlightened politicians and financiers.¹² The case for the treaty was supported by the French ministry of foreign affairs, to which the two initiators of the proj-

ect belonged. Both friends of Foucher, these initiators were the General Secretary Philippe Berthelot, who held office from 1920 to 1921 and from 1925 to 1934, and Ambassador Charles-Eudes Bonin, who was posted to Iran from 1918 to 1921 and who established contact with his Afghan counterpart, 'Abd al-'Aziz Khan (1920-25). The project had the equal support of the ministry of public education; of different groups of Parisian scholars (such as the Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, the Société Asiatique and the Société française des fouilles archéologiques); and of the Comité de l'Asie française, a colonial interest group that sought to install in the Afghan capital instruments of close cooperation in all areas. Thus it was that the beginning of DAFA was paralleled by a vote in the French Chamber of Deputies and the Senate for the creation of a French embassy in Kabul. Prepared by the anthropologist and ethnographer Louis Marin, the parliamentary report emphasized the importance of the putative heritage of Afghanistan by way of traces of the expeditions of Alexander the Great, the Seleucid age and the Greco-Buddhist art of Bactria. In the Senate, the Hellenist Victor Bérard gave a grandiloquent speech in favor of archaeological excavations in Afghanistan which must, he declared, 'demonstrate how ancient Europe had since the distant past had the same civilizing and softening role on the Far East that we hope to reclaim today'.¹³ There was consensus from the French side. Archaeology, it was felt, would at the same time help the discovery in Afghan territories of original Greek and Buddhist antiquities and encourage the development of the young Afghan state in its march towards modernity.

Despite these demonstrations of official enthusiasm, the work of DAFA during the 1920s was the action of isolated individuals. On the ground, in the best case the 'Délégation' did not consist of more than four delegates, and sometimes only one person. During the three years and eight months that Alfred Foucher spent in Afghanistan, for two years and three months he found himself alone in the country with just his wife for company.¹⁴ From January to October 1923, the Fouchers were joined for nine months by the architect André Godard and his wife Yedda, then in 1924 by the archaeologists Joseph Hackin and Gabriel Jouveau-Dubreuil for eight months and one and a half months respectively. Jules Barthoux, who came to take over Foucher's position on his final departure, was alone for almost three years until the spring of 1928. The missions were therefore very long, exhausting, carried out in difficult

climatic conditions and without holidays. In Kabul, in the manner of the Great Game, French relations with the English, Germans, Italians and Russians wavered between surveillance, cooperation, sociability and subterfuge.¹⁵ In the north, the excavations of the immense site of Balkh, where the Europeans had dreamed of finding a new Baalbek or Persepolis, did not deliver the riches hoped for.¹⁶ Finances were also sporadic in the context of the financial crisis of the late 1920s, which saw the severe devaluation of the franc. If funding became more regular after 1925 (when it was paid annually), it remained poor and had to be renegotiated each year. This problem was not specific to Afghanistan, and in the first quarter of the twentieth century French research in general was characterized by minimal resources in comparison to Germany, Britain or the United States.¹⁷ To make matters worse, the Délégation did not receive any financial aid from the Afghan government. Any such local aid manifested itself solely in the form of occasional free accommodation and in providing personnel to act as assistants or armed escorts. The French thus had to take responsibility for their own expenses by way of rent, salaries for workmen and a cook, and for the logistical necessities for their work. All this involved serious constraints: the lack of functioning roads meant that couriers regularly arrived two weeks late; very high import taxes meant that importing commodities was very costly; and then there was the absence of banking, for religious reasons.

This evocation of the context in which DAFA worked during the reign of Amanullah helps explain its chosen mode of operation, the relative success of the results it obtained and the position that the archaeologists would take on their return to France. But they accepted their heavy responsibilities as best they could, even though the task was immense and the means insufficient. From the French side—and, one suspects, from the Afghan side as well—there was a genuine disconnection between their wishes and the reality on the ground.

The Afghans' Relations with their Past

From 1919 onwards, descriptions of Afghanistan and its inhabitants began to multiply due to the arrival in Kabul of increasing numbers of European archaeologists, diplomats, teachers and journalists. Their exchanges with local populations as much as with government elites provide us with various materials for reconstructing the ways in which

Afghans were conceiving their past during the 1920s. It must be admitted from the outset that the French sources on the condition of Afghanistan's heritage in this period were not very enthusiastic.

It seemed that the only old buildings to be maintained were certain Muslim religious sites, such as the tomb of 'Ali at Mazar-i Sharif, which had been a place of pilgrimage since the Middle Ages. According to Foucher, it was 'one of the rare Muslim edifices of Central Asia in which the *kashi* [tile-work] was still complete'. But in general, even religious edifices had experienced much degradation since happier times. Such was the case with the tomb of the Mughal Emperor Babur (d.1530) in Kabul, which in 1925 appeared in the form of a yellow gravestone surrounded by ruined water channels, all contained within the enclosure of the German legation.¹⁸ In Herat, the city's Islamic heritage had been especially degraded during the previous fifty years, since on the advice of British officers Amir 'Abd al-Rahman Khan had destroyed its Timurid buildings for ballistic reasons in 1885. In 1922, Foucher found nothing more of Timurid Herat than the 'dismembered skeleton of its earthen walls' and its minarets, one of which had collapsed just before his arrival.¹⁹ In Balkh, he described how the monumental façade of the mosque had disintegrated. Writing about the portal to the city's Sayyid Subhan Quli Khan madrasa, he wrote that it 'still has a quite beautiful allure though its glazed decoration is in the midst of crumbling, and nobody can do anything to prevent the collapse'.²⁰

Traditional forms of urbanism seemed to be no better maintained and the French descriptions of the Afghan capital were merciless. According to the journalist Maurice Pernot, 'Modern Kabul gains from being seen from a distance. The closer one approaches, the more one regrets the sight of gardens enclosed in horrid walls of mud and badly constructed and unpleasantly painted houses.'²¹ The architect André Godard offered no more praise for the old city: 'Kabul, at the foot of its old ruined fortress, has more than the air of a town under demolition, of a heap of clay in a swamp than of a capital. It appears like a lair of cholera, plague and typhoid.... It is so unhealthy, so hopelessly steeped in filth...that the current Amir has...like his father and grandfather, thought of abandoning it and moving his capital a bit further away.'²² At best, visitors sometimes conceded that 'the bazaars have kept the picturesque quality of the old ways'.²³

In this context, the country's pre-Islamic remains present no better state of conservation. Captain Bertrand, who crossed Afghanistan in an

all-terrain motor vehicle in 1924, described the route from Qandahar to Herat via Farah as a journey across a 'shattered landscape', so much so that it seemed to him an apocalyptic sight of 'rare and miserable villages', of 'numerous ruined cities' and of 'chaotic hills whose characteristic appearance reveals the sites of ancient towns'.²⁴ In 1926, the Indian Parsi scholar Nariman discovered between Ghazni and Qandahar the 'remnants of massive ruins evidencing past habitation of man'. And for his part, Godard observed in his notebook that at Jalalabad he had seen nothing but 'ruined stupas, poor piles of rubble'.²⁵ The Buddhas of Bamiyan had a powerful allure, but they had long suffered from the effects of natural degradation involving fissures, problems of water erosion, damaged paintings and the disappearance of ancient access paths. The site itself was occupied by a bazaar and several granaries, with some of the monastic caves still being inhabited.²⁶ Such continued occupation—and the progressive degradation that it caused—was not specific to pre-Islamic buildings. Thus, Godard described how at Shahr-i Gholghola, near Bamiyan, a medieval palace 'in a very pure Persian style' had become a village whose occupants had 'rendered its layout almost unreadable' through the effects of destruction and construction.²⁷ The first French ambassador in Kabul, Maurice Fouchet (who held office from March 1923 to December 1924 and previously held diplomatic posts in Constantinople and Cairo) explained this general state of affairs as a result of the 'Muslim habit of never replacing that which falls into ruins'. 'In this respect,' he added, 'Afghanistan concedes nothing to its neighbouring fellow believers.'²⁸

Were matters any different at the level of collections? For his part, Amir Habibullah (r.1901–19) had gathered in his little castle at Bagh-i Bala a disparate ensemble of antiquities and *objets d'art*. These included Greco-Buddhist sculptures; ancient coins, both Islamic and Pre-Islamic; wooden statues from Kafiristan; manuscripts; embroideries; alabasters; Afghan, Mughal, Persian, Japanese and European weapons; costumes and other curiosities, such as a plaster bust of Napoleon I and several items of furniture. By the time DAFA was founded, at the insistence of Amir Amanullah one of Fouchet's first tasks in Kabul consisted in assembling these collections to make a proper museum that would interest the local public and eventually foreigners. For this purpose, Fouchet developed a pedagogical relationship with the Afghan minister of education, who revealed the absence up to that point of any Afghan heritage

policy as well as the complete Afghan unawareness of the elementary rules of behavior in this type of public establishment ('do not smoke, do not spit on the ground, do not touch the objects'). It was to this original collection that the antiquities brought to light by DAFA were added little by little.²⁹

Overall, then, the situation was catastrophic. As Godard explained, the country had 'to tell the truth, few things to offer the curiosity of tourists which is not necessarily the same as that of archaeologists'.³⁰ A visiting Christian missionary added that 'except for the tomb of Timur, and the Buddhist remains at Bamian and other places, there are no ancient monuments in Afghanistan...; and the strictly orthodox Afghan capital has never been a seat of art or learning as were Baghdad and Damascus'.³¹ Compared to other countries of Islamic Asia, Afghanistan's heritage seemed to be completely unknown to and neglected by its inhabitants, who tended to let it disappear from the landscape little by little.

Rapidly becoming aware of the particular conditions in which he had to carry out his mission, Foucher at first preferred to give advice to the Afghan authorities, explaining to them the principles of an archaeological service charged with 'researching and conserving the historical monuments and all other vestiges of the national past' and the principles of the conservation 'of the heritage left behind by the ancestors of the living people...that which has been bequeathed to the present generations by those of former times'. With regard to beginning work on the ground, he opted for an initial inventory that would serve as a kind of archaeological map. Fascinated by Bactria prior to his arrival in Afghanistan, once he was on the spot Foucher decided to concentrate his efforts and those of his colleague Godard on the south-east of the country, an area that lay roughly between Bamiyan, Ghazni and Jalalabad. It was the regulatory authorities in Paris who finally forced him to explore the northern site of Bactria beginning in January 1924.³² At the same time, during the 1920s, Hackin and Barthoux carried out their country survey and excavations at Paitava and Hadda in the south-east.

For local populations, the work that the French carried out on the ground generally constituted a novelty. Among those locals who witnessed it, the foreigners' interest in the Afghan past provoked diverse reactions, the most radical of which interpreted what they saw to be the archaeologists' destruction of exhumed remains as being carried out for religious reasons. Thus, after the first discoveries were made in the spring

of 1923, the French mission became, in Foucher's words, the object of 'the vandalism of the local inhabitants' and of 'the iconoclastic raids of the Afghans':

My fears of difficulties with the excavations were confirmed after we were attacked at one of the sites around Hadda... The sculptures we brought to light were destroyed by the villagers. I still hope that the Afghan authorities will make their people see reason and that they will at least allow us time to photograph the discoveries!³³

For his part, Godard explained that the site had recently become a place of pilgrimage once more following the death of a mullah with powerful political influence who 'encouraged the hatred of foreigners'.³⁴ It was not an isolated case. Foucher saw all this as the unfortunate repetition of what had happened at the site of Sahri-Bahlol, which had been excavated in 1907 by his friend David Spooner of the Archaeological Survey of India. A German mission in the Hindu Kush encountered similar destruction of its work during the mid-1920s.³⁵ In reaction to these difficult beginnings of Afghan archaeology, the British suggested to Foucher that he work on Muslim antiquities, such as those at Ghazni, in a fashion that would 'enlist their sympathy and wean them from wanton vandalism'.³⁶ Nonetheless, the destruction of the sculptures at Hadda was repeated three years later during the excavations of Jules Barthoux. Amir Amanullah reacted in a manner that he hoped would set an example by severely punishing the troublemakers, but the tensions recurred regularly.³⁷ In their written testimony, the archaeologists gave several explanations, such as 'the hostility of the local population being incited by the mullahs' and the greed of 'ignorant vandals'.³⁸ As well as accusing the local troublemakers, one commentator accused the Afghan collaborators connected with the French and even the 'Afghan government' itself for demolishing remains left *in situ* 'in order to recover and then to sell' the sculptures.³⁹ It does in fact seem that the discoveries at Hadda had whetted local appetites for antiquities, for in 1929 clandestine excavations were attested following 'interest in discoveries in the Tagaw and the Nijraw regions'.

The archaeologists did not know of any such incidents at other sites, but the Afghan authorities feared that they might be repeated. They forbade Hackin from excavating at Jalalabad in December 1924 due to the fear of 'a fanatical movement in this region if anyone started unearthing

idols'. It has to be said that in the meantime, between the original signing of the agreement and the early excavations, the Mangal Revolt had erupted and damaged Amir Amanullah's power. Foucher took such Muslim susceptibilities into account when, on the moment of leaving Bactria, he advised the Afghan ministry of education about what measures to take for the conservation of Tapa-yi Rustam. His last item of advice consisted of 'placing a sign in the French, Persian, Pashto and Uzbek-Turkoman languages forbidding the public from damaging the monument and including on it the date [and] the fact that it is a "memorial" constructed by their ancestors [;] in French one could say that it is a Buddhist stoupa (*stupa*)—naturally, perhaps in local languages one should not speak of religion'.⁴⁰ Another of the protection measures taken, this time for Tapa-yi Rustam, recommended 'enclosing the monument with a wooden fence (or wood and barbed wire fence, or brick and barbed wire), putting a wooden turnstile at the entrance to prevent animals from entering'. This seems to indicate some measure of local indifference towards the site, where the locals let their animals wander freely.⁴¹

Notwithstanding these problems, the greater part of the Afghan population did not show hostility to the archaeologists or their activities. The French spoke most favorably about the attitude of the mountain people, whom they contrasted with those of the towns and plains. Despite the incidents described above, at Hadda Barthoux praised the Hazara site workers as being 'excellent diggers' and 'indispensable collaborators' who had also become 'interested in the method and result of the investigation'.⁴² On numerous occasions Foucher likewise complimented the good character of these mountain populations, who excavated on the digs in Bactria far from their winter seasonal homes and contrasted them to the 'laziness of the local people' whom he saw as comprising 'some poor devils stupefied by poverty and some orchard owners'. However, curiosity did draw some of them to the excavation site, as attested in a photo dated 13 April 1924 and taken 'at the moment when the *mazdûr* (coolies [*sic*])... began to dig the great N-S inspection trench. Their Afghan companions and some residents of Balkh had come to assist in this inauguration of the excavations in the citadel'.⁴³ Foucher attested equally to the 'popularity' of the archaeologists in the north of Afghanistan, which he attributed partly to the 'relative well-being that the daily pay to our coolies brought to the poor masses of Balkh' and partly to the 'engaging personality of Mr Hackin'. The 'ambient inertia' which Foucher denounced in

Bactria—and which eventually also affected the French—seemed to be the combined result of the heat, fevers and some kind of malnutrition.⁴⁴

The French investigations were also received with goodwill away from the excavation sites. Godard noted that when he was examining Muslim monuments:

I have never encountered, not even at the tomb of Mahmud on the outskirts of Ghazni, any difficulty on the part of the mullahs or the guardians of the ziarats [pilgrimage-places] and tombs which I have entered. On the contrary, some of them invited me to enter themselves. It even turned out that the mullah of one ziarat even brought into the ziarat milk, bread and fruits that we ate there, on the ground, cool, the mullah, my god, my guide, some travellers who had entered to rest in the shade, and me.⁴⁵

In his diary, Hackin admired how during his work uncovering the pre-Islamic paintings at Roui his workers seemed to be 'curious descendants of iconoclasts helping [him] to save the remains of images destroyed by their ancestors', noting in this way 'how different [they were] from the iconoclasts of the frontier!'⁴⁶



Fig. 13: Archaeological Labours: Photograph by André Godard of Afghan Excavation Workers (1923) © Musée Guimet, Paris

For his part, Foucher recounted how during his journey 'on the road to Balkh, towards the stop at Bamiyan' he and his wife were 'amused to read to the present habitants of the region that which the pilgrim [Xuanzang] had written about their valley: to every phrase, they made but one single comment: *dirost!* Exactly so!' In Bactria, similarly, locals pointed out to Foucher their '*sanj-e-navesta* [*sang-i nawishta*] inscribed stones' that they took for inscriptions or carried to Hackin shards of pottery with figurative decoration.⁴⁷

The surviving photographs taken by the French during this period provide little evidence of the connection of locals with the archaeological work. The majority of the photographs depict monuments or archaeological elements without any human presence. Some rare views of landscapes or buildings do include the occasional anonymous Afghan, though mainly for the sake of the picturesque. Some photographs do focus on Afghans, individually or in groups, mostly seen standing in awkward poses. There is not a single woman among them. Indeed, Afghan women were forbidden to be photographed, or at least so Ena Foucher claimed. On this subject, however, one should note that it was however just a question of scheduling for the time when the veiled women visited the Kabul Museum.⁴⁸ Certain clichés linger around the excavation labourers and their 'primitive tools': hoe (*tesha*), shovel (*bél*), barrow (*zambél*)' (Fig. 13).⁴⁹ Among the numerous surviving photographs of inspections and excavations, the local members of the French escort (including labourers, armed guardians and general 'companions') serve to indicate a sense of the operations' scale.⁵⁰

Some of the succinct commentaries written by Foucher on the back of some photographs suggest a daily routine that the French and Afghans shared with good humour and in which as individuals the Afghans were more or less involved in the archaeological excavations. Such was the case at Balkh, where one of the escort soldiers who came from Kabul was 'promoted to the dignity of chief of the work site'. In another such photograph, we see the Afghan guard accompanying one of the French scholars during horseback site inspections appearing to be in a hurry to return to base. The local workers did not hesitate to give their own interpretations during excavations. Such was the case with the unearthing of a sculpted marble slab pierced with holes which, according to Foucher, 'our Afghan companions immediately gave the name of *tasht-nâv* (pierced bowl)'.⁵¹ Finally, there are the rare photographs that show the Afghan workers

together with the French archaeologists, such as a photograph taken beneath the vault of one of the Bamiyan Buddhas with Madame Foucher and another with the Fouchers together with four Afghans of different ages, including the caravaner Muhammad Mir Khan, upon whose death at Balkh Foucher later decreed two days' halt in the excavations as a sign of mourning.⁵² Though tenuous, these clues corroborate the testament of Daniel Schlumberger who, after working in Afghanistan and in Bactria in 1945–7, reported his happy memories of its inhabitants, from the workers to the notables, as well as Hackin and the Fouchers.⁵³ But such good relations cannot hide the fact that, as was repeated regularly in surviving correspondence, the labourers at Mazar-i Sharif were more preoccupied with their pay and holidays than with the excavations. With regard to local Afghan populations, generally speaking the archaeologists of the 1920s emphasized the omnipresence of poverty and the lack of education. Illiteracy, which was characteristic of the majority of Afghans for a good part of the twentieth century, helped cultivate superstition and the power of religious leaders.⁵⁴ The notion of the *but* (idol)—the term used by the Muslim to designate ancient figurative representations—could in this way hold more or less radical implications.⁵⁵

Even before his entry to Afghanistan, Foucher explained his interest in pre-Islamic art to the Afghan ambassador 'Abd al-'Aziz Khan in diplomatic terms, noting that 'the characteristic trait of *buts* [statues] is the curious resemblance that they present with the sculptures of ancient Greece'.⁵⁶ Yet an analyst of the period declared that 'uncivilised Islam's dislike of the past is intense, especially if that past is connected in their imagination with idols, figurative carvings and relics of the cult of the *but-parast* (= idol worshipper) which rouse the zeal of the *but-shikast* (= idol-breaker)'.⁵⁷ This kind of obscurantism was even described by Amir Amanullah in his interviews with the Western press, when he described the fears aroused by the construction of roads or the opposition of the *ulama* to photographs in male passports as being caused by beliefs that 'whoever lets himself be photographed would die a year, a month and a day later'.⁵⁸

Even so, the Western accounts distinguished differences between tribes and their varying degrees of 'civilization' and 'savagery'. In this ethnological classification, the Pashtuns were thus considered to be 'xenophobes' and 'looters', rendering access to their territories impossible; the Hazaras as 'farmers and shepherds', 'peaceful and courageous';

and the Turkomans as 'cameleers and horse-dealers'.⁵⁹ In this vein, Andrée Viollis (1870–1950), a journalist present in Kabul during the 1929 uprising, described the troops of General Nadir Khan (subsequently King Nadir Shah) as 'formed mostly of armed tribesmen' to whom 'war is their natural state, the favorite relaxation...; pillage is their legitimate coronation. They say Allah has only given them rocks. But from the top of their stone promontories, they see golden harvests and riches: why not share them? Had not the Prophet himself been enriched by attacking the caravans of enemy infidels and dividing the spoils?' During the sacking of Kabul that accompanied these political upheavals, the museum was not spared. The statues suffered without being totally damaged and the coins and jewels disappeared.⁶⁰ More than religious hostility, it was banditry that threatened the archaeologists on the ground. This was why the French were often armed and guarded with policemen. And not without reason, for like all strangers they were the object of attacks or attempted robberies.⁶¹ Indeed, European prejudices were reinforced by the actions of the Afghan government, which on grounds of security either forbade expeditions or enforced escorts during archaeological visits to this or that region.⁶²

Since at the level of the local populations ignorance seemed to dominate support for heritage, then it is worth asking how matters stood at the highest level of the Afghan state and its legislation? Hackin's report of 1936, which recommended the 'promulgation of an antiquities law' in Afghanistan, testifies that up to this date no such law existed. In any case, during the 1920s heritage matters were not listed among the official responsibilities of Afghanistan's ten ministers.⁶³ Such legislation could have been attached to the ministry of interior, which oversaw provincial administration, or to the ministry of agriculture, which was charged with 'surveying the value of and exploitation of state assets'. Teaching policy, which lay under the responsibility of the Afghan minister of education, carried no mention of history or culture other than in the general terms of 'indispensable knowledge' and 'instruction'. There were plans for 'a secretarial service (*Dar al-Tasnif*), composed of Afghan and foreign scholars and teachers, which the Amir had agreed to and which had as its mission to prepare, under the guidance of a ministerial council, publications that were judged to be useful'. But there appears to have been nothing similar concerning the fine arts or historical monuments.

According to the French sources, during the reign of Habibullah between 1901 and 1919 religion, along with some notions of geography

and national and foreign history, figured among the various subjects taught by Indian teachers (essentially Punjabi Muslims) at the Maktab-i Rushidiya secondary school in Kabul. In Kabul's French college, founded by Amanullah and named Maktab-i Amaniya after him, geography and general history were taught in French by French teachers, leaving religion, geography and Afghan history to be taught in Persian by Afghan teachers. The college's director Louis Ténèbre explained that the programs of studies dispensed in certain other schools ('in the organization of which French teachers had made their contribution') consisted of 'matters of purely national interest (religious history, national history, Persian language)'.⁶⁴ It would be necessary to look much more closely at the contents of teaching curricula during this period to determine the place eventually given to Afghan history and the manner in which the past was treated. But the testimony of the French teachers does at least show the contradictions that came through the conflict of ideas that regularly appeared through the dual teaching system at Kabul's French school, which combined two models: one rationalist and scientific, the other Quranic. A sociological or prosopographical study of former students from the Amaniya high school in Kabul could equally reveal whether or not the school played a role in the subsequent development of national historical studies. The Franco-Afghan Lycée at least educated the future president of the Afghan Historical Society, Ahmad 'Ali Kuhzad (1907–83), and the geographer and historian Muhammad Akram, who in 1947 published his *Bibliographie analytique de l'Afghanistan*.⁶⁵

The notion of heritage management appeared to be equally absent from the state and provincial governmental apparatus during this period. The responsibilities given to local administrators applied to various domains, such as transport and communications and the management of forests and catastrophes. But antiquities, historic sites and monuments were not explicitly listed among these responsibilities, except for the district chief (*alakadar*) who 'must repair dilapidated buildings, maintain mosques in good condition, and himself account for any necessary works.' As regards the conservation of monuments, it was tacitly understood by the members of the Franco-Afghan convention that it was the Afghan government which had to be responsible.⁶⁶ Foucher confirmed this to Barthoux at the moment of his departure in 1925: 'The proof is that they bore the brunt of the repairs to the Chakri Minar and Shiraki and these kinds of expenses were in any case allocated as an item in their budget.'

As early as 1923, Foucher had suggested measures for the conservation of Bamiyan with a view to 'a new era, that of archaeological tourism'; and Amanullah had in response given 'his most urgent order' to following up on the suggestion, but the measures were never concretized.⁶⁷ As a result, the bazaar at Bamiyan was not evacuated until the 1930s and Godard specified that Afghan promises of 'ready funds' comprising 'several thousand rupees specified in this year's budget' for 'conservational measures' had not been given over to the archaeologists 'despite reiterated requests'.⁶⁸ The proposal to classify the area around Bamiyan as a state domain had similarly not been followed through. Ancient antiquities were not alone in being neglected: at the end of Amanullah's reign it was reported that even 'the Bala Hissar...has been allowed to continue in the ruin into which it was already falling'.⁶⁹

In Kabul, the principal interlocutors of the French archaeologists were the director of the Kabul Museum, Ghulam Muhyi al-Din (c.1866–1939); the successive ministers of education; and Amir Amanullah himself. Relations with Ghulam Muhyi al-Din were not always easy and he was often suspected by the French not so much of privileging the interests of his country, which was of course legitimate, but of promoting his personal interests even to the point of the embezzlement of funds and the illicit sale of antiquities.⁷⁰ Yet even Ghulam Muhyi al-Din seemed interested in ancient inscriptions written 'in Indian script', several of which he photographed, and he collaborated with visiting Parsi scholars from India who studied them.⁷¹ Of the successive two ministers of education during Amanullah's reign—Hayatullah Khan (1922–4) and Fayz Muhammad (1924–9, though active from 1923)—it was the latter who dealt with Foucher and his collaborators. The attitudes that the minister had towards the archaeologists differ according to the sources: he was variously accused of being 'wily' and of giving promises he did not keep.⁷² In general, he seems not to have always been favorable towards the French, though it is difficult to know whether or not he was favorable towards the development of Afghan archaeology as such. Tensions with Fayz Muhammad and the director of the Kabul Museum were particularly lively with regard to the division of materials uncovered during excavations. The model of half-half division, written into the archaeological convention, was the subject of numerous discussions and contestations, not least since the Afghans did not hesitate to reopen debate about an agreement that had already been made. However, one should

note that from the Afghan side there seem to have been no religious or artistic presuppositions entering into their choice of favored objects.

As things turned out, the minister of education was less helpful than Amir Amanullah in maintaining good relations with the French and providing that practical decisions were made and problems overcome.⁷³ Even so, the archaeologists realized that despite the amir's goodwill towards them in lending them his ear, his entourage could still present obstructions, falsify information and prevent messages from reaching him. However, the French managed to maintain communications with the ruler through the Francophile Persian secretary Ziya Humayun, whom Foucher had brought with him to Afghanistan.

Among the Afghan elite there was at least the appearance of respect for the work of DAFA and of interest in the development of its excavations, even if the French cynically considered this to be due more to eagerness for the discovery of precious objects than to genuine archaeological interest. Regarding the brief reign of Habibullah Kalakani in 1929, Hackin noted that 'archaeology must give him the recognition of having protected the [Kabul] museum till the end of his reign': the damage to the museum was due solely to the sacking of Kabul during the political takeover. That said, Habibullah Kalakani did not permit the teaching of non-Islamic history or of foreign or illustrated books (though certain works escaped being burned by being protected by former pupils).⁷⁴

At the local level, from 1922 onwards local governors proved their hospitality by hosting the archaeologists, at Bamiyan for example. Similarly Foucher reported from Bactria that 'living here, far from the intrigues of the capital, it is easy for us to enter excellent relations with the local authorities. The local secretary of foreign affairs [Raminullah] and the governor-general ['Ulumi] himself have paid a visit to our excavations and recognized our efforts.'⁷⁵ Even so, while excavating in Roui, Hackin received a visit from some 'notorious' locals.⁷⁶ And in any case, the curiosity of all Afghans was roused when discoveries were made. In Hadda, Barthoux stated that both 'the ordinary people and the courtiers walk in line past my excavations which have been successful beyond my hopes'. Nonetheless, archaeology appears to have been unable to seduce those younger Afghans belonging to Kabul high society who were affiliated with the French as interpreters or 'secretaries'. Foucher and his wife complained about their lack of motivation and their sole interest in the pleasures of the capital, pointing out several desertions among them.⁷⁷ More

generally, comparing the 'masculine' domestic interiors of the Kabul elites to those of Iran and Turkey that showed 'delicate taste', Ambassador Fouchet found in Kabul only ugly 'gross copies' of paintings and furniture that sought but did not achieve a Western effect.⁷⁸ But what Fouchet, as a European aesthete of the early twentieth century, took for a lack of artistic skill is revealing of a certain aspiration for modernity among these young Afghans, even perhaps at the cost of things of the past.

From the testimony of the French, it appears that the national reception of archaeological works carried out in Afghanistan in the 1920s remained mixed and limited to a small number of people, mainly workers and neighbors of the excavations and persons in charge either locally or at the royal court, with most of the interest being passive rather than active. Aside from a few scholars and ideologues affiliated with Mahmud Tarzi in the 1910s and with government schools and newspapers in the 1920s, most Afghans do not seem to have been much preoccupied with research on their past and origins. The French ambassador Maurice Fouchet noted in this vein that if 'many Afghans believed themselves to be descendants of Israel, the majority of the population...took no interest in this question which has been raised for so long by English scholars'.⁷⁹

The Ambiguous Attitudes of Amanullah

Finally, we must place the French archaeological expeditions in the more general context of the politics and policies of Amanullah. For in effect the researches of DAFA inserted themselves within a program for the modernization of the country that can be analyzed through the amir's speeches, writings, public actions and projects for development and even transport. So what messages did all of these policies communicate with regard to national history, and what model did they represent at both the national and international level? Amanullah was certainly present at the origins of the archaeological convention and the early works of DAFA. But taking his reign as a whole, it is difficult to detect a true cultural or heritage policy, aside from measures in favor of general education and the sending of young Afghans (including his children) to foreign schools to learn 'science and philosophy'.⁸⁰ In terms of urban development and architecture in particular, he favored Western architecture and construction *ex nihilo*, projects that took place within a conceptual range that stretched from American neo-classicism to German and Anglo-Indian styles.⁸¹ In Kabul

he began his reign by knocking down buildings and demolishing the walls that blocked the view from his palace before finally opting for the foundation of a new city 10 kilometers away, the plans and styles for which he selected himself.⁸² All the Europeans with whom he discussed such matters emphasized his great love of gardens.⁸³

These tendencies manifested themselves in two books which the amir published with French collaboration to promote tourism in Afghanistan. The first of these books was an album of black-and-white photographs with eleven pages of text entitled *Souvenir d'Afghanistan: Kaboul—Kandahar—Galalabad—Laghmann—Paghman*.⁸⁴ The pictures were intended to show 'the beauty, the grace' of the country, which had 'very justified pride in possessing such natural riches and such picturesque sites...and...[which] marches at a fast pace, under the enlightened direction of its king, towards a future of economic prosperity and intellectual culture'. Yet among the 180 views that the album contained, only eight plates represented ancient or Muslim buildings and picturesque sites. These were: the (modern) mosque in Paghman; Qandahar with its minaret, palace and one of its government buildings; the 'fortification of the ancient royal palace' in Kabul; 'the ancient ruins of Paghman'; the village of Dara-yi Nur; and finally the village and 'ruins' of Ghazni. In this way, the album's contents gave a deliberately modernist vision of Afghanistan, along with a highly policed urbanism that almost totally concealed the country's past and patrimony, including, astonishingly, the site of Bamiyan.

The second book for tourists, also published in Paris, was entitled *L'Afghanistan nouveau*. This book sought to develop a more documented presentation of the country, as indicated by its subtitle, *Son évolution historique, ses relations internationales, ses tendances politiques et économiques*.⁸⁵ The history of Afghanistan took up twelve pages of the text, comprising two pages for 'the pre-Islamic period' and ten pages for 'the post-Islamic period'. Thus, as the title implied, the focus was on a 'new Afghanistan'. The guidebook opened with the following statement: 'from a historical point of view the Afghan nation is a very ancient nation. Ethnographically, it belongs to the Aryan race.' It went on to clarify that 'the ruins of these civilizations sleep silently beneath the earth of contemporary Afghanistan. The monuments, tombs and ancient edifices that have survived to our times attest that in antiquity Afghanistan was a very important center of civilization.' Part six of the book ('a general overview', or '*aperçu général*') contained nothing more than the reproduced descriptions of Captain

Alexander Burnes on 'the picturesqueness and magnificence' of Kabul and its surrounding gardens and farms and of Bamiyan.⁸⁶ These were the descriptions of a British traveler from the 1830s, almost a century before, who—with some historical irony—was assassinated in Kabul in 1841!⁸⁷ As for the book's illustrations, these consisted of portraits of members of the royal family and government, military troops and, as in the *Souvenir d'Afghanistan* album, modern palaces and gardens.

A comparison might be made here with the *Kabul* journal published by the Kabul Literary Society (*Anjuman-i Adabi-yi Kabul*) from 1931 onwards during the reign of Nadir Shah.⁸⁸ The journal's cover com-




Fig. 14: A National Patrimony? Cover of *Kabul* Magazine, official journal of the Kabul Literary Society (1932) © Société Asiatique, Paris

prised a montage of various Afghan monuments from all periods, among them the cliffs of Bamiyan (albeit without the Buddha!); the Green Mosque (Masjid-i Sabz) in Bactria; the sanctuary of 'Ali in Mazar-i Sharif; and—emphasizing newness again—Duranti's metal bridge near Jalalabad (Fig. 14). In such ways, Afghan publications of the 1920s and early 1930s offered only a partial vision of the nation's historical patrimony. Aside from modern Western architecture and French-style gardens, the personal tastes of Amir Amanullah appear in any case to have been for hunting expeditions and luxury cars.⁸⁹ His visits to the Bamiyan region (for which a motorable road was specially built) seemed to unite these two princely penchants.⁹⁰ Thus it was that Amanullah's sole attested visit with the French to Bamiyan took place on the occasion of a hunting expedition in the autumn of 1922 (Fig. 15).⁹¹ The French archives mention only one other visit by Amanullah to an archaeological site, which was in this case a stupa he inspected in the company of his entourage.⁹² Aside from cars and hunting, another of his hobbies was taking photographs, though he took his subjects from his royal environment by way of military troops, dwarves, Western-style palaces and so on.⁹³ More generally, his attitude towards art objects remained above all that of a monarch, as, for example, when he presented Godard with a copy of a *Shah-nama* illustrated with sixteenth-century Persian miniatures that had probably come from the library of his grandfather, Amir 'Abd al-Rahman, but which Amanullah had made part of his own collection in the museum at Bagh-i Bala.⁹⁴ Before departing for his European tour of 1928, Amanullah similarly expressed his intention of taking with him several of the ancient sculptures that had been recently discovered, so as to offer them to the Louvre as royal gifts.⁹⁵

This great circuit of 1927–8 that took Amanullah to India, Egypt, the whole of Europe, Russia, Turkey and Iran had two objectives: to see the progress of the Western world in order to apply certain elements of it to Afghanistan; and to augment the prestige of Afghanistan on the international stage. However, it also allowed the amir, who had up to this point never left his country, to discover the unfamiliar regions of Europe. The itinerary was approved or modified by Amanullah himself and he declared himself interested above all in 'military, questions of schooling and university education, and economic technologies'.⁹⁶

It is true that, in Egypt, Amanullah visited Cairo's library and the Musée Arabe (now the Museum of Islamic Art) with King Fu'ad and

presented the museum with several eighteenth-century Afghan weapons. He then took several days of private holiday to take in ancient Egypt, including the pyramids, the Sphinx and Luxor, where he visited the tomb of Tutankhamun with its American discoverer, Howard Carter, and the Director General of Egyptian Antiquities, the Frenchman Pierre Lacaux. But in all the European countries he visited—including Italy, France, Belgium, Switzerland, Germany, Britain and Poland—he showed the most lively and recurrent interest in monuments to the war dead, military hardware, aeroplanes, cars and agricultural machinery, showing only a minor concern with matters of education or patrimony. Although in Bern he was shown around the historical museum and its Persian collections by M. Moser, the amir visited no cultural institutions in London or Berlin, despite their celebrated museums. The British newspapers did not neglect to note this; so in response to the reports a day trip to Oxford was added to his itinerary. During the lunch after his official visit to the Bodleian Library, the High Steward of the university, Lord Birkenhead (1872–1930), spoke of Afghanistan's past, evoking the river Oxus and 'the worldwide fame of the university at Bactria, destroyed by Genghis Khan'. The allusion was full of British understatement, for it alluded to the French archaeological monopoly in Afghanistan and the Afghan refusal to issue a permit to allow Sir Aurel Stein to excavate in Bactria.

The visit to France, between 23 January and 8 February 1928, was supervised by the former ambassador, Charles-Eudes Bonin. Foucher, Godard and Hackin also took part in planning the program of visits on the grounds that 'having all three of them been in Afghanistan and associated with the King, they were familiar with his tastes'. Foucher planned a reception for the amir at the Sorbonne, with a projection of photographic slides by the banker and philanthropist Albert Kahn (1860–1940) and of a scientific film on atoms by the Nobel laureate Jean Perrin (1870–1942), followed by a visit to a geological laboratory and the tomb of Cardinal Richelieu. This was to be followed by a tour of cultural sites, including the Louvre (particularly the Apollon gallery, the Salle Dieulafoy and the Islamic art collection); the Musée Guimet; the Bibliothèque and Archives Nationales; and the specialist schools (particularly the École des Beaux-Arts and the École des Arts et Métiers).⁹⁷ The final program was submitted to Amanullah, who accepted its main outline but categorically refused to visit the Paris Mosque. As it turned out, the amir's tour looked quite different. On 26 January he saw the palace at Versailles; the next

day he visited the Panthéon, where he reflected on the tomb of Napoleon; the Invalides, where he focused on the collections of the military museum (taking all morning); and the Louvre, where in the company of the French minister of education and several conservators he was shown the Egyptian, Assyrian and Greek antiquities. In the Louvre, the amir showed most interest in the crown jewels of the kings of France and expressed his desire to take away with him 'three reproductions of works he had noticed'. Revealing his personal tastes, these were the *Bacchanale* of Clodion (1738–1814), an antique *Minerve* and the *Vénus* of Falconnet (1716–91), all three being sculptures in a high classical style. It was on this occasion that he affirmed that in 'the coming time, he had the intention of constructing a museum that would retrace the history and the art of Afghanistan and that in doing so he would once more call upon French ingenuity'. His tour continued on the Sunday, when together with Bonin the amir visited the Musée Guimet, where he was received by the elder statesman Georges Clemenceau (1841–1929) and the DAFA archaeologist Joseph Hackin 'in the presence of scholars and friends of the museum'. Reportedly, he looked with interest at the objects on display which came from the DAFA missions in Afghanistan (though the hall that was subsequently dedicated to them was **not** officially inaugurated for another year).⁹⁸ Amanullah then presented the museum with a gift of four small wooden statues from Kafiristan.

The following afternoon the amir visited the university quarter, the Curie laboratories and the Sorbonne, where he saw a 'projection' of colour films about India, Egypt, Italy and France by the geographer Jean Brunhes (1869–1930). Next, on 31 January, the amir visited the gardens of Albert Kahn in Boulogne-Billancourt, which 'had interested' him, and then the military college of Saint-Cyr, whose museum he apparently appreciated greatly. On 1 February he was taken to the Bibliothèque Nationale but refused to visit the temporary exhibition on the French Revolution on the grounds that it was 'of minor interest to him'. One evening he went to the Gaumont film studios, where he had asked to see the film *Napoléon* before then giving up the idea. As regards his itinerary beyond Paris, he paid a 'detailed visit' to a textile museum in Lyon and to the new oceanographic museum in Monaco.

During his voyage, whenever he spoke of his country Amanullah praised above all its landscapes. Thus, amidst a large gathering of 'intellectual personalities' whom he met at the house of the banker Albert




Fig. 15: Royal Pursuits: Photograph by Alfred Foucher of Amir Amanullah's Hunting Party at Bamiyan (1922) © Société Asiatique, Paris

Kahn, he declared: 'When you Europeans visit my country, you will see that it is a charming place of interest for its nature: the water and the mountains and above all the people, who are so dignified, noble and proud to belong to a nation that has never been conquered.' It was only in Turkey, in the company of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, that Amanullah appears to have invoked Afghanistan's past. In Ankara, he insisted on the racial fraternity of the Afghan and Turkish peoples, who he declared shared the same origins since the Turks came from Central Asia, which is to say the regions situated to the north of Afghanistan. Nonetheless, the two heads of state carefully avoided any mention of Islam.

As we have seen, the amir's attitudes both at home and during his travels do not appear to demonstrate any particular interest in matters of antiquity. In any case, the image he projected through his official visits,

the press and the publications designed to attract tourists to Afghanistan was not that of a statesman concerned with promoting the history of his country. The fact is that during the reign of Amanullah neither archaeology nor the historical past more generally served to nourish a political ideology.⁹⁹ Despite being concerned with modernization and education, the amir gave no strong signs in favor of a national heritage or its preservation, nor did he appear to favor the identification of his country with particular emblematic historical sites. In 1924 Ambassador Fouchet had complained that the amir 'is still in the period of simple intentions and fragmentary efforts'.¹⁰⁰ For his part, the archaeologist Foucher preferred to emphasize Amanullah's innovative attitude in comparison with his predecessors, and in a lecture in 1929 he recollected how:

When he was thirty years old, the uncle of the current Amir, Sardar Nasrullah Khan...risked the first voyage of an Afghan prince to Europe, of course neither he nor his companions would have dared take their women with them and, with their religious scruples, they even killed their own lamb in their rooms at the Grand Hôtel in Paris to be sure that their national *pillau* would be prepared with meat that was ritually pure. Yet we have seen that the king [Amanullah] not only dresses like a European, takes part in all the official banquets and eats our French food...but also, in a step further than any taken by any eastern monarch, whether from Iran or Egypt, he officially presented his wife as queen, showed her with her face uncovered and permitted her bare hand to meet the lips or to hang on the sleeves of an incalculable number of infidels. It truly was the inauguration of a new era.

Having personally rubbed shoulders with the amir and lived for several years in Afghanistan, Foucher was able to see Amanullah's actions in perspective. Foucher would be grateful to the amir to the end of his life for having permitted French archaeologists to work in his country and for his wider attempts at reform. Bonin joined Foucher in judging the amir more positively: 'In his tendencies towards the modernization of his country,' wrote Bonin, 'he was not burdened by any preconceived ideas or religious scruples.... He gave the impression of a Merovingian who wanted to become an American.'¹⁰¹

Conclusions

Judging by the evidence in the French archives, there was no emergence of a genuine Afghan patrimonial policy during the reign of Amanullah,

whether in Afghanistan itself or beyond its frontiers. These mixed results had multiple causes. The restrictions on the archaeological convention and the French lack of means severely limited the extent of archaeological activity. And at the level of the individual archaeologists, the assumption that they would have to leave behind whatever they found in Afghanistan broke their spirits. More generally, the lack of significant discoveries during the first years of excavation explains the weak impact of the DAFA project both within the country itself and in the international press. Here we should remember that the 1920s were dominated by the prestigious discovery of the tomb of Tutankhamun, which even Amanullah chose to visit.¹⁰² In Afghanistan, the power of religion, poverty and illiteracy weighed heavily on the positive evaluation of a pre-Islamic past. For his part, the amir seems to have finally delegated the entire question of Afghan heritage to the French, both in financial and practical terms. Perhaps it was no coincidence that the cultural aspects of his European tour appear to have been concentrated on France. More generally, Amanullah's inner circle at the heart of the Afghan government manifested a certain reticence towards archaeological investigations. On the part of the Afghans responsible for such matters, the recurrent discussions regarding the division of finds do testify to a desire to retain a good part of the materials that were discovered, even if they were pre-Islamic. But this was not the same as a real official will to create a national heritage that was accessible to everyone.

At a meeting in Oslo in 1928 with the president of the Nobel Peace Prize committee, Alfred Foucher was delighted to declare that the Buddhas of Bamiyan had resisted the guns of the Muslim iconoclasts. Remembering the words of the twelfth-century Indian chronicler Kalhana about the fall of the Kabul Shahi kingdom, Foucher poured praise on Afghanistan's pre-Islamic remains: 'We never dreamed that Afghanistan, which passes today for one of the strongholds of Islam, had once been conquered then made part of Indian Buddhism. If all of this past has vanished and there remains nothing more for us, alas, than ruins, then at least those ruins are still there to attest to the historical reality of those past events.'

By the end of the 1920s, the world's gaze did finally turn towards Afghanistan after the fabulous discoveries at Hadda. In the words from 1929 of René Grousset, art historian and conservator at the Musée Guimet, the exhibition in Paris of the treasures of Hadda was an 'unex-

pected revelation of a new form of art, profoundly moving, almost incredible'.¹⁰³ This was also the moment of the first appearance of the initial volume of the *Mémoires de la DAFA*, which focused on Bamiyan.¹⁰⁴ Then, during the 1930s in Kabul, voices around the young king Zahir Shah (r.1933–73) called for the establishment of a common history of his people, a set of developments that is discussed in Senzil Nawid's chapter in this book.¹⁰⁵ And so, despite their only partly successful beginnings, the initiatives of Amanullah, the work of DAFA and the establishment of the Franco-Afghan high school sowed the seeds for the blossoming from the 1940s of a generation of Afghan national historians. Yet what we have seen in this chapter through the study of the founding period of the modern Afghan nation-state in the 1920s invites us to question any permanence in its manner of dealing with its past and heritage. For in this period, we have seen the difference between Western expectations and interests and those of the Afghan elites; the lack of formal historical education and even general learning among the local population; the absence of any real heritage policy; and the dominance of financial interests over matters of heritage. Almost a century after those first attempts to recover those ruins as historical patrimony, the Afghan people as a whole are yet to take ownership of their heritage.

FROM PATRIOT TO PORT-CITY POET

MAHMUD TARZI IN ISTANBUL

Thomas Wide

My city, Istanbul, is a manifestation of the lights of truth
 With mosque and drinking house both parcel and part
 The White Sea and the Black, Europe and Asia
 All have one being..

Mahmud Tarzi (1933)

Introduction

In August 1933, a marble column with text in Dari, English and Turkish was unveiled in south-west Kabul. The monument recorded the 'outstanding efforts' of a Turkish medical doctor named Kamil Rifki Bey, who had founded Afghanistan's first tuberculosis sanatorium on the site. The final line of text on this memorial to Turco-Afghan relations noted that it would stand 'as long as the world exists'. Although we will have to wait awhile to see if that prediction proves true, the monument still stands today, in the middle of a busy road where Toyota TownAce minivans wait

90. Amir Amanullah Khan eventually had the *mustawfi al-mamalik* murdered. But in Habibullah's time he was a powerful figure. See *Siraj al-Tawarikh* 3 (Kabul, 2011), *tatimma*, p. 344. A. C. Jewett, who seems not to have known his name and refers to him only as 'Mustofi-al-Mamalik', paints a vivid picture of Mirza Muhammad Husayn Khan's local authority in Kuhistan-i Kabul as well as his power in Kabul. See Jewett Bell (1948), pp. 27, 34, 43, 64, 119, 123, *et passim*.
91. *Siraj al-Tawarikh* 4, pt 1, p. 3.
92. *Ibid.*, pt 3, pp. 606–9.
93. *The History*, vol. 3, p. 868.
94. See e.g. *Siraj al-Tawarikh* 4, pt 3, pp. 606–9.
95. Sayyid Mahdi Farrukh, *Tarikh-i Siyasi-yi Afghanistan* (Tehran: Ihsani, 1371/1993 [originally published in 1314/1935]). For a longer discussion, see *The History*, vol. 1, pp. lxxxi–lxxxiv.
96. *The History*, p. lxxxiii.
97. McChesney (1999), p. 236.
98. Khil'atbari came in 1921 or 1922. He also was one of the people who blurred Mu'addib al-Sultan's work. Farrukh replaced him in 1926 and stayed for two years. Khil'atbari then returned in 1929, according to Adamec (1979), p. 20.
99. Stephanie Cronin, "An Experiment in Revolutionary Nationalism: The Rebellion of Colonel Pasyan, April–October 1921", *Middle Eastern Studies* 33, 4 (1997).
100. As is clear from what follows, Farrukh did not mean Hazaras when he used this term, although it was a term sometimes applied to them. Under his fifth entry for the word barbar, 'Ali Akbar Dihkhuda, *Lughat-nama* (Tehran: Mu'assasa-i Lughat-nama-yi Dihkhuda, 1372/1993), p. 3911 understands one of the meanings of the term as 'tribes living along the border of Iran and Afghanistan'. Ethnographic information from the period shows numerous Hazara and Barbari groups already living on the Iranian side of the border, displaced there by the campaigns against them in the early 1890s and carrying the names of their (Hazara) homelands (Day Kundi, Day Zangi, Bihsud, Jaghuri, etc.). See the index in Massoume Price, *Iran's Diverse Peoples: A Reference Source Book* (Santa Barbara: ABC-Clio, 2005).
101. Farrukh (1370/1992), pp. 252–4.
102. Mulla Fayz Muhammad Katib Hazara, *Nizhad-nama-yi Afghan* (ed. 'Azizullah Rahimi) (Qum: Isma'iliyan, 1373/1993–4).
103. McChesney (1999).
104. For his extensive coverage of the war against the Hazaras, see the index entries under 'Hazaras' in volume 6 of *The History*.
105. See for example, *The History*, vol. 1, pp. cvi–cviii.
106. *Siraj al-Tawarikh* 4, pt 3, p. 214.

4. ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE REIGN OF AMANULLAH: THE DIFFICULT BIRTH OF A NATIONAL HERITAGE
1. Ehsan-Ullah d' Afghanistan, *Le voyage d'Amān Ullāh roi d'Afghanistan, 1927–1928* (Paris: CEREDAF, 2005), pp. 215–16.
2. According to the former DAFA directors, (the late) Roland Besenval and Philippe Marquis, there appear to be no documents in the National Archives in Kabul concerning the early archaeological investigations of the 1920s.
3. The principal archival sources (all in Paris) which were consulted for this chapter are: the Société Asiatique (fonds Alfred Foucher); Archives du Ministère des Affaires étrangères; Musée Guimet (manuscript archives, including the notebooks of A. Godard: inv. 58875; the diary of J. Hackin 1924; and photographic holdings). Subsequent notes indicate primary documents that have been published in Annick Fenet, *Documents d'archéologie militante: La mission Foucher en Afghanistan (1922–1925)* (Paris: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 2010), hereafter Fenet (2010). Unless otherwise specified, all other sources cited in this article can be found in the Foucher papers.
4. Vartan Gregorian, *The Emergence of Modern Afghanistan: Politics, Reform and Modernization, 1880–1946* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1969), pp. 163, 171–2, 175; and Nile Green, "The Trans-Border Traffic of Afghan Modernism: Afghanistan and the Indian 'Urdusphere'", *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 53, 3 (2011), pp. 479–508.
5. Bodleian Library, Ms. Stein 339, f.178. On the first project in 1902 and its rejection by Habibullah in 1912, see Jeannette Mirsky, *Sir Aurel Stein: Archaeological Explorer* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), pp. 201–4 and 346.
6. Ehsan-Ullah (2005), p. 182.
7. Annick Fenet, "Paris–Athènes–Constantinople: Rivalités et collaborations archéologiques en Méditerranée orientale à l'aube du XX^e siècle", in Martine Poulain and François Queyrel (eds), *Éclats d'antiques: Sculpture et photographie: Gustave Mendel à Constantinople* (Paris: Armand Colin, 2013), pp. 43–55.
8. On this topic, see Nicole Chevalier, *La recherche archéologique française au Moyen-Orient, 1842–1947* (Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les civilisations, 2002); and Ève Gran-Aymerich, *Naissance de l'archéologie moderne* (Paris: CNRS Editions, 1998).
9. Maurice Pernot, *L'inquiétude de l'Orient II: En Asie musulmane* (Paris: Hachette, 1927), pp. 5–46.
10. For more details on the membership of the mission, see Fenet (2010).
11. Françoise Olivier-Utard, *Politique et archéologie: histoire de la délégation archéologique française en Afghanistan (1922–1982)* (Paris: Editions recherche sur les civilisations, 2003), pp. 35–44; Chevalier (2002), pp. 357–9; and A. Foucher, "Appendice inédit", in Fenet (2010), pp. 582–606.
12. Fenet (2010), pp. 42–82.

13. *Ibid.*, nos 72 and 92.
14. Annick Fenet, "De la Sorbonne à l'Asie: Routes orientalistes d'Ena Bazin-Foucher", *Genre et histoire* 11, 2/2 (2011) [special issue on *Voyageuses et histoire(s)*]: <http://genrehistoire.revues.org/index1441.html>
15. Fenet (2010), pp. 86-90, 110-20.
16. For example, Archives Guimet, Conférence Hackin 80; Fenet (2010), no. 246 and p. 559. On Bactria, see Paul Bernard, "L'œuvre de la Délégation archéologique française en Afghanistan (1922-1982)", *Comptes rendues de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres* (2002), pp. 1287-323.
17. Annick Fenet, "Perse, Afghanistan, Extrême-Orient: Politiques archéologiques françaises en Orient dans le premier quart du XXe siècle, d'après les archives de la Société Asiatique", *Les Nouvelles de l'archéologie* 126 (dec. 2011), pp. 60-64.
18. Pernot (1927) and Anonymous, "Is Afghanistan Closed? By a Danish Student", *Moslem World* 17 (1927), pp. 165-76.
19. Alfred Foucher (with the collaboration of Mme E. Bazin-Foucher), *La vieille route de l'Inde de Bactres à Taxila*, 2 vols (Paris: Les Éditions d'art et d'histoire, 1942-47), vol. 1, plate 1a (p. 161).
20. Fenet (2010), no. 285.
21. Pernot (1927), p. 26.
22. Godard, Carnet N, f.132.
23. For example, Raymond Furon, *L'Afghanistan: Géographie, histoire, ethnographie, voyages* (Paris: Librairie scientifique Albert Blanchard, 1926), pp. 60-64.
24. Captain René Bertrand, "De l'Inde à Téhéran en automobile par l'Afghanistan", *L'Illustration* 1 (1926), pp. 4-5, 7.
25. G. K. Nariman, "Afghanistan To-day", *Islamic Culture: The Hyderabad Quarterly Review* 1 (1927), pp. 252-8; and Godard, Carnet N, f.112. On Nariman, see Fenet (2010), p. 250.
26. *Journal asiatique* 202 (1923), pp. 354-68.
27. Fenet (2010), no. 125.
28. Maurice Fouchet, *Notes sur l'Afghanistan* (Paris: Éditions Maisonneuve Frères, 1931), p. 55. On the ambassador, see Fenet (2010), pp. 117-19.
29. Fenet (2010), pp. 100, 222-7 (no. 57) and 605-6. View of the exterior of the Bagh-i Bala in the Archives MAE: Album of Maurice Fouchet, photo AO27811.
30. Godard, Carnet N, f.165.
31. Anonymous (1927).
32. Fenet (2010), no. 57 and pp. 77-82, 101-3.
33. Fenet (2010), no. 96.
34. Godard, Carnet N, ff.124-30.
35. Fenet (2010), nos 96 and 102; and Sir George Macmunn, *Afghanistan: From Darius to Amanullah* (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1929), pp. 322-3.
36. Fenet (2010), no. 120.

37. Olivier-Utard (2003), pp. 93-4; and J. Buhot, *Bulletin de la Chambre de commerce franco-asiatique* 4, 1 (January 1928), special issue: *L'Afghanistan*, p. 42.
38. "Les nouvelles fouilles françaises en Afghanistan", *L'Illustration* 1, 9 (February 1929), pp. 130-33.
39. Fenet (2010), p. 97.
40. Fenet (2010), no. 237 and p. 97.
41. Cf. Foucher (1942-7), vol. 1, plate 2f (p. 162).
42. *Mémoires de la Délégation archéologique française en Afghanistan* 4 (1933), pp. 2-3.
43. Foucher (1942-7), vol. 1, plate 7c (p. 164).
44. Fenet (2010), pp. 94-5, 388-9, 395, 401, 421, 442 and fig.7 (p. 115).
45. Godard, Carnet N, f.161.
46. Journal of J. Hackin (1924), f.48.
47. Foucher's lecture (undated); Journal of J. Hackin (1924), f.36.
48. Foucher (1942-7), vol. 1, plate 1f (pp. 161-2); Fenet (2011); Fenet (2010), no. 57.
49. Foucher (1942-7), vol. 1, plate 12 (p. 166); Fenet (2010), figs 29-30, 32; Archives Guimet, photos 8117/18 here, fig. 13, with my thanks to Jérôme Ghesquière, Chief of the Photographic Archives' Department) and 817221/96.
50. For example, Foucher (1942-7), vol. 1, plates 8a (p. 164), 20d (p.168), 15d (p. 167); Fenet (2010), figs 18 and 33; and Archives Guimet, photo 817221/101.
51. See respectively Foucher (1942-7), vol. 1, plate 15a (p. 166), 28f (p. 171) and 16d (p. 167).
52. Fenet (2010), figs 16 and 28 and nos 251 and 252.
53. *Ibid.* no. 332.
54. Gregorian (1969), pp. 356-7. On mullahs as barriers to knowledge, see Anonymous (1927) and Fouchet (1931), pp. 177-8.
55. Foucher (1942-7), vol. 2, p. 398, s.v. 'Buddha'.
56. Fenet (2010), no. 14.
57. Macmunn (1929), pp. 322-3. Strictly speaking, the correct term is *but-shikan*.
58. *Bulletin de la Chambre de Commerce franco-asiatique* 4, 1 (January 1928), pp. 13-15. In 1930, Nadir Shah expressed similar regrets. See Andrée Viollis, *Tourmente sur l'Afghanistan* (Paris: Valois, 1930), p. 200. On the photographic warning, see Ehsan-Ullah (2005), pp. 212-13.
59. Raymond Furon, *L'Hindou-Kouch et le Kaboulistan. Contribution à l'étude géologique et géomorphogénique de l'Afghanistan* (Paris: L'Henriot, 1927), pp. 34-5. See also Fouchet (1931), pp. 61-70.
60. Viollis (1930), pp. 72-3, 81, 105-6.
61. For example, Foucher (1942-7), vol. 1, plate 15a (p. 166); and Fenet (2010), pp. 98, 321, 471.
62. Furon (1927), pp. 11-13.
63. This statement is based on the presentation of the state structure given in the Afghan publication of the period, *Afghanistan nouveau*.

64. F. Benoit, "Modern Education in Afghanistan under King Amanullah", *Visva-Bharati Quarterly* 7, 1 (1929–30), pp. 50–59; and [L. Ténébre], "Le collège français de Kaboul", *L'illustration* 1 (1928), pp. 80–81.
65. On Kuhzad, see the chapter in this volume by Senzil Nawid. On Akram, see Fenet (2010), p. 57, note 145. His book appeared as Mohammed Akram, *Bibliographie analytique de l'Afghanistan*, vol. 1, *Ouvrages parus hors de l'Afghanistan* (Paris: Centre de documentation universitaire, 1947).
66. Cf. the opposite opinion in Olivier-Utard (2003), pp. 44, 96–7.
67. *Journal asiatique* 202 (1923), pp. 354–68.
68. Godard, Carnet N, ff.179–82.
69. Macmunn (1929), p. 292.
70. See, for example, Furon (1926), p. 84.
71. Nariman (1927), pp. 257–8.
72. Paul Bernard, "Avant-propos", in Fenet (2010), p. 22; and *ibid.*, p. 94.
73. On the autocratic character of the regime, see Jens Christensen, "The New Afghanistan", *Moslem World* 16 (1926), pp. 349–56.
74. Benoit (1929–30).
75. For the photo, see Foucher (1942–7), vol. 1, plate 11b (p. 165).
76. Journal of J. Hackin (1924), f.47.
77. Foucher (1942–7), vol. 1, plate 15b (p. 166); and Fenet (2010), p. 435.
78. Fouchet (1931), pp. 81–2 and 105–6.
79. *Ibid.*, pp. 113–14.
80. D. M. Donaldson, "Modern Persian and Afghanistan Thinking", *Moslem World* 12 (1922), pp. 334–41; and, for example, "Le fils de l'Émir au lycée Michelet", *L'illustration* 1 (1922), p. 233.
81. Godard, Carnet N, ff.143–4: "The Amir unfortunately draws his inspiration from a photographic collection of Potsdam and Washington."
82. Pernot (1927), p. 26.
83. See, for example, Viollis (1930), p. 130.
84. *Souvenir d'Afghanistan: Kaboul—Kandahar—Galalabad—Laghmann—Pagman* (Paris, undated [1926–9?]). See Archives MAE: inv.30D59.
85. *L'Afghanistan nouveau: Son évolution historique, ses relations internationales, ses tendances politiques et économiques* (Paris, 1924).
86. *Ibid.*, pp. 53–61.
87. Alexander Burnes, *Travels into Bokhara, London, 1834*, 3 vols (London: John Murray, 1834); and *idem*, *Cabool: Being a Personal Narrative of a Journey to, and Residence in that City, in the Years 1836, 7, and 8* (London: John Murray, 1842).
88. I am grateful to Nile Green for identifying the magazine, of which two issues are conserved at the Bibliothèque de la Société Asiatique (Paris).
89. For example, *L'illustration* 1 (1928), pp. 55–8.
90. Green (2012).

91. Fenet (2010), no. 74 and fig.15.
92. The name of the stupa in question is not given. For comparison, see Foucher (1942–7), vol. 1, plate 32d (p. 173): Amir Habibullah at the Darunta stupa.
93. V. Forbin, "Dans l'impénétrable Afghanistan", *La nature* 2532 (14 October 1922), pp. 252–6.
94. Godard, Carnet N, ff.152–3. The amir gave the gift of another Persian manuscript to the British sovereign. See Ehsan-Ullah (2005), p. 161.
95. Apparently, though, the king finally did no such thing.
96. Archives du MAE: PA-AP 26 (Bonin), dossier 30: "Rapport sur le voyage en France du roi d'Afghanistan (23 janvier-8 février 1928)". Unless otherwise mentioned, the following descriptions rely on his report; on numerous contemporary articles in *L'illustration*; and on Ehsan-Ullah (2005).
97. The Salle Dieulafoy exhibited materials found in the excavations at Susa by Marcel and Jane Dieulafoy. See Ève Gran-Aymerich and Jean Gran-Aymerich, *Jane Dieulafoy: Une vie d'homme* (Paris: Librairie académique Perrin, 1991), pp. 139–80.
98. *L'illustration* 1, 9 (February 1929), pp. 130–33; and Archives Guimet, photo 9992–72.
99. Olivier-Utard (2003), p. 311.
100. Fouchet (1931), pp. 136–7.
101. Archives MAE: Rapport Bonin.
102. Fenet (2010), pp. 23, 124, 609.
103. Viollis (1930), pp. 229–35; and René Grousset, *Sur les traces du Bouddha* (Paris: Plon, 1929), pp. 89–90.
104. A. Godard, Y. Godard and J. Hackin (with additional notes by Paul Pelliot), *Les antiquités bouddhiques de Bâmiyân [Mémoires de la Délégation archéologique française en Afghanistan 2]* (Paris: G. van Oest, 1928). The third volume, on Hadda, was published in 1933. Confusingly, *Mémoires de la Délégation archéologique française en Afghanistan* 1, which gave a general presentation on the country and a detailed account of the excavations at Bactria, did not appear until much later due to the outbreak of World War II.
105. Gregorian (1969), p. 354.

5. FROM PATRIOT TO PORT-CITY POET: MAHMUD TARZI IN ISTANBUL

1. The phrase is from Andrew Watson, "The Arab Agricultural Revolution and its Diffusion, 700–1100", *Journal of Economic History* 34, 1 (1974), p. 21.
2. For a discussion of these figures, see Thomas Wide, *The Refuge of the World: Afghanistan and the Muslim Imagination, 1880–1922* (DPhil dissertation, Oxford University, 2014), ch.2. On an important spiritual leader who traveled from Ottoman lands