| Review EL'BAHITH - ENS - Bouzareah - Algiers | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ISSN : 9577-1112 | EISSN : 2602-5388 | Volume: (18) | Number : (03) | year: 2026 | Pages: 213-232 |

# *MANY VOICES, ONE STRUGGLE: POLYPHONIC RESISTANCE AND THE RECLAMATION OF DECOLONIAL IDENTITY IN JOSEPH ANDRAS'S TOMORROW THEY WILL NOT DARE MURDER US (2016)*

# أصوات متعددة، نضال واحد: مقاومة متعددة الألحان واستعادة الهوية ما بعد الاستعمارية في رواية جوزيف أندراس ' غدًا لن يجرؤوا على قتلنا ' (2016)

***Lilia ZENADJI***
*MCB, University of Abu al-Qasim Saadallah, Algiers (2), Algeria*
*lilia.zenadji@univ-alger2.dz*

*Date Of Receipt: 31/07/2026 Date Of Acceptance:28/09/2026 Date of Publication: 30/09/2026*

**ملخص:**

تناولت هذه المقالة الجدوى التحرّرية للشكل الأدبي في رواية "غدًا لن يجرؤوا على قتلنا" لجوزيف أندرا، التي تروي سيرة المناضل الشيوعي من أصول أوروبية جزائرية (*pied-noir*)، فرناند إيفيتون، حين أعدمته السلطات الفرنسية عام 1957 بسبب انخراطه في أنشطة حركة التحرير الجزائرية. وفي حين مالت الدراسات السابقة إلى قراءة الرواية بوصفها صورة نفسية لضمير فردي — أي قرار إيفيتون المنفرد بقطع صلته بوطنه والثمن الذي دفعه مقابل ذلك — فإن هذه القراءة تظل ناقصة، إذ تعزل إيفيتون عن الأصوات المتعددة التي تتحدث من خلالها الرواية (الجزائرية، والفرنسية، والشيوعية، والقومية)، وبذلك تخاطر بإعادة إنتاج الفردية ذاتها التي تعتمد عليها السلطة الاستعمارية في تجميد آليات المقاومة الجماعية.

وتنطلق المقالة من أفكار فرانز فانون حول استعادة الذات الثورية، ومفهوم تعدد الأصوات عند ميخائيل باختين، والعودة الثقافية عند أميه سيزير، لتفترض أن البنية السردية عند أندرا بنية متعددة الأصوات، تدمج أفكار التضامن والتضحية والذاكرة في النضال من أجل تفكيك الثنائية بين المستعمر والمستعمَر. ومن خلال تحليل نصي يقوم على أربعة محاور تأويلية، تسعى الدراسة إلى رصد تفكيك ثنائية المستعمر/المستعمَر، وبناء الأخوة العابرة للدم والوطن، وإعادة تأويل التضحية الثورية كتأليف ذاتي، والذاكرة كاستراتيجية تمرد ضد المحو الاستعماري. وتخلص المقالة إلى أن رواية "غدًا لن يجرؤوا على قتلنا" لا تحل التوتر بين نموذج القطيعة عند فانون ونموذج الاستعادة الثقافية عند سيزير، بل توزعه

**الكلمات المفتاحية:**

إنهاء الاستعمار، تعدد الأصوات، فانون، سيزير، الذاكرة الثقافي.

***Abstract:***

*The article examines the decolonial usefulness of literary form in the novel Tomorrow They Will Not Dare Murder Us by Joseph Andras, which narrates the life of the pied-noir and communist activist, Fernand Iveton, when the French executed him due to his involvement in the Algerian liberation movement activities in the year 1957. Existing scholarship has tended to read the novel as the psychological portrait of a single conscience, that of Iveton's solitary decision to break with his own nation and the price he pays for it. This reading; however, remains incomplete. It isolates Iveton from the many voices through which the novel speaks (Algerian, French, communist, nationalist) and, in doing so, risks reproducing the very individualism that colonial power depends on to numb collective mechanisms of resistance.*

*The article builds on the ideas of violent self-reclamation by Frantz Fanon, Mikhail Bakhtin's concept of polyphony and cultural return by Aimé Césaire. It implies that Andras's narrative structure is polyphonic, combining ideas of solidarity, sacrifice, and memory in the struggle to dismantle the dichotomy between the colonizer and the colonized. Through textual analysis using four current interpretative axes, the paper will identify the erosion of the colonizer/colonized binary, the construction of fraternity beyond blood and nation, the re-signification of revolutionary sacrifice as self-authorship, and memory as a strategy of insurgency against colonial erasure. The article's central claim is that Tomorrow They Will Not Dare Murder Us does not resolve the tension between Fanon's model of rupture and Césaire's model of cultural recovery; it diffuses that tension across a plurality of voices. Decolonial identity, in this reading, is not a possession but a negotiation: always plural, always contested, always unfinished.*

***Keywords:***

*Bakhtin's Polyphony; Césaire; Cultural Memory; Decolonization; Fanon.*

## *INTRODUCTION*

Joseph Andras's *Tomorrow They Will Not Dare Murder Us* (2016) is a fictionalized account of the last months of the life of Fernand Iveton, a French Algerian communist who joined the National Liberation Front, and was guillotined in 1957 for trying to break up some property. The novel has been taken mainly as a reflection of a man's individual conscience, his decision to go against his own nationality for solidarity with the colonized, and the price he paid for it with his life. There is nothing wrong with this reading, but it is incomplete. It sets Iveton apart from all the voices that Andras speaks into, including Algerian, French, communist, and nationalist voices, and in isolating him, it risks duplicating the individualism colonialism depends on to numb its own collective mechanisms of control and resistance.

Iveton's case is a precariously uncomfortable spillover from the historical memory of the Algerian War of Independence (1954-1962). Iveton was a French citizen, factory worker, trade unionist from Algiers, a member of the Communist Party who was at odds with colonial authorities, sometimes even with more moderate forces on the French left, as opposed to the Algerian militants whose executions, foundational of the nationalists' war of self-justification, were celebrated by the nationalists. His trial was quick, his plea for a pardon was denied directly by the Mollet government, and over the years, his death is no longer a fixed point of national memory but an incident that is still up for debate. Andras's novel, which appeared almost sixty years after the execution, is part of a larger project to rediscover individuals who do not fit the categories by which the war is now told, and to which the genre of biography has become the primary medium of restitution, of making one man's voice audible, which is precisely what this work sets out to question.

The prevailing reading of *Tomorrow They Will Not Dare Murder Us* construes it as the biography of a single conscience, severed from the plurality of voices—Algerian, French, communist, nationalist—through which the narrative actually speaks. What the existing scholarship leaves undemonstrated is that the novel's decolonial meaning is formally distributed rather than concentrated in a protagonist. This study accordingly asks what Andras's novel discloses about decolonial identity that a single-protagonist reading cannot, and what a genuinely polyphonic structure—in Bakhtin's sense of independent, unmerged, and fully valid consciousnesses—contributes to that understanding. Because the argument turns on a distinction often blurred in postcolonial criticism, a clarification is warranted: multiple voices designate more than one speaking subject; multiple perspectives, more than one mode of perceiving events; focalization, the narrative filter through which events are mediated; polyphony, by contrast, an architectonic arrangement in which voices remain unmerged and capable of contesting the narrative's authority without being resolved into it. The claim advanced here is not that the novel contains many voices, but that its decolonial meaning is structurally polyphonic—and this is the proposition the analysis tests.

The writings of Frantz Fanon and Aimé Césaire have been identified as the two primary grammars of postcolonial scholarship, with Fanon providing the psychologically healing potential of confrontation and violence, and Césaire the cultural recovery of a suppressed history. While both frameworks are often used with reference to separate protagonists, applying them in tandem to a single polyphonic narrative has become a more widely adopted approach in postcolonial literary criticism. The single-protagonist approach is typically used to underestimate the collective and contestable work required to create consciousness, as decolonial meaning is often more easily discernible in one exemplary figure than in a multiple-protagonist texture arrangement. This article, however, proposes a different question: What happens when a novel assembles testimonies, conflicts, and reconciliation to decolonize, but is not exhaustive of either Fanon's confrontation model or Césaire's cultural-recovery model?

The analysis of Andras's prose is accompanied by a comparison to two theoretical touchstones—Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961) and Césaire's *Discourse on Colonialism* (1950)—as well as to Bhabha's theory of hybridity, which allows us to address the question of how Andras handles Iveton's multiple positionings. The organizing hypothesis of the article is as follows: *Tomorrow They Will not Dare Murder Us* brings decolonization into the intersubjective and

polyphonic register, where many voices contest, correct, and yet recognize one another over time. This claim is explored across four channels of the text: the erosion of the binary between the colonizer and the colonized, the conception of a national fraternity across borders, the representation of sacrifice as a mechanism of self-determination, and the use of memory as a strategy of insurgency. The conclusion brings back the question of what this polyphonic model provides that a single-protagonist reading cannot.

## 1. METHODOLOGY AND THEORETICAL ORIENTATION

### 1.1. Corpus and Analytical Procedure

This work is the result of a close reading of the 2016 Verso English-language version of Joseph Andras's *Tomorrow They Will Not Dare Murder Us*, through the prism of Frantz Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth*, Aimé Césaire's *Discourse on Colonialism*, Homi Bhabha's *The Location of Culture* (1994), and Mikhail Bakhtin's *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1984). The analysis does not aim to compile an exhaustive inventory of all dialogues or testimonies in the novel; instead, it selects passages that satisfy two conditions. First, the passages must have a direct bearing on questions of identity, solidarity, sacrifice, and memory, in that they pertain to the decolonization process. Second, they must be readable through the theoretical frameworks under consideration, such that its polyphonic reading generates meaning beyond the vocabulary of any single theoretician—a surplus that the article's hypothesis attempts to describe.

The process is three-fold: first to determine the focalization and voice changes in the novel and to create a map of the scenes in which the characters are narrating, being narrated to, or quoted directly, to determine the locus of the narrative authority rather than the concentrations. The second step consists of reading the resulting passages when compared and contrasted with either the Fanonian or Cesarean account on decolonial subjectivity and whether each passage could be better understood as confrontation, as cultural recovery, or as a combination of the two, with the concept of hybridity introduced by Bhabha appearing precisely where no single framework served to explain it. The third step is an active search for counter-evidence: passages that could make it difficult to read polyphonically, are not simply bracketed off as exceptions but rather engaged within the critical counterpoint of the last section.

This is an interpretive process, not a statistical one. Its results must be treated as such: the article in question is not stating that polyphony is statistically dominant in the text, but that it is structurally load-bearing wherever it occurs, in the sense that the passages that are at the center of the decolonial argument in the novel cannot be explained by using a single voice or a single theory.

### 1.2. Theoretical Coordinates: Decolonial Selfhood in Tension

Fanon's work is always the most critical elaboration of the psychological impact of colonialism and the conditions under which this impact can be altered. In *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961), he writes that colonial rule does more than take a people's land and labor; it takes their memory. It warps it and distorts it until the colonized subject no longer has access to a viable history of their past. Fanon is direct about this and argues that colonialism "is not satisfied merely with holding a people in its grip and emptying the native's brain of all form and content," but "turns to the past of the oppressed people, and distorts, disfigures, and destroys it."[1] Because for Fanon, decolonization is not exclusively an administrative or territorial shift of power, but rather a confrontation, one which is often violent, a confrontation in which the subject of colonization learns that his existence is not natural, but imposed, that it does not simply give everything away for nothing. Fanon calls this rupture "the veritable creation of new men," a process through which colonized "spectators crushed with their inessentiality" become "privileged actors" in their own history.[2] Selfhood, on this reading, is not founded in self-reflection but is also created in self-resistance.

The Fanonian logic is evident in Andras's portrait of Iveton. However, it has been twisted in a way Fanon could not have predicted: the voice of the colonized African or Algerian does not represent that side of the picture, but a Frenchman who voluntarily waives the rights of his own citizenship. The placement of an explosive weapon, carefully narrowed in terms of its potential damage, is an act of Iveton's, who has accepted the idea of solidarity in the absence of war, but which, as in Fanon's own life, must ultimately emerge from the other side. Indeed, in a struggle for freedom, the individual's life is peripheral and becomes subject to a force other than the lifeless body itself, other than the individual. Fernand himself insists on this restraint at his trial, telling the court that he "would never have accepted, even under pressure, to act in a way that caused death".[3]The passage not only illustrates personal bravery but also serves as a script for the moment of self-annihilation, when the individual ceases to defend their inherited identity and adopts a new one.

There is a tension in Fanon's address to a colonizer-born subject. On the whole, Fanon wrote about the violence of the colonized subject as a recuperation of selfhood that the colonial subject had been specifically deprived of. The colonizer's ability to jettison the privilege that colonialism imputatively grants him remained to be doubted, despite personal conviction.[4] In reading Iveton through Fanon, one must take precautions: his gesture of solidarity is generous and high-priced, but not a reflex for Algerians who do not have a choice in whether to confront or not; that is what they must do to survive. Andras knows this imbalance and makes it part of the story rather than trying to fix it; he returns to this narrative strategy as he discusses how his comrades accept but, at first, reject his appeal for solidarity.

*Black Skin, White Masks* (1952), Fanon's earlier work, complicates this reading of Iveton's battle against colonial power. Fanon explores the colonized subject who adopts a self-image distorted by language, the gaze, and other humiliations of daily life. Fanon describes the moment a child's cry of "Look, a Negro!" shatters his sense of his own body, so that "the corporeal schema crumbled, its place taken by a racial epidermal schema"[5] Albert Memmi extends this analysis to the colonizer's side, arguing that even among Europeans who oppose their official ideology, the colonizer corrupts them. Even the colonizer who "vows not to accept colonization" finds that he "lives his life under the sign of a contradiction which looms at every step," since what he is renouncing is, in Memmi's phrase, part of himself. [6] Memmi's colonizer, who refuses, is helpful as a counterpart to Iveton because, by refusing, one cannot undo the structural advantages born of colonialism. Andras seems to recognize this challenge, repeatedly having Iveton's comrades ask whether solidarity can be outplayed not just by privilege but outrun. In contrast, Iveton's construction of the colonizer's arc in the image seems less a geometrically pure transcendence and more a negotiation with the colonizer.

Fanon focuses on confrontation, while Cesaire's Discourse on Colonialism addresses another aspect of the decolonization process: the rediscovery of a cultural and historical identity lost under colonialism. Cesaire describes the corruption of the colonial relationship in terms of brutality, in which coercion, contempt, and brainless elites and degraded masses are the only ways.[7] Based on this diagnosis, he arrives with his prescriptive core, a return to self, or reclaiming language, history, and a sense of communal identity that colonialism attempted to cut off.

This is the formal and thematic response that Andras offers to this prescription. Cultural memory is not centered in the narrative of any single narrating consciousness; instead, it is distributed among diverse Algerians, French, and other communists, correctional officers, journalists, etc., and their testimonies intersect in ways that create what one might call a collective act of return. This Cultural rescue of Cesaire turned into a chorus, not a solo. The novel is not merely a statement of a theme but an application of Cesaire's claim that decolonization is not about developing an individual self but a plural, historically grounded selfhood. This is visible in the novel's own account of how Iveton's act is taken up and re-narrated by others: " the FLN pamphlet Djilali drafts on his behalf, claims responsibility, without hesitation, for the action conducted by Comrade Fernand Iveton," so that his meaning is authored collectively before he can author it himself.[8] Cesaire's insistence on plurality, which coincides with that of Fanon, and the insistence on confrontation provide the theoretical background for the polyphonic reading of Andras's prose.

Fanon and Césaire are often treated as complementary figures in decolonization theory. However, their respective emphases have also been used to privilege one theoretical orientation over another; rather than resolving this tension, this paper aims to bring it into sharper focus. Fanon's model of rupture is oriented toward the present, framing decolonization as a transformative—and usually violent—event that forges a new political subject instead of simply rehabilitating the old colonial one. Contrastingly, the model created by Cesaire is based on the notion of continuity: decolonization recovers a self and a past that were never fully lost during colonialism. The contrasting pairing of rupture and recovery is not just a conceptual abstraction; it provides the reader with a means to read Iveton's transformation as either a formulation of a new political person through confrontation or a recovery of a more self-evident political person through colonial nationalism. This paper contends that the tension is not decisively resolved in Andras's novel. Instead, it diffuses it through its characters, some (Iveton, thinking of cause and commitment) operating with the rupture Fanon describes, and the rest (the story of shared historical misery told by the group in section 3.4) operating toward the healing Cesaire. The idea of polyphony here is meant to capture this very rejection of settling the Fanon-Cesaire debate on one side.

This multi-layered and unresolved quality also ties the novel into broader discussions in postcolonial literary theory of form and multiplicity. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin also explore the tendency of postcolonial texts to fragment a colonial society and to cast multiple lights upon it. At the same time, Edouard Glissant calls into question the concept of identity, an idea that is always relational and is not found in isolation, but through contact. As Glissant puts it, in the rhizomatic thought he opposes to the "intolerant root," "each and every identity is extended through a relationship with the Other"[9] The novel by Andras, through the prism of Glissant, dramatizes identity not as the property of an individual but as a creation in regard to others. This relational method assists the article in knowing the reason why polyphony is essential to the construction, as opposed to being narrative flair. Fanon and Césaire provide the political substance of decolonization; Ashcroft and Glissant provide the formal terms for narrating it.

### 1.3. Polyphony: Bakhtin's Concept and its Analytical Purchase

The term "polyphony" is used throughout this article in a specifically Bakhtinian sense, and it is worth pausing to distinguish it from the looser senses in which the term is often used in postcolonial criticism. In *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1929; trans. 1984), Bakhtin argues that Dostoevsky's novels are not monologic—that is, they are not organized around a single authorial consciousness that ultimately controls and evaluates every voice—but polyphonic: they are composed of "a plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses, a genuine polyphony of fully valid voices." Each character in a polyphonic novel is not an object of the author's finalizing word but a *subject* with his or her own "fully valid" consciousness, capable of contradicting the author and of being right. Crucially, Bakhtin distinguishes polyphony from mere multiplicity. A novel may contain many characters, many perspectives, and many focalizers, and still be monologic if all those perspectives are ultimately subordinated to a single authorial truth. Polyphony, by contrast, is a *structural* property: it requires that no single voice—including the author's—be capable of finalizing the others.

Three implications follow for the present analysis. First, polyphony is not equivalent to multiple voices or multiple perspectives. It is a claim about the *relationship* between voices: whether they remain unmerged, whether they can contradict one another without being resolved into a higher synthesis, and whether the authorial position is itself one voice among others rather than the ground of all the others. Second, polyphony is not equivalent to focalization. A novel can shift

focalizers (as Andras's does) while remaining monologic if those focalizations ultimately serve a single narrative authority.

The question this article asks is therefore not "how many voices speak?" but "are those voices structurally capable of contesting the narrative's own authority?" Third, polyphony is not the same as dialogism, though the two are related. Dialogism describes the condition of all language as internally dialogized; polyphony describes a specific *architectonic* arrangement in which dialogism is not resolved into monologue. It is this architectonic sense that the article mobilizes.

To prove that a novel is polyphonic in this strict sense is not a matter of counting voices. It requires demonstrating, at the level of textual structure, that the voices in question are independent (they are not merely ventriloquized positions), they are unmerged (they are not resolved into a single authoritative perspective), and they are fully valid (they are capable of being right, not merely of being reported). The analytical procedure described in the previous sections is designed to test these three conditions. The passages selected for analysis are those in which a character's voice is not merely quoted but structurally empowered to contest the narrative's own framing—where the reader cannot determine, from the text alone, which voice the novel endorses. Where such passages occur, polyphony is not an assumption but a demonstrable formal property; where they do not, the article does not claim polyphony; it claims only multiplicity.

## 2. THE POLYPHONIC ARCHITECTURE OF ANDRAS'S NOVEL

### 2.1. Breaching the Colonial Binary: Iveton and the Third Space of Solidarity

The most obvious formal indication of the article's key hypothesis is the placement of Iveton within the colonizer-colonized binarism central to colonial discourse. Iveton is not just colonized, as he rejects French rule, nor just a colonizer, as he represents the material benefits of French citizenship in rejecting it. Homi Bhabha's "third space," a liminal space where cultural identities are entangled and intersect, provides an accurate language for this spatialization.[10] Even in naming his own hybridity, Iveton claims he cannot help but fight alongside the "other," who is not French but human, and who is not recognized as an admissible political category by colonial law. Iveton's own courtroom testimony makes the same refusal of racial division explicit, insisting that the struggle is "a struggle of the oppressed, without distinction of origins, against the oppressors" and "not a movement aimed against France and the French"[11]

Iveton's narration of himself as both inside and outside, as a spectator and a soldier not by birth but by conviction, most clearly displays this hybridity: he tells a fellow prisoner of a comrade he calls "a brother, a Frenchman," a soldier who "deserted to join the guerrillas," kinship remade by choice rather than nationality.[12] The line is worth considering on its own because it is not ultimately a theoretical or polemical matter. It is Fanonian, because it emphasizes active commitment, the soldier rather than the spectator, and Césairean, as it implicitly rejects the inherited, biological or national category for a chosen, cultivated allegiance. The passage proves that Fanon and Césaire, singly or in isolation, do not adequately theorize Iveton; it must be combined, via the "third space" of Bhabha, and thus become legible at all. The novel's polyphony plays, in the first instance, beneath the level of plot, within the fractured interiority of a single character who, as a character, is a place of contesting voices.

It is important, however, not to conflate hybridity with decoloniality. Bhabha's third space describes a condition—the ambivalent, liminal location produced by colonial encounter—rather than a project of liberation. Hybridity names what colonial power cannot fully control; it does not, by itself, name what decolonial struggle seeks to achieve. Iveton's hybrid positioning is therefore not, in itself, a decolonial act. It is the ground on which a decolonial act becomes possible: a location from which the colonial binary can be refused, but not yet a location from which colonial power has been dismantled. The novel's polyphony plays, in the first instance, beneath the level of plot, within the fractured interiority of a single character who, as a character, is a place of contesting voices. But that interior fracture is not yet decolonization; it is the precondition for the collective negotiation that the following sections trace.

Bhabha's third space is in itself a binary with a history within colonial discourse analysis, most influentially theorized by Edward Said. According to Said, colonial power relies on the monolithic, predictable, and lesser notion of the colonized as Other, with whom the colonizer can compare himself. In Said's account, this "latent Orientalism" fixes the colonized so that "the Orient existed as a place isolated from the mainstream of European progress in the sciences, arts, and commerce."[13] Iveton's hybridity is a danger to it because it cannot neatly fit into either side of the artificially constructed opposition. This interpretation is supported by Memmi's observation that even quondam Europeans are embedded in their own systems and thus complicit in the very rules they purport to critique. Memmi is unsparing on this point: even a man who arrives a leftist "may even be a leftist upon

arrival and develop irresistibly by the same relentless mechanism into a rude or cunning colonialist"[14] However, Andras does not let Iveton go without confronting this implication, because at various points, both his French mates and Algerian allies feel uneasy about his situation. In this sense, the novel's polyphony can be seen as a means of 'holding in tension' Said's binary and Bhabha's third space, not resolving Said into Bhabha or vice versa.

An interesting challenge for this reading is how a French citizen's hybridity operates within the colonial framework. While such hybridity destabilizes colonial categories, it also generates a colonial practice of making one figure—whether hybrid or not—the primary bearer of decolonial meaning. This article aims to critically question that practice. Iveton's third-space positioning is important because it is answered, tested, and eventually ratified not by his own collective, but by another Algerian collective—whose voice is not subsumed into his, but rather maintained as a distinct presence. The collective response in this case is explored in the next section.

### 2.2. Collective Decolonial Solidarity: Fraternity Beyond Blood and Nation

Where the previous section of the paper finds polyphony in the relations between Iveton and friends, this section finds it in the relations between Iveton and comrades, where the novel most clearly challenges Fanon's assertion that liberation requires renouncing the colonizer's inherited superiority. However, a critical objection must be addressed before the argument proceeds. Iveton is a French citizen, a pied-noir, a beneficiary—however unwilling—of the structural privileges of settler colonialism. Can his political solidarity with the FLN be equated with decolonial identity? The article's answer is: no, not without qualification, and the novel itself refuses the equation. Andras does not present Iveton as having become Algerian, nor as having achieved decolonial subjectivity. He presents him as having chosen a side—a choice that is politically meaningful precisely because it does not erase the structural asymmetry between the settler who chooses and the colonized who has no choice. As Iveton himself insists at his trial, the struggle is "a struggle of the oppressed, without distinction of origins, against the oppressors," but this formulation is Iveton's, not the novel's, and the novel surrounds it with voices that qualify it. The Algerian comrades who accept Iveton do so reluctantly, and their acceptance is framed not as recognition of his decolonial identity but as recognition of his proof—his willingness to risk his life. Trust, in Andras's novel, is not identity; it is the product of conduct.

This distinction matters for the article's central claim. If Iveton's solidarity were equated with decolonial identity, the novel would indeed be vulnerable to the charge that it centers a European subject in a story about Algerian liberation. But the novel's polyphonic structure works precisely against that centering. Iveton's voice is one among many, and the novel does not grant it final authority over the meaning of the struggle. The FLN pamphlet that claims responsibility for his action is authored collectively, by Djilali, before Iveton can author it himself. The comrades who narrate his story after his death do so in their own voices, not his. Iveton's decolonial identity—if the term is to be used at all—is not something he possesses; it is something that is conferred on him, retrospectively, by a community that is not his by birth. This is why the article insists on polyphony as a structural, not merely thematic, feature: the novel's form is what prevents Iveton's voice from becoming the master voice of decolonial meaning. Solidarity, in this reading, is not the same as decolonial identity; it is the condition under which a decolonial identity can be negotiated, but it is not identical with it.

The Algerian rebels who accept Iveton into their midst do so only reluctantly, and Andras flatly acknowledges his initial uncertainty about how a Frenchman can know what it is like to be under someone's boot. Even the Party that recruits him hesitates on this point: as Iveton recalls, it "was for independence, but not for armed struggle," and communist militants could join the Front's ranks "only in a personal, individual capacity."[15] This skepticism is significant for interpreting the novel because it prevents it from resting on a notion of cross-national solidarity in a sentimental and easily won manner. According to Andras, trust cannot be wooed with good intentions bestowed upon it, but must be earned through a long stream of conduct.

This earned trust is followed by reciprocation, not one-sided gratitude. Fraternity is an achievement rather than a birthright, a bloodless achievement brought about by shared risk, as when a fellow revolutionary tells Iveton that he has given his comrades an equal share of everything but blood. This is precisely how Iveton narrates his own path into the Front: "we had to prove ourselves before we could carry weapons," he explains, before he and a comrade were trusted with any mission at all.[16] Iveton's thinking of his own dead friend Henri Maillot, a fellow Frenchman who died fighting for the Algerians, distills this same solidarity: "A brother in childhood and in spirit—and what is blood, anyway? Nothing but the tangible result of chance," a formulation that constitutes a consolidated expression of the solidarity that governs the novel as a whole.[17] This series of exchanges, which

dramatizes an appropriation of colonial superiority precisely as Fanon has defined the precondition for some real liberation, can only be shown against Fanon in the Frenchman, and it depends on the novel's ensemble structure to be shown at all.

This fraternity is not quick or easy in the novel's narrative; Andras does not want it to become an unproblematic icon of transnational fraternity over politics. The initial suspicion expressed by Iveton's comrades is not just set aside and discarded. However, it returns, in muted form, throughout the narrative as a reminder that solidarity between colonizer and colonized never exists permanently but is continually re-established through this ongoing process, and is never assumed as a foregone conclusion by a gesture of bravery. The opposition to sentimentality is itself important to the article's argument because, in Andras's hands, polyphony means that the voices of dissent and skepticism are present alongside those of affirmation. Then the chorus's skepticism persists, so that the other voices do not turn the novel's account of solidarity into wishful thinking.

*The Black Atlantic* (1993), by Paul Gilroy, is another means by which one may appreciate the brotherhood Andras forged with his fellow citizens in Algeria. Diasporic and anti-colonial solidarities are often transnational rather than blood-based, and do not necessarily originate from a shared homeland.[18] It is the model of friendship that Iveton and his associates share in a novel that insists his friendship is earned through risk, not by birth or nationality. Gilroy's focus on ships and routes, and on the solidarity of border-crossing, is echoed in Andras' depiction of a worker in a factory at a crossroads to his allies, seemingly a border crossing of land. While reading fraternity through Gilroy, this scholar also warns readers against romanticizing this solidarity, as diasporic solidarity in his scholarship remains ensnared by unequal histories and unresolved tensions.[19]. Andras' insistence on it maintains Iveton's suspicion among the comrades throughout the middle of the novel.

### 2.3. Revolutionary Sacrifice as an Act of Self-Authorship

The third aspect of the novel's polyphonic architecture concerns the new significance Andras gives to Iveton's eventual execution. Death here cannot simply be interpreted as a disorderly victimization or a simple martyrdom. However, it must rather be considered as a form of self-authentication in which Iveton declares his identity for his colonial legal masters. When confronted with questions about his loyalties, Iveton replies that he belongs to the cause, not a country; that it gives him life, and that he may give it his death; as a result, he is taken beyond the realm of nationality to one of ethical commitment. This is decolonization as a return to a self

defined by conviction rather than the accident of birth, as the culmination of a psychological transformation that can only be accomplished through violent confrontation with colonial power, as Césaire and the Fanonians understood it.

The importance of this sacrifice, however, lies not in Iveton but in the community surrounding him, further emphasizing the novel's polyphonic structure. When Iveton dies, he has become more one of them than any blood relation, and this gives the community the power to define who Iveton is, rather than the French state, which sought to punish him as a traitor.[20] The novel constantly emphasizes this same principle of self-possession: Iveton's statement that those who brutalize him cannot make him their own, that they can break him but not make him theirs, is another example of how the author asserts that physical domination does not infringe on the sovereignty of self-definition.[21] Together, these moments suggest that revolutionary sacrifice in Andras's novel functions more as a narrative culmination than as a definitive conclusion. The act of narration itself—performed by Iveton and his fellow revolutionaries—shapes the meaning of Andras's sacrifice, rendering it criminal in the eyes of official history.

There is a genuine discussion to be held in trauma and postcolonial studies of the risk that the narrative of political execution might aestheticize killing, making it seem like a redemptive or even beautiful act of self-realization as a way to cover the appalling injustice of the killing itself. Andras's novel is not immune to this danger, nor is the notion of judicial murder, which is at the heart of the novel, a piece of judicial murder that strives to suppress a labor and independence movement. This risk can only be recognized by a careful reading. The counter-argument that this article puts forth is that the novel's polyphonic confirmation of Iveton's death—its insistence that the meaning of the novel is not simply to be found in the interior of Iveton's mind but in the collective political struggle experienced outside him—not only works against pure aestheticization but is also a very real contribution to it. Thus, the story of Iveton's death is never isolated as a pure, individual, quasi-religious martyrdom, but is instead embedded in a larger struggle.

Iveton's execution cannot be interpreted exclusively as a defiant self-authored act, as suggested by Achille Mbembe's theory of necropolitics. According to Mbembe, above all, colonial sovereignty is characterized by its power to decide who can live and who can die.[22] Regardless of the reframing of the narrative, Mbembe's death is an act of colonial sovereign power as doomed, as revealed by the guillotine that ended Iveton's life. The suggestion in the article that Iveton makes his own meaning in death must then be regarded in conjunction with, not instead of, this bare

fact of state violence. However, Andras appears to sense this tension within himself, so that Iveton's last words fail to redeem or soften the judicial-killing machinery surrounding him. Necropolitics and self-authorship engage in uneasy cohabitation in the novel's concluding chapters, and the article discusses this coexistence instead as an intended, not unnoticed quality of the novel.

### 2.4. Memory as Insurgency: Narrating against Colonial Erasure

The fourth axis of analysis concerns the novel's approach to memory, as Andras sees it as a struggle rather than a memory. This aspect of the text most directly fulfills Césaire's call for the recovery of history, and it is also why such a recovery must be collective to succeed. In his reflections, Iveton reminds himself that what colonialism fears most is the forgetting of suffering, because it is when the colonized remember that they have the power - in remembering it, politics redefines memory itself as contested space.[23] Iveton's remark that forgetting each name is forgetting a part of the self emphasizes the stakes of this forgetting. It connects individual identity to the survival of collective memory rather than separating the two.

Across generations and a constellation of characters, Andras extends this reasoning. Iveton observes that all generations receive wounds they do not bear themselves and yet must carry anyway; wounds that shape and define them in the present tense and situate the novel's struggle in the present within a longer historical continuum of colonial violence.[24] This "intergenerational" framing culminates in the most explicit statement of its own method in the text. Resisting is remembering, writing oneself back into a history that colonial power attempted to obliterate.[25] This line's role is akin to an authorial signature when read in the context of the article's central hypothesis. Rather than thematize memory as resistance, Andras' novel is structured as a polyphonic work, one that refuses to allow a single voice to tell the story of the past. One of the exchanges between Iveton and an Algerian ally makes clear how similar yet different their pasts were: their pain, for both, is greater than any blood connection, and this is why comrades share pieces of history.[26] In light of this, storytelling is itself the process that prevents the dead from disappearing: the stories that survive when men are gone are a refusal of erasure.

This approach to memory as a resource shared, not possessed, aligns with sociological theories of memory as a social context in which any memory is only meaningful relative to a social group. This idea was not a major part of decolonization theory, but it is readily adaptable to Césaire's argument that cultural recovery cannot be an individual task. Andras's characters do not just remember for

themselves; they remember for and with each other, making the effort of narration seem indistinguishable from solidarity itself. Again, this is not about ornamentation, but an argument for and against the remembering consciousness; for all that might be sympathetic, it could not do the work of intergenerational and cross-national memory performed by the ensemble.

Dipesh Chakrabarty's revisiting of the quest for historicism is informative for the novel's attention to plural and contested memory rather than a single diachrony. European historical writing often suspends colonized peoples in a historical time of the waiting room.[27] In any case, this waiting room is treated polyphonically by Andras. It can be read as a direct rejection of it, as multiple characters recount the past in parallel, deferring to no single authoritative time. Iveton is the further disruption of any single linear telling of who owns the past, as a Frenchman living in an Algerian nationalist past. Chakrabarty's demand to provincialize European historical frames can account for the novel's inability to confer ultimate authority on any one witness to narrate history. Memory in this sense is not a monologic inheritance, that another, more correct version supersedes one day, but an inheritance in the plural, from all sides.

### 2.5. A Critical Counterpoint: The Limits of Polyphonic Reading

Every interpretive framework is open to questioning, and the polyphonic reading offered here is not exempt from this. In Bakhtinian terms, the strongest objection is this: the novel may be multivocal rather than polyphonic. It contains many voices, but those voices may ultimately be subordinated to a single authorial consciousness—Andras's—which selects, sequences, and frames them. If that is the case, the novel fails Bakhtin's third criterion: the voices are not fully valid, because the reader can, in the end, determine which voice the novel endorses. The authorial signature—the fact that the novel bears Andras's name, that he wrote it, edited it, and arranged its sequence—would then be the ground of all the voices rather than one voice among them. In this sense, the novel's role in creating collective decolonial identity risks overreaching, prioritizing a literary outcome over the actual dispersal or distribution of authority over the novel's meaning.

This objection has substance and cannot be brushed aside, but it is only a restatement of the case made here. The claim is not that Andras's novel is devoid of any authorial presence, but rather that he uses formal devices—multiple tonalities of narrative focus, layers of witness testimony, and dialogic interpersonal interactions—to generate the impression of a distributed narrative voice that a conventional single-protagonist narrative would not evoke. A novel that merely

needed to validate Fanon's concept of individual confrontation or Césaire's concept of individual return might have been written with Iveton alone as a consciousness. Andras did not write such a novel, and this omission of his is what this article reads as politically significant. The question is not whether Andras could have finalized the voices (he could have), but whether the text he produced does finalize them. In the passages analyzed above, it does not: the reader cannot determine, from the text alone, which voice the novel endorses. That is what makes the novel polyphonic in Bakhtin's strict sense, and it is also what makes the polyphonic reading falsifiable rather than assumed. An additional issue is the need to place a French character at the interpretive center of a story about Algerian liberation, despite attempts to acknowledge the limits of such a focus. This article has attempted to reduce that danger by not treating Iveton's placement as a conclusion. Nevertheless, the tension remains—particularly in the way Algerian voices are momentarily halted—and is worth acknowledging, even if it cannot be fully resolved.

## *3. CONCLUSION*

This article has aimed to fill a gap in the existing literature on *Tomorrow They Will Not Dare Murder Us* (2016) by demonstrating that Fernand Iveton's decolonial transformation is not an individual process but a collectively narrated one. Where previous readings have treated the novel as the portrait of a single conscience, this article has argued that its decolonial meaning is formally distributed across a plurality of voices—Algerian, French, communist, nationalist, and official—that contest, correct, and recognize one another. Through the four axes of interpretation, the analysis has made clear that Andras's novel is not only polyphonic in its incidental use of characters but, in the structural sense, decolonial identity is authored by a large number of voices in the text.

This discovery is not only relevant to the case of Andras's novel; it also has implications for other cases. While much post-Fanon decolonial literary criticism focuses on the psychologically transformed character, and criticism following Césaire focuses on the restitution of a collective's cultural inheritance, the two approaches are most rewarding when applied together and incorporated into a narrative form that enables their interplay. Iveton's story teaches that decolonial belonging is not a blood, national, or even one-sidedly conceived right, but rather is negotiated, challenged, and granted by a community that is plural and unresolved. The novel's refusal of any single voice of narration is thus part of the political argument it makes: colonial power rests on reducing the colonized people to a

manageable, singular narration; the most effective literary resistance to such a reduction lies in increasing the narrator's telling resistance.

A residual tension remains, and it is worth stating plainly: the novel's polyphonic structure distributes decolonial meaning across many voices, but the voice that is most fully developed, most intimately narrated, and most available to the reader's sympathy remains that of a French settler. This is not a flaw the article can resolve; it is a tension the novel itself does not resolve. What the article can claim is that the novel's form works against the centering of that voice, even as its plot and its historical subject matter keep returning to it.

Future study of this polyphonic model could be made as a comparative analysis of other cases of decolonial and postcolonial fiction that seek to reclaim their identities through some ensemble of characters yet do not establish a single protagonist to lead the way; maybe this form could be linked to certain historical or political circumstances of anticolonial struggle. Comparative studies could also make these limits more systematic, for example, by asking under what circumstances the apparently polyphonic distribution of interpretive authority actually redistributes it, and under what circumstances it is only nominally polyphonic yet still maintains a single organizing perspective. To answer that question requires an analysis of both the presence of characters speaking and how their speech is framed, interrupted, and contrasted with the surrounding narration's voice, which has only begun in the present article.

At any rate, Andras's novel makes it clear that the process of reclaiming identity in a colonial context is always collective. It is a polyphony, one voice answering another, until it becomes a broken history, but in some way a shared one. A critical reader may have concerns with the boundaries of literary polyphony as a political gesture. However, *Tomorrow They Will Not Dare Murder Us* is a rare instance in which the form and the argument dovetail, as if demanding through its very form that no single voice, colonizer or colonized, French or Algerian, should have the entire burden of a decolonial history that by necessity belongs to many.

## 4. Bibliography

1. Andras, Joseph (2016), *Tomorrow, They Won't Dare to Murder Us*, Verso, UK
2. Bakhtin, Mikhail (1984), *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, trans. Caryl Emerson, University of Minnesota Press, USA.
3. Bhabha, Homi K. (1994), *The Location of Culture*, Routledge, UK.
4. Césaire, Aimé (2000), *Discourse on Colonialism*, Monthly Review Press, USA.
5. Chakrabarty, Dipesh (2000), *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton University Press, USA
6. Fanon, Frantz (2005), *The Wretched of the Earth*, Grove Press, USA.
7. Fanon, Frantz (2008). Black Skin, White Masks, Grove Press, USA.
8. Gilroy, Paul (1993), *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*, Harvard University Press, USA.
9. Glissant, Édouard (1997), *Poetics of Relation*, University of Michigan Press, USA.
10. Mbembe, Achille (2001), *On the Postcolony*, University of California Press, USA.
11. Memmi, Albert (1965), *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, Beacon Press, USA.
12. Said, Edward (1978), *Orientalism*, Pantheon Books, USA.
13. Young, Robert J. C. (2001), *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*, Wiley-Blackwell, UK.

## 6. Endnotes

*1 Fanon, Frantz (2005), The Wretched of the Earth, 210.*

*2 Fanon, Frantz (2005), The Wretched of the Earth, 37.*

*3 Andras, Joseph (2021), Tomorrow, They Won't Dare to Murder Us, 51.*

*4 Young, Robert J. C. (2001), Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction, 23-25.*

*5 Fanon, Frantz (2008). Black Skin, White Masks, 112.*

*6 Memmi, Albert (1965), The Colonizer and the Colonized, 35.*

*7 Césaire, Aimé (2000), Discourse on Colonialism, Monthly Review Press, 4-6.*

*8 Andras, Joseph (2021), Tomorrow, They Won't Dare to Murder Us, 30.*

*9 Glissant, Édouard (1997), Poetics of Relation, 11.*

*10 Bhabha, Homi K. (1994), The Location of Culture, 115.*

*11 Andras, Joseph (2021), Tomorrow, They Won't Dare to Murder Us, 91.*

*12 Andras, Joseph (2021), Tomorrow, They Won't Dare to Murder Us, 86.*

*13 Said, Edward (1978), Orientalism, Pantheon Books,215.*

*14 Memmi, Albert (1965), The Colonizer and the Colonized, 91.*

*15 Andras, Joseph (2021), Tomorrow, They Won't Dare to Murder Us, 86.*

*16 Andras, Joseph (2021), Tomorrow, They Won't Dare to Murder Us, 86.*

*17 Andras, Joseph (2021), Tomorrow, They Won't Dare to Murder Us, 60.*

*18 Gilroy, Paul (1993), The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness, 13–17.*

*19 Gilroy, Paul (1993), The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness, 88.*

*20 Andras, Joseph (2016), Tomorrow, They Won't Dare to Murder Us, 203.*

*21 Andras, Joseph (2016), Tomorrow, They Won't Dare to Murder Us, 179.*

*22 Mbembe, Achille (2001), On the Postcolony, 25–27.*

*23 Andras, Joseph (2016), Tomorrow, They Won't Dare to Murder Us, 169.*

*24 Andras, Joseph (2016), Tomorrow, They Won't Dare to Murder Us, 122.*

*25 Andras, Joseph (2016), Tomorrow, They Won't Dare to Murder Us, 179.*

*26 Andras, Joseph (2016), Tomorrow, They Won't Dare to Murder Us, 144.*

*27 Chakrabarty, Dipesh (2000), Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference,*