

The Citizens of 1946: Lamine Guèye, Marius Moutet, and French Colonial Reform on the Road to Decolonization

Undergraduate Thesis

Presented to the Department of History
Columbia University in the City of New York

6 April 2016

Wallace Teska

Seminar Advisor: Professor Rebecca Kobrin

Second Reader: Professor Mamadou Diouf

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project has undertaken a long journey, and has immensely benefited from feedback from numerous individuals at many stages.

I would first like to thank my Second Reader, Professor Mamadou Diouf, my Advisor, Professor Rebecca Kobrin, and the members of my Thesis Seminar for their unwavering support and encouragement of my project. I am greatly indebted to their willingness to read and offer comments on my innumerable drafts, regardless of length or completeness. They pushed me to consistently improve my writing and clarify my arguments.

I owe special thanks to Professor Emmanuelle Saada, who aided me at the very beginning of this process. Although my thesis has changed greatly from the first prospectus, it was from these early brainstorming sessions that I formulated the base of this paper. I am incredibly grateful for her advice and guidance, which have greatly shaped this project.

Research at the *Archives nationales d'outre-mer* in Aix-en-Provence and the *Archives nationales de France* at Pierrefitte-sur-Seine was made possible by grants from the Columbia University Department of History's President's Global Innovation Fund Fellowship, the European Institute of Columbia University, and the Beesen Global Research Fellowship. I would additionally like to thank Professors Susan Pedersen and Charly Coleman for their instrumental aid during this phase of my journey and their unrelenting support of undergraduate historical research.

Lastly, I would like to thank my friends and family for their unending emotional and intellectual support during this often-stressful, but enjoyable, year.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
The Postwar Structural Reform of Empire	4
Bringing Opposing Voices into Conversation	8
Chapter I: Terminology in the French Empire	11
Chapter II: Marius Moutet’s Emancipation through Attraction	16
From Fraternal Solidarity to the Common Mold of Citizenship	19
Customary Law and the Debate over Assimilation Politics	24
<i>Libération</i> : Transcending Theory	27
Chapter III: Lamine Guèye, Negritude, and the Right to Vote	29
Lamine Guèye’s Politics and Negritude	32
Lamine Guèye and Senghor during the World War	35
The Promises of the Brazzaville Conference	37
The <i>Sénégalaises</i> and Lamine Guèye’s Conception of Citizenship	40
Chapter IV: The Constituent Assemblies and the <i>Loi du 7 mai</i>	44
The French Union: Fraternity in Difference	44
The Formulation of the Citizens of 1946	49
French Union Citizenship and the <i>Double Collège</i>	54
The Lasting Ambiguity of the <i>Loi Lamine Guèye</i>	58
Conclusion	60
Works Cited	66

INTRODUCTION

Beginning on the 1st of June 1946, all inhabitants of the overseas territories (including Algeria) have the quality of citizen, of the same title as French nationals from the metropole and overseas territories. Specific laws will establish the conditions under which they will exercise their rights as citizens.¹

The *Loi Lamine Guèye*, reproduced above, was the product of a convergence of often-antithetical political beliefs and ideals. Proposed by West African-born Lamine Guèye, yet ratified by an overwhelmingly metropolitan Constituent Assembly in Paris in the spring of 1946, the theoretical meanings and practical applications of the law differed depending on the party speaking.² While African delegates claimed the law provided an absolute equality of rights, especially pertaining to voting, metropolitan delegates dismissed the *Loi Lamine Guèye* as a largely symbolic measure, thereby reinforcing the divide between the colonizer and the colonized. So why, and how, did both parties agree upon this singular law, which was approved unanimously without debate?³ And what can this tell us about the changing dynamic of imperialism during the postwar period? The core questions on both sides: Was the “quality of citizen” referenced truly the same as that of “French nationals,” and what rights were attached to this new citizenship?⁴

¹ *L'Assemblée nationale constituante de la Gouvernement Provisoire de la République Française*, Loi n° 46-940, 7 mai 1946.

² The term “metropolitan” is meant to signify individuals born in continental France, not in the overseas territories. The use of the word “national” or “French” is problematic as some individuals born outside of metropolitan France were nonetheless considered French, citizens, and nationals. Additionally, the word “metropolitan” has racial as well as cultural components, signifying Caucasian individuals whose families hailed from continental France. See discussion in Chapter I. The First and Second National Constituent Assemblies (*Première et Deuxième Assemblées nationales constituantes*) met from 1945 to 1946 directly after World War II and were responsible for the drafting of a new French Constitution to replace the Constitution of the Third Republic. In American English the term “Constituent Assembly” is best understood to be equivalent to a Constitutional Convention where delegates were, usually, popularly elected. These Assemblies produced the Constitution of 19 April 1946, which was ultimately rejected by popular referendum, and the adopted Constitution of 27 October 1946, which was followed by the first elections of representatives to the National Assembly under Fourth Republic on 10 November 1946.

³ Evidence that the law was passed quickly and without debate can be found in the *Procès Verbaux* of the First Constituent Assembly in J.O. A.N. No. 56 de 1946, Pg. 2274.

⁴ Unless otherwise noted, all translations from French sources, or of French terminology, are my own.

To find the theoretical origins of the *Loi Lamine Guèye*, one must look before World War II to the political development of the factions involved in the law's genesis. This thesis is a close examination of two groups: Marius Moutet and the metropolitan "colonial humanists," and Lamine Guèye and African delegates, including Léopold Sédar Senghor, Félix Houphouët-Boigny, and Aimé Césaire, who were sympathetic to the ideology of Negritude.⁵ Dividing representatives of the Constituent Assemblies into two groups, however, does not mean all their beliefs were dichotomous. As no one in 1946 was seriously considering absolute political independence from the French Empire as a viable option, every individual discussed in this study believed in the value of French Republicanism and advocated for reform from within, not through extra-parliamentary means.⁶ Consequently, both groups worked together to create a solution to widespread dissatisfaction with colonial rule. Interestingly, both parties believed the solution lay in redefining citizenship. This preoccupation brought about the conception of the *Loi Lamine Guèye*.

⁵ Marius Moutet was the *Ministre des Colonies* (Minister of the Colonies) under the *Front Populaire* during the interwar period and *Ministre de la France d'Outre Mer* (Minister of Overseas France) during much of the Constituent Assemblies. "Colonial humanists," refers to Gary Wilder's conception of a "colonial humanism" which evolved during the interwar period, and specifically under the *Front populaire* administration of Marius Moutet. "Colonial humanism" was a "strategy and method of rule" in which colonial reformers proposed humanistic policies, focused on improving the social conditions of colonial peoples. See Gary Wilder, *The French Imperial Nation-State: Negritude and Colonial Humanism between the two World Wars* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 76-81. "Colonial humanism" will additionally be discussed in depth in Chapter II of this essay. Additional Note: Although Césaire was the deputy representing the Caribbean possession Martinique, he is one of the founding members of the Negritude (*Négritude*) movement and acted in solidarity with his African colleagues during the Constituent Assemblies. Works that discuss Negritude and Pan-Africanism's influence on these delegates include, to name a few, Irving Leonard Markovitz, *Léopold Sédar Senghor and the Politics of Negritude* (New York: Atheneum, 1969) and "The Political Thought of Blaise Diagne and Lamine Gueye: Some Aspects of Social Structure and Ideology in Senegal." *Présence Africaine* 72 (1969): 21-38, Reiland Rabaka, *The Negritude Movement: W.E.B. Du Bois, Leon Damas, Aimé Césaire, Léopold Senghor, Frantz Fanon, and the Evolution of an Insurgent Idea* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2015). Although Negritude took many shapes and forms, undoubtedly influenced by core individuals responsible for its development, it can be best described as the ideological and cultural solidarity of a "black race." Negritude as an ideology and political philosophy will be discussed in depth in Chapter III of this essay.

⁶ This was because the collapse of the French Empire and decolonization was not inevitable after WWII. See: Catherine Coquery-Vidrovitch, "Nationalité et Citoyenneté en Afrique Occidentale Française: Originaires et Citoyens dans le Sénégal Colonial," *The Journal of African History* Vol. 42, No. 02. (2001), 303.

While it is true that the immediate postwar witnessed an era of “revolutionary and fluid context” in which the metropole was willing to negotiate its relationship with the colonies, this merely created an opportunity to push for radical reform.⁷ Both the colonizer and the colonized saw redefining citizenship as a tool to improve the structural defects of the French Empire’s political system because of precedents from the interwar period. Reforming citizenship had been on the minds of African and metropolitan delegates alike for years, if not decades, beforehand: West African delegates, recognizing this revolutionary context with a spirit of opportunism, sought to radically revise the engrained legal and political system of the French Empire.⁸ These revisions were often achieved through the manipulation of colonial lexicon to match fixed goals. In the debates surrounding the negotiation of France’s relationship with its colonies, both metropolitan and African delegates consistently redefined terms in order to bolster their own perspectives.

This often-confusing manipulation of terminology led to the ambiguous wording of the *Loi Lamine Guèye*. While both parties wanted to redefine citizenship, each had its own vision. Remarkably, leaders on both sides initially saw this singular law as the embodiment of their own political platforms. The law was thus the product of a conflation of two distinct political philosophies. Only through examining the generation of these philosophies, and the reason for their convergence in the postwar, can one grasp why the law was nearly fated to fail to be implemented in a manner satisfactory to the inhabitants of the French colonial empire. In this manner, the debates surrounding the *Loi Lamine Guèye* illustrate an overlooked relationship between the metropole and colonies, highlighting the importance of African politicians in determining the internal reform of the empire.

⁷ James E. Genova, “Constructing Identity in Post-War France: Citizenship, Nationality, and the Lamine Guèye Law, 1946-1953,” *The International History Review* 26, 1. (2010), 60.

⁸ Ibid.

The Postwar Structural Reform of Empire

The structural reform of empire after World War II was not a uniquely French phenomenon. The creation of the French Union under the Constituent Assemblies points to an overarching evolving relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. The French, much like the British, utterly relied upon their colonies for economic and military support during and after World War II. In a time of relative central weakness, colonial peoples were able to express their grievances with empire and demand reforms in a parliamentary setting. Antithetical to the romanticized interpretation of anti-colonialism as a violent struggle from oppression, this relationship characterized by open debate and discussion exemplified European imperialism between World War II and decolonization. However, the demanded reforms were not generated solely from the experience of war; rather, the war allowed for the airing of long-felt grievances. African delegates, who pushed for more reforms than any other group in the Constituent Assemblies, saw constitutional reform as an opportunity to advocate for their long-held political beliefs. The *Loi Lamine Guèye* was a product of aired grievances concerning equal rights and citizenship and, thus, a product of this seldom addressed postwar imperial relationship. Its creation and implementation is therefore symbolic of a larger, rarely discussed, historical pattern: the failure of colonial powers to earnestly address the concerns of colonial peoples and the inevitable radicalization of colonial demands due to these failures on the road to decolonization.

Few scholars have written on the *Loi Lamine Guèye*. Most notable, perhaps, is the doctoral law thesis of Doudou Thiam, a Senegalese student at the University of Paris. Writing only five years after the debates on the *Loi Lamine Guèye*, Thiam's account remains the only piece of known legal or historical literature focusing specifically on the trajectory of the law under the Constituent Assemblies. However, as close ally of Lamine Guèye after the

independence of Senegal, lauding him for attempting to better Africans' political standing, Thiam's work is innately biased.⁹ Additionally, his conclusions were limited both by publication date and frame of reference. Writing in the early 1950s, Thiam did not have access to confidential telegrams or briefs from the period of the Constituent Assemblies or even decades before 1945-46. Ultimately, as a law thesis, Thiam's work did not focus on the interaction of colonial and anticolonial philosophies in the theoretical realm. Instead, his work used a cause and effect interpretation of law, looking primarily at implementation rather than drafting. Thiam, therefore, did not link the *Loi Lamine Guèye* to prewar political philosophy, or explain how the convergence of these philosophies was responsible for the confusion surrounding the interpretation of the law.

Frederick Cooper also offers a coherent and thorough examination of the citizenship debates under the National Constituent Assemblies.¹⁰ His analysis, while a remarkable synthesis of the documentation from the postwar era, fails to route the direct connections with the political philosophies of the interwar period. Although Cooper references Lamine Guèye and Senghor's Negritude, along with Moutet's *Front populaire* colonial office, in passing, his work does not explain how the interaction of these specific political philosophies under the Constituent Assemblies led to the *Loi Lamine Guèye*. Cooper describes the tenuous interactions between African and metropolitan delegates, however, he does not explicitly outline the political and philosophical backgrounds of the leaders whose arguments in the Constituent Assemblies he examines. Thus, his approach does not go far enough in explaining the complexity of postwar colonial interactions. By attaching individuals to certain political philosophies, the ambiguity of

⁹ Amady Aly Dieng, *Lamine Guèye: une des grandes figures politiques africaines, 1891-1968* (Dakar, Senegal: L'Harmattan Sénégal, 2013), 150 and Doudou Thiam, "La portée de la citoyenneté française dans les territoires d'outre-mer" (Doctoral law thesis, Université de Pontiers, Faculté de Droit, 1951), 98.

¹⁰ Frederick Cooper, *Citizenship between Empire and Nation: Remaking France and French Africa, 1945-60* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014).

the *Loi Lamine Guèye* becomes clear. In this instance, competing interests led to the drafting of a singular law. While both Cooper's book and Thiam's doctoral thesis explain the "how," they neglect to unveil a significant portion of the "why" behind the passing of the *Loi Lamine Guèye* that can only be revealed by analyzing the prewar political philosophies of both groups and displaying their interaction in the Constituent Assemblies.

This study is an explication of the interaction between Lamine Guèye and Léopold Senghor's interpretations of Negritude and Marius Moutet's "politics of emancipation."¹¹ The intermingling of these competing philosophies in 1945-46 demonstrates that World War II was not the origin for instigating change; rather, the events of the war, including the reformist propositions of the 1945 Brazzaville Conference, permitted the ratification of policy seen as the natural end of interwar philosophies.¹² The war was a catalyst for reaching the end goal of each political philosophy, not an inspirational moment prompting the complete revision of previous attitudes: it was a tool to provide rationale not revelation.

Some historians believe the revision of French citizenship in the postwar and the creation of the *Union française* (French Union) were owed merely to the weakness of the metropole relative to its colonies after the war.¹³ France was economically dependent on its colonies after the war, as Cooper argues, and was desperate to retain them for economic benefit and political bravado.¹⁴ Faced with fresh resistance to imperialism by the United States, Soviet Union and the newly minted United Nations, the French sought to redefine their empire. Therefore, in Cooper's opinion, parliamentary reform of the immediate postwar period sought to change little on the

¹¹ Moutet's "politics of emancipation" can be loosely defined as a variation of Wilder's "colonial humanism" in which the colonial administration advocated for colonial peoples to, at least superficially, have a voice in government. This concept will be discussed in Chapter II.

¹² The Brazzaville Conference and its effect on the actors participating in the Constituent Assemblies will be discussed at the end of Chapter III.

¹³ Cooper, *Citizenship between Empire and Nation*, 39.

¹⁴ Eric Jennings, *Free French Africa in World War II* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 251.

ground as it was simply a charade to maintain political and economic capital. To be sure, little actual political development transpired from the reforms under the Constituent Assemblies.¹⁵ However, this project intends to explain why so little changed through examining the political climate lingering in France from the prewar era, notably the conception of what Gary Wilder terms “colonial humanism,” or a “strategy and method of rule” in which colonial reformers proposed humanistic policies focused on improving the social conditions of colonial peoples.¹⁶

This thesis accordingly comes into conversation with an opposing branch of historiography that views the *Loi Lamine Guèye* as a creation of World War II: a well-intentioned reward of sorts for colonial peoples’ service during the war. Championed by scholars such as James E. Genova and Eric Jennings, this approach views wartime as a powerful ideological catalyst.¹⁷ Genova argues that after being occupied by Nazi Germany for the vast majority of World War II, France no longer saw the economic or political domination of colonial peoples as acceptable.¹⁸ The parliamentary reforms of the years following World War II, therefore, were corrections for former wrongs. While this approach seems to superficially explain the reformist attitude that prevailed under the Constituent Assemblies, it neglects to examine prewar precedents for the same reforms characterized by manipulation, not generosity, on the part of the French.

It is necessary to examine interwar political philosophy not only to explain why the metropole sought reform, but also to explain why African delegates countered with their own reforms. While few historical accounts portray the presence of African delegates in the

¹⁵ Cooper particularly presents his point in reference to the institution of the *double collègue*, which will be discussed in Chapter IV.

¹⁶ Wilder, *The French Imperial Nation-State*, 76-81.

¹⁷ James Genova, “Constructing Identity in Post-War France,” 57 and Eric Jennings. *Free French Africa*.

¹⁸ Gary Wilder, *Freedom Time: Negritude, Decolonization, and the Future of the World* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015), 128.

Constituent Assemblies, recognizing their significant role reveals that history presenting the *Loi Lamine Guèye* as purely a devise of colonial manipulation is incomplete.¹⁹ Including voices that have been wrongly viewed as contextually insignificant removes responsibility from African delegates in the metropole's manipulation of its colonies. Additionally, it helps explain the arc of African political intellectualism and the Negritude movement: from Senghor's rejection of European culture, to African political elites' embrace of republicanism, to Fanon's theory on violence. Highlighting the attempts of Lamine Guèye and his compatriots to promote positive change through the development of their politics and interactions with the metropolitan elite helps to declassify them as pocketed colonial sympathizers and rebrands them as champions of equal rights.

Bringing Opposing Voices into Conversation

In order to comprehend the shifting dynamic of imperial relations after World War II, one needs to understand the political backgrounds of the metropolitan and colonial parties represented in the postwar Constituent Assemblies. Accordingly, this study first analyzes the metropolitan perspective, then the African, and finally coalesces the two in a close reading of the debates of the First and Second National Constituent Assemblies. However, first and foremost, a section provides a brief outline of the development of colonial terminology from 1915 to 1946. Focusing on the definition and evolution of these terms helps portray the terminological reassessment that was so central to the reforms of the Constituent Assemblies.

¹⁹ Some exceptions including sections of Cooper's *Citizenship between Empire and Nation*, Frederick Cooper, "Alternatives to Nationalism in French West Africa, 1945-60," in Marc Frey and Jost Dülfer, eds., *Elites and Decolonization in the Twentieth Century*, 110-37. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011 and Michael C. Lambert, "From Citizenship to Négritude: 'Making a Difference' in Elite Ideologies of Francophone West Africa." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 35, 2 (April 1993): 239-262.

The first voice we hear appears in the second chapter, which explicates the development of metropolitan interwar colonial political philosophy in an attempt to explain how this philosophy led to the *Loi Lamine Guèye* and the *Union Française*. As stated, this topic has traditionally been approached through the lens of the aftermath of World War II: the unacceptability of empire, rewarding colonial subjects for wartime service, and forced decolonization by the United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Nations. This analysis, by contrast, will focus heavily on the political philosophy of Marius Moutet, the *Ministre des Colonies* (Minister of the Colonies) during the interwar period and *Ministre de la France d'Outre Mer* (Minister of Overseas France) during much of the Constituent Assemblies. Examining Moutet's Ministry under the *Front Populaire* (Popular Front) and after World War II shows that the theoretical groundwork for the *Loi Lamine Guèye* was laid before the war, not afterwards.

The following section is dedicated to the perspectives of West African delegates to the Constituent Assemblies who advocated for structural legal reform. A large portion of this chapter draws from the writings and actions of Lamine Guèye. Providing a perspective absent from the literature, this section will discuss Lamine Guèye's exposure to Negritude and Pan-Africanism and how these ideals impacted his views on French Republicanism and citizenship. This section aims to show the agency of African politicians involved in the conception of the *Loi Lamine Guèye*, depicting them as experts of French law, not pawns of the metropole.

Finally, the fourth section of this paper discusses the process by which French and West African delegates combined their ideas to conceive the *Loi Lamine-Guèye*. These interactions highlight the often-ignored role of African delegates in the Constituent Assemblies and their true impact on French postwar reforms. This perspective highlights the early and great agency of

African political leaders to promote changes to empire from within and diminishes the focus on a metropole-gear policy of reform after World War II. By demonstrating the activity of African politicians within French parliamentary structures the trajectory of decolonization after the war appears differently. This work does not present a romanticized narrative of a violent struggle for freedom, but a narrative of struggle for reform from within. It is important to understand this earlier struggle to grasp how the failure of internal reform led an embrace of violence on the road to decolonization.

CHAPTER I: Terminology in the French Empire

As evidenced by the many private debates held concerning expanding French citizenship under the Constituent Assemblies, terminology held an important place in the French Empire. It served as a means of distinction and segregation. Individuals native to metropolitan France, the metropole, were *nationaux* (nationals) and *citoyens* (citizens). The title *citoyen*, originating from the French Revolution and the political upheaval of the late eighteenth century, bestowed specific legal rights and duties often associated with the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen*. In concrete legal terms, *citoyens* were regulated by a French civil code ordained by a representative assembly under popular mandate. The term national, likewise, referred to heredity, or blood, with individuals in only certain geographic areas granted this title.²⁰

Individuals residing in the French colonies did not possess the same titles as those in the metropole. Inhabitants of the colonies were traditionally referred to as *indigènes*, *autochtones* (both of which are translated as “natives”), *sujets* (subjects), and *protégés* (literally “protected people”). *Indigène*, *autochtone*, and *sujet* implied a partial exteriority to the state, while the term *protégé* referred to the inferiority of a person in a Social Darwinian sense. These titles invoked a hierarchy, which legitimized domination. In the final decades of the French Empire, the term *ressortissants* was widely used to refer to colonial peoples. This term had complex connotation, translating as “a person under the jurisdiction of a state.”²¹ Therefore, it became the preferred term of the postwar French Empire as it implied direct authority over colonial peoples.

²⁰ Note: Not all nationals and citizens were born in the metropole. Inhabitants of territories classified as *départements* (*Départements*, unlike *colonies*, were administratively integral parts of the French metropole. They had representation in the French metropolitan assembly and were governed by the same metropolitan statutes and laws. These territories, for example, included the Caribbean isle of Martinique and, after 1870, Algeria.) were viewed as nationals, but still distinguished by geography.

²¹ Cooper, *Citizenship between Empire and Nation*, XV.

While the title *ressortissant* implied direct control of the state, all of these titles provided a distinction, a deliberate “othering,” to borrow the term of Edward Said.²² Only colonial peoples were referred to by these terms. However, this othering was not limited to a superficial status: it defined the rights colonial peoples were awarded. French *sujets*, and those with equal statuses, were ruled under the *Code de l’Indigénat* (The Native Code), a series of laws passed throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth century. This legal code dealt out harsh punishments for minor crimes, subjected colonial peoples to the *corvée* (forced labor), and prohibited millions of individuals from any sort of representation in government.

The French, nonetheless, priding themselves on leading a *mission civilisatrice* (civilizing mission), provided pathways for colonial *sujets* to become *citoyens*. Known as the *évolués*, or the “evolved natives,” these select individuals gained French citizenship via *évolution*: by proving their dedication to France through the use of the French language, military service, and assimilation to Western values and norms.²³ The number of individuals achieving *évolué* status, however, numbered fewer than 100 in any given decade.²⁴

Geography additionally served as a means of distinction. Although few colonial subjects became *évolués*, there were instances of granting political rights by geographic region. Most famously, in a series of laws beginning in 1915, the peoples of the Four Communes (*Quatre Communes*) of coastal Senegal achieved a quasi-*évolué* status, placing them between autonomous *sujets* and assimilated *citoyens*: a unique citizenship outside the jurisdiction of the French civil code. Muslim Africans, who comprised a majority of the Communes, were

²² By the term “othering” I do not only mean to reference Edward Said’s *Orientalism* in which Europeans designated their own identity as “a superior one in comparison with all the non-European peoples and cultures,” but a tangible political differentiation with intimate effects on individuals’ daily lives expressed through law. Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage, 1979), 7.

²³ Translation of “*évolués*” borrowed from Emmanuelle Saada, *Empire’s Children: Race, Filiation, and Citizenship in the French Colonies*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2012), 60, 64.

²⁴ Coquery-Vidrovitch, “Nationalité et Citoyenneté,” 298.

permitted to vote as *citoyens* and yet maintain a system of Islamic law for personal affairs.²⁵ Granted due to the Communes' cooperation during the conquest of Senegal, this privilege expanded the complex web of "customary law" already present in the French Empire.²⁶

While it is true that colonial *sujets* were subject to the *Code de l'Indigénat*, some exceptions were made based on local culture. Widely referred to as "customary law," these exceptions bought into the antiquated notion of privilege inherent to the French system of "imperial republicanism."²⁷ The French colonial administration is frequently described as a system of "direct rule," in that the *Code de l'Indigénat* was applied evenly and colonial officers existed on the ground.²⁸ However, in reality, there was a great deal of political autonomy in the French Empire.²⁹ This discrepancy provided the kindling for a continuous debate on association (granting a level of autonomous government) versus assimilation extending through the interwar period to the postwar Constituent Assemblies.

Marius Moutet's *Front populaire* colonial office, siding with association, believed in the possibility of "évolution" for all of France's colonial *sujets* while admitting the necessity for customary rule and regulated autonomy.³⁰ In his campaign for re-election after World War II,

²⁵ Elizabeth Foster, *Faith in Empire: Religion, Politics, and Colonial Rule in French Senegal* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2013), 6.

²⁶ Mamadou Diouf, *Une histoire du Sénégal: le modèle islamo-wolof et ses périphéries* (Paris: Maisonneuve & Larose, 2001), 137-138 and Foster, *Faith in Empire*, 6.

²⁷ "Imperial Republicanism" builds upon the work of Alice Conklin who discusses the peculiar interaction of French Republican values and imperialism during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This variation of republicanism included the allowance of a level of 'self-governance' (often only in title) including the continuation of local legal codes often regulating personal affairs (marriage, birth, death, etc.). See: Alice L. Conklin, *A Mission to Civilize: the Republican Idea of Empire in France and West Africa, 1895-1930* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1997).

²⁸ See for instance Mahmood Mamdani, *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996); Michael Crowder, "Indirect Rule – French and British Style," *Africa*, 34, pp. 175-205; Kathryn Firman-Sellers, "Institutions, Context, and Outcomes: Explaining French and British Rule in West Africa," *Comparative Politics*, 32, 3. (April 2002): 253-272.

²⁹ Wilder, *The French Imperial Nation-State*, 81.

³⁰ See for example Catherine Coquery-Vidrovitch, the Popular Front and the Colonial Question. French West Africa: An Example of Reformist Colonialism," in: Tony Chafer and Amanda Sackur, *French Colonial Empire and the Popular Front: Hope and Disillusion* (New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1999).

Moutet spoke of his prior office as a “collaboration between all races...founded upon the principle of absolute economic and social equality.”³¹ Members of the *Front Populaire* administration, many of whom served in the Ministry of Overseas France in 1945-47, believed in a policy of human equality while maintaining marked political difference. As Robert Delavignette, head of the Colonial School (*École coloniale*), famously stated, “Fraternity in difference, is this so difficult to understand?”³²

“Fraternity in difference” did not refer only to geographic or racial difference; it directly implicated differences in legal status. Adhering closely to the tradition of customary rule, French lawmakers struggled with the distinction between political and civil equality and, later, citizenship. As early French colonial officers, including Delavignette, so eloquently presented, the empire consisted of a fraternity (*fraternité*) of peoples. Customary rule permitted peoples distinguished by geography or religion to maintain different civil codes than the metropole. The French colonizers stated, in this manner, that colonial peoples possessed equal political citizenship (*citoyenneté politique*) but they did not have access to a civil citizenship, including access to the metropolitan civil code. A statement by Yvon Guet, a legal expert and advisor to Minister of Colonies Jacques Soustelle, in a private séance in the Colonial Ministry in 1945 summarizes this point well:³³

Political citizenship is singular, but civil statutes are plentiful. I believe that one can clearly distinguish the notion of political citizenship, which is accorded to everyone, and particular civil statutes...currently common to French citizens and special local civil statutes in different parts of the overseas territories.³⁴

³¹ ANOM C 73, dr. 575, *L'Oeuvre de Socialisme et de Marius Moutet dans l'Union Française*, 1945.

³² Wilder, *The French Imperial Nation-State*, 124.

³³ Cooper, *Citizenship Between Empire and Nation*, Footnote 9 on 123.

³⁴ ANOM AP 215, dr. 1, *Commission Chargée de l'Étude des questions d'ordre constitutionnel intéressant les territoires d'outre-mer*, Pg. 6.

It was in this terminological context that the *Loi Lamine Guèye* was ratified in 1946. The empire was rife with debates over civil versus political and assimilationist versus association. Were colonial inhabitants privy to republican ideals and the same civil codex? Did colonial participation in World War II merit expanding the policy of “customary law” or a true elevation into the French *citoyenneté*? The *Loi Lamine Guèye*, from the perspective of both African representatives (*députés*) and French nationals, intended to resolve these issues. Both African and metropolitan representatives manipulated the colonial-political lexicon and these important theoretical debates in order to achieve their end goals. Perhaps ironically, each side found its completion in the *Loi Lamine Guèye*. This law encompassed association and assimilation, the expansion of the civil code and a return to customary law, the removal of colonial titles and the propagation of continued difference.

CHAPTER II: Marius Moutet's Emancipation through Attraction

In April 1937, the Minister of Colonies, Marius Moutet, embarked on a state visit to Côte d'Ivoire in the A.O.F. (French West Africa). Typical of Moutet's new style of colonial politics, he met directly with the "*indigènes*," noting that "the indigenous peoples were intelligent" and that "they could contribute to development of the state." He continued, promising his dedication to improving the quality of life in *Afrique noire* remarking, "the natives could count on the concern of the government...to improve their situation, and active efforts towards full civilizational *évolution*."³⁵ Commenting on the peculiarity of the Minister's visit to the A.O.F., Louis Trabes, a French colonial bureaucrat who hosted Moutet in Abidjan, stated in a telegram to him after his trip, "our people were excited to see a representative of the government come to them in order to objectively examine the challenge of colonization."³⁶

The "challenge of colonization" Trabes mentions in his telegram illustrates the self-awareness of Moutet's administration to the humanitarian abuses of colonialism. When the *Front populaire* coalition entered power in 1936, the acceptance of colonialism in France was relatively unquestioned. Some on the far left objected to colonialism, especially after colonial soldiers' service in World War I, but these sentiments were generally dismissed.³⁷ The 1936 coalition granted the left its first true opportunity to enact its brand of colonial politics. Their politics attempted to "put an end to the abuses to which [the colonial empire] had given rise" while maintaining the economic profitability of the colonies.³⁸ Marius Moutet piloted this new brand of politics, which would persist through World War II.

³⁵ ANOM AP 553, Télégramme Presse, par Dakar, 1937. Note: *Afrique noire* translates to "Black Africa," used commonly to refer to the French colonies of *l'Afrique Occidentale française* (A.O.F.) and *l'Afrique Équatoriale française* (A.E.F.) along with the Protectorates of Cameroon and Togo.

³⁶ ANOM AP 553, Letter, Louis Trabes to Marius Moutet, 9 April 1937.

³⁷ Coquery-Vidrovitch, "The Popular Front and the Colonial Question," 155-156.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 158.

In this context, near the end of the *Front populaire* government in 1937, Marius Moutet characterized his colonial policy as “a politics of *libération* first and foremost.”³⁹ Described publically as a liberal reformist, Moutet brought reforms to the French Ministry of Colonies that were sympathetic to what Gary Wilder terms “colonial humanism.” Appreciating this ideological shift, Moutet’s contemporaries in the French press described him as “one of the greatest French colonial ministers since Jules Ferry” due to his sympathy towards the colonial populations.⁴⁰ In a June 1936 article on the colonial policy of the newly in-power Popular Front in *La Nouvelle Dépêche*, a Parisian newspaper, Moutet was portrayed as an advocate for the equality of individuals within the state regardless of “birth...race...or religion.”⁴¹ While his administration was not truly humanitarian, Moutet’s 1936-38 Ministry of Colonies was responsible for reforms to the colonial penal code, the naturalization system, and the labor code under his direct guidance.⁴² These three initiatives, which Moutet would later emphasize during his bid for reelection after World War II, formed the basis of his “politics of *libération*.”

Libération, however, should not be equated with a desire for decolonization. Rather, it was a strategy to maintain empire. In the context of the 1930s French Empire, this term did not connote radical independence policies; rather, it was understood to mean the granting of particular individual rights. In French historiography the term “*libération*” generally refers to the rescue of a population under domination, such as the “*libération de Paris*” by Charles de Gaulle and the Allied Forces in August 1944. However, for Moutet, *libération* did not describe this type of shift, as he did not view colonial rule as domination, but elevation. In this sense, the term

³⁹ ANOM 28 PA 8, dr. 176, *Introduction du Bilan de l'Action de M. Marius Moutet*, Marius Moutet, 1937.

⁴⁰ ANOM 28 PA 1, dr. 1, René Marin, *Bilan de l'oeuvre accompli par M. Marius Moutet au Ministère des Colonies*, “Les Hommes du Jour,” 20 January 1938.

⁴¹ ANOM 28 PA 5, dr. 147, Marius Moutet, *La Politique Coloniale du Nouveau Gouvernement*, “La Nouvelle Dépêche,” 16 June 1936.

⁴² ANOM 28 PA 5, dr. 138, *Direction des Affaires Politiques*, 1936.

“*libération*” is better equated with the English term “emancipation.” For Moutet, emancipation entailed a massive reform of the *Indigénat*, “one of the forms of colonialism the most decried and most disagreeable...for the native populations.”⁴³ In addition to improving the lives of colonial peoples through legal reform Moutet advocated for a system in which colonial territories could exercise a degree of local government, at least on paper.⁴⁴

Like colonial humanism, *libération* was not so much exact policy as a broad ideology that could be used to justify particular policy. Likewise, the prevalence of colonial humanism and *libération* did not imply that all colonial policies fell within these ideologies. Nor did it insist that policies evoked in the name of “*libération*” were actually enacted on the ground. Rather, *libération* was a philosophic framework in which Moutet chose to place himself. Operating within this framework, Moutet came to be seen as a sympathizer to colonial peoples despite the gross failures of many of his colonial reforms under the *Front populaire* on the ground.

The humanistic element of Moutet’s 1936-38 Ministry of Colonies did not coalesce in authentic humanism.⁴⁵ Rather, the images of humanism and *libération* were created in order to attract the colonies more strongly to the metropole. Moutet, behind closed doors, equated his “politics of emancipation” with a more manipulative “politics of attraction.” In a 1936 secret policy brief from the *Ministère des Colonies*, colonial officers discussed the importance of communicating with local “colonial chiefs” to create convincing propaganda.⁴⁶ The brief recommended agricultural reform, trade shows, and “the celebration of holidays particularly

⁴³ ANOM 60 APOM 2, dr. 1, *Suppression du régime de l’Indigénat*, 1946.

⁴⁴ This, theoretically, entailed the establishment of local representative assemblies. In response to a June 1936 letter from the *Union Coloniale Française* arguing, “it is essential to let local governments have a large part of the initiative,” Moutet agrees that local assemblies should be established in the near future. ANOM 28 PA 5, dr. 147, Letter, M. le Neveu, Directeur Général de l’Union Coloniale Française, to M. Moutet, 5 June 1936.

⁴⁵ By “authentic humanism” I simply mean a candid and open attempt to ameliorate the humanitarian violations of colonialism, without ulterior motives. As discussed, “colonial humanism” did not imply a true concern for the suffering of colonial peoples, but was simply a strategy to maintain colonial rule.

⁴⁶ ANOM 28 PA 5, dr. 145, *Politique d’Attraction*, 1936.

enjoyed” by the natives in order to convince colonial populations of the benevolence and generosity of the metropole, resist the “seduction of foreign powers, and better the lives of indigenous peoples.”⁴⁷ Moutet’s “politics of attraction” and “politics of emancipation” completely overlapped: they represented a single manipulative attempt to control the colonies through empty promises and symbolic gestures. Moutet’s reforms under the *Front populaire* display his appreciation for the power of symbolic policies and reform. These symbolic reforms centered on advocating for “fraternal solidarity” with indigenous populations and territorial autonomy.

From Fraternal Solidarity to the Common Mold of Citizenship

The French promise of “fraternal solidarity” was largely hollow under the *Front populaire* administration, centering on intellectual speculation not tangible policy. As stated in an official summary of the Popular Front’s colonial policy in 1937, “In the colonies, the Popular Front is dedicated to raising the level of physical, economic, and cultural life for our *protégés*. We intend to demonstrate to everyone that colonization could not be a self-serving and vain endeavor, but is a well considered act of fraternal solidarity.”⁴⁸ Moutet attempted to increase the legitimacy of his office through direct appeals to the wishes and desires of colonial peoples. In an address in 1936 on Radio Cité, a Parisian radio station, Moutet stated, “By our influence, whether intentional or not, indigenous society is changing daily.”⁴⁹ Moutet’s administrative approach was reactionary, responding to changes in demands in “indigenous society” and the international community calling for self-determination. For instance, although Moutet famously

⁴⁷ ANOM 28 PA 5, dr. 145, *Politique d’Attraction*, 1936.

⁴⁸ ANOM 28 PA 1, dr. 1, *Note sur les Principaux actes au Ministre des Colonies depuis l’Avenement du Front Populaire*, 1937.

⁴⁹ ANOM 28 PA 5, dr. 132, *Courserie de M. Marius Moutet, Ministre des Colonies, à Radio Cité, Sur le Comité d’Etude des Cotumes Indigènes*, 1936.

attempted to align colonial labor policy with the International Labor Organization's ban on forced labor, the administration only followed through superficially, frequently covering up recruitment practices.⁵⁰ In this manner, the Popular Front's colonial "politics of attraction" was truly a politics of manipulative reform, seemingly offering improvement while delivering little change on the ground.⁵¹

Moutet's "fraternal solidarity" was largely limited to theoretical intervention. The Minister of Colonies before World War II never promulgated tangible rights, such as proportional electoral colleges or purely local self-determined government. One of the symbolic acts of solidarity proposed by Moutet was the recognition of colonial subjects as equally legitimate participants in governance. In 1936, he charged the Ministry's proposed Inquiry in the Colonies (*Enquête aux colonies*) with surveying the "participation of indigenous peoples in the administration and representation of the masses."⁵² Moutet's colonial officers, in particular Robert Delavignette, spoke of the native peoples as part of the "whole French," not peoples subjected to arbitrary rule.⁵³ In the same breath, Delavignette described the formation of a federation amongst equals, a French "*eurafricaine*" federation comprised of "a base of black African peasantry."⁵⁴

During the interwar, colonial policy and theory were not only discussed by members of the colonial administration but by French intellectuals and legal theorists. Delavignette's idea of

⁵⁰ Martin Shipway, "Reformism and the French 'Official Mind': The 1944 Brazzaville Conference and the Legacy of the Popular Front" in Tony Chafer and Amanda Sackur, *French Colonial Empire and the Popular Front: Hope and Disillusion* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999), 139.

⁵¹ See for instance Gary Wilder, "The Politics of Failure: Historicizing Popular Front Colonial Policy in French West Africa" in Tony Chafer and Amanda Sackur, *French Colonial Empire and the Popular Front: Hope and Disillusion* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999), 33-55; William B. Cohen, "The Colonial Policy of the Popular Front," *French Historical Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 3 (Spring, 1972), 368-393; Julian Jackson, *The Popular Front in France, Defending Democracy, 1934-1938* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

⁵² ANOM 28 PA 4, dr. 128, *Note Relative à la Commission d'Enquête aux Colonies*, 1936.

⁵³ ANOM 28 PA 5, dr. 132, Robert Delavignette, *Le Front Populaire devant l'Afrique noire*, "Bulletin du Comité de l'Afrique Française," April 1936, Pg. 234.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, Pg. 235.

federation in place of empire became extraordinarily popular amongst French left-leaning intellectuals during and after the fall of the *Front populaire* in 1938.⁵⁵ One of the most explicit of these theoretical federations was Eugène Guernier's 1944 *Project for a Constitution of the French Empire*.⁵⁶ Guernier, a well-respected historian and specialist in African history, centered his project on the theoretical equality of all individuals in the empire through citizenship.⁵⁷ Whereas Delavignette opposed the creation of a colonial citizenship, Guernier insisted that "French citizenship...will serve as the common mold" for individuals residing in the metropole and the former colonies.⁵⁸ Guernier, building off a notion of political citizenship, encouraged solidarity through equality of title and right to participation. However, it is evident that Guernier did not intend for citizenship to lead to an equal voice in governance, insisting eight years later that Africans' "emotionality" excluded them from equality with the French; Guernier's citizenship was philosophical and symbolic.⁵⁹

Projects such as that of Guernier, stemming from Moutet's "politics of emancipation," led to the return of a decades old debate: political versus civil citizenship in the French Empire. Discussions of colonial federations merged the debate over citizenship with the debate over what "fraternal solidarity" truly involved. While Moutet's *Front populaire* administration had focused on manipulating policy goals to give the appearance of "colonial humanism," his postwar administration would center on manipulating terminology for political ends. Guernier's idea of a singular political citizenship for the French metropole and colonies provided Moutet with an opportunity to further express his ideals of fraternal solidarity and *libération*.

⁵⁵ See, for example, Aruthur Girault's plan for the extension of citizenship, Latron's plan for a "colonial charter," Lampué's "state territory," and Charles Michelet's "imperial constitution": Wilder, *The French Imperial Nation-State*, 34.

⁵⁶ ANOM C 56, dr. 367, Eugène Guernier, *Projet d'une Constitution de l'Empire Français*, 22 September 1944.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, Pg. 10.

⁵⁹ Markovitz, *Léopold Sédar Senghor*, 47-48.

While Moutet was always a left-leaning politician, the content of his *libération* platform varied greatly over his political career. In a pamphlet for his re-election campaign in 1945 he bragged about this legacy, stating that “as a man of the state...since 1914” he had always based his policies on “a collaboration between individuals of all races...founded on a principle of absolute economic and social equality.”⁶⁰ The phrase “principle of...social equality” in his platform implied different policies in 1945 than in 1936. In 1936, the phrase indicated policies such as reform of the *Indigénat* and the *corvée*, in 1945 it echoed a support for federation, or union, with France’s overseas territories. In Moutet’s own words, the term “union” in the title of this pamphlet, *The Masterpiece of Socialism and Marius Moutet in the French Union*, consisted of replacing “a domination in reality by a freely consented collaboration.”⁶¹ Replacing “empire” with “union” was first and foremost a symbolic move in 1945; however, this gesture opened the floodgates to the formulation of concrete policy in following years.

Using his track record, Moutet attempted to retrospectively prove his dedication to the idea of the union. He cited his attempts to pass a law in 1919 granting citizenship to Muslim inhabitants of Algeria and his legacy as “suppressor of the *Indigénat*” under the *Front populaire* as irrefutable proof of his commitment to governmental reform in the postwar.⁶² Moutet’s private manifestations of this reformist attitude, however, contained racial and geographic dimensions absent from his propaganda and public expressions of “fraternal solidarity.”

Moutet used the idea of “*évolution*” as a justification for the continuation of colonial rule in one form or another. While previous administrations had believed in granting “*évolué*” status to particular individuals who had achieved *évolution*, Moutet’s politics of emancipation

⁶⁰ANOM C 73, dr. 575, *L’Oeuvre de Socialisme et de Marius Moutet dans l’Union Française*, 1945.

⁶¹ANOM C 73, dr. 575, *Marius Moutet et l’Union Française*, 1946.

⁶²ANOM C 73, dr. 575, *L’Oeuvre de Socialisme et de Marius Moutet dans l’Union Française*. Additionally note: the term “suppressor of the *Indigénat*” has been taken from another of Moutet’s postwar political propaganda pamphlets: ANOM 60 APOM 2, dr. 1, *Suppression du régime de l’Indigénat*, 1946.

envisioned *évolution* on a larger scale. In a 1946 campaign speech Moutet stated bluntly, “we have begun to abolish the prejudice of racial inequality: but we know very well that all human races have not arrived at the same point of *évolution*.”⁶³ Moutet saw people not as individuals, but in terms of racial groupings and geographic populations. Moutet thus insisted on transforming the “*vieilles colonies*,” the colonies dating back to the First French Empire, into *départements*, or integral pieces of the French metropole with equivalent rights regulated by the same civil code.⁶⁴ Moutet saw these colonies as integral pieces of France, much like Algeria in 1919, due to their long history within the French Empire. Individuals residing in much of the empire, particularly in *Afrique noire*, were not privy to the same immediate consideration due to their race and shorter history with France. In this manner, Moutet’s administration created and energized an ideological paradigm in which a belief in a humanistic equality of the races coexisted with a belief in the inferiority of particular “human races” based on geography and the necessary *évolution* of mankind.

After the war, Moutet combined his notion of the humanistic equality of the races with the expansion of French political citizenship. While prior to the war, applications for citizenship were reviewed on an individual basis, after the war this process was universalized as a humanistic measure. Under the *Front populaire* Moutet invited colonial, and particularly African, soldiers who had fought on behalf of France to the French *citoyenneté*.⁶⁵ In 1936, a law was passed under the direction of Moutet’s Ministry “assuring the quality of French citizen to all French subjects in the A.O.F. and A.E.F. with a military title of the *Legion d’Honneur* or the

⁶³ANOM C 73, dr. 575, Marius Moutet, *Peroraison*, 1946.

⁶⁴ANOM C 75, dr. 587, *Ordre du jour du Conseil des Ministres*, M. Moutet to M. le Secrétaire Général du Gouvernement, 27 November 1946.

⁶⁵ These extensions were often withheld for lengthy amounts of time, but Moutet’s administration, largely due from pressure directly from the *ex-tirailleurs* themselves, gave many earned titles and rights to former soldiers: Gregory Mann, *Native Sons: West African Veterans and France in the Twentieth Century* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006), 104-107.

Medaille Militaire or the *Croix de Guerre*, or former prisoners of war or soldiers with a *carte du combattant*.”⁶⁶ With this citizenship under the 1936 Law came a full inclusion into the civil code of the French metropole. These individuals, from the vantage point of Moutet, achieved full *évolution* through their dedication to the *patrie*. This citizenship was a recognition of military devotion through inclusion in the metropolitan system of law and politics. Moutet’s postwar reforms, privileging not individuals but “human races,” were not recognitions of military service and devotion, but, rather, moot recognitions of humanity. The postwar transformation of the empire into the *Union française*, and accompanying citizenship laws, did not represent civilizational or evolutionary approval, but were simply the next logical steps in Moutet’s rhetoric of emancipation through attraction.

Customary Law and the Debate over Assimilation Politics

The French colonial legal system had struggled with the complexity of customary law long before Moutet’s arrival on the political scene. The legal system of the French Empire demanded a certain level of autonomy in which local territories could regulate, to some extent, the personal laws that governed them. For example, in the *Quatre Communes*, Islamic code, not French civil, regulated marriage, divorce, birth, death, and inheritance.⁶⁷ Under Moutet’s *Front populaire* Ministry, the relative autonomy of the overseas colonies increased, in accordance with the belief that natives should be “guided” towards civilization, not dominated.⁶⁸

Moutet did not see a sharp divide between assimilation and association, or increasing autonomy. He viewed colonial peoples as valuable “customers” of metropolitan industry and

⁶⁶ ANF CC//15150, Commission de l’Algérie, des Colonies et des Protectorats, *Séance du 30 décembre 1936*.

⁶⁷ Diouf, *Une histoire du Sénégal*, 138.

⁶⁸ Wilder, *The French Imperial Nation-State*, 52-53.

culture that could be assimilated into France by allowing partial, largely symbolic, autonomy.⁶⁹ In 1937, Moutet requested and the *Chambre des Députés* (Chamber of Deputies) approved a small delegation of men to travel to the A.O.F. in order to examine topics including the administration, indigenous workforce, education, organization of justice, and treatment of former soldiers there.⁷⁰ The documentation of the voyage stretched 100 typed pages and varied in tone and message depending on the deputy drafting the section. However, in the left-dominated Blum government of 1936, every individual sent to West Africa was a Socialist or Communist. While men, including Adolphe Vincent, the Socialist deputy leading the Inquiry, observed that customary law in the A.O.F. was “very complex and dense,” none of the Inquiry’s members recommended getting rid of it.⁷¹ In fact, like Moutet, the members of the Inquiry in the A.O.F. regarded customary law as a tool of assimilation, not a legal device encouraging disobedience. In the section of the *Enquête*’s report regarding propaganda and education, Henri Lozeray, a Communist deputy, wrote, “the desire that animates the blacks [*le noir*] to promptly assimilate themselves to French civilization is particularly comforting.”⁷² Customary law was not seen as a hindrance to French rule, but a tool of “colonial humanism.” The *Enquête* believed that by giving indigenous peoples a sense of control over their governance, they could better maintain political and economic control.

Postwar calls for autonomous governance on the part of metropolitan bureaucrats promised little more than a symbolic gesture to colonial peoples while promoting an image of *libération* politics. Moutet’s “politics of emancipation” spurred *évolution* towards a symbolic

⁶⁹ ANOM 28 PA 4, dr. 124, *Discours de M. Marius Moutet*, “Agence Havas,” 23 August 1936.

⁷⁰ ANF CC//15152, Commission de l’Algérie, des Colonies et des Protectorats, *Voyage d’Enquête en Afrique Occidentale Française, Janvier-Février 1937, Introduction*.

⁷¹ ANOM AP 513, dr. 12, *Rapport de la Sans-Commission chargé d’une enquête en A.O.F., l’Organisation de la Justice en A.O.F.*, 1937.

⁷² ANF CC//15152, Commission de l’Algérie, des Colonies et des Protectorats, *Voyage d’Enquête en Afrique Occidentale Française, Janvier-Février 1937, L’Enseignement*.

policy of association in which semi-autonomous colonies would theoretically be permitted to be “organized, and developed, following their own aptitudes and means.”⁷³ With staffing shortages in the colonies after World War II, association became the favored policy of the postwar provisional governments.⁷⁴ In 1944, the committee charged with designing the postwar order under the Free French insisted that the empire “would be ruled by a...local government.”⁷⁵ The appeal of autonomy and local government was not only propagated by the severe staffing shortages caused by the war, but out of fear of being politically overpowered by the colonies. The Free French feared that “there would be a real danger of the metropole being put in minority” to its former colonies if colonial peoples and French metropolitan nationals were represented in the same assembly.⁷⁶ In other words, rather than allowing themselves to be overpowered in the legislature, the metropolitan administration believed that by granting autonomy to the colonies via the rhetoric of *évolution* France would be able to maintain more effective control than through direct political assimilation. The solution to this problem was to allow for local assemblies to create (or sometimes simply approve) law while simultaneously forming a new assembly for both the metropole and overseas territories with the number of representatives for each locale “varying by the degree of *évolution* of the territory.”⁷⁷ The idea of *évolution* being necessary for civil rights harkened back to the *libération* politics of Marius Moutet. The local assemblies that the metropole would theoretically create would play a role already filled in practice by local magistrates operating within customary law.

⁷³ ANOM 28 PA 5, dr. 147, Letter, M. le Neveu, Directeur Général de l’Union Coloniale Française to M. Moutet, 5 June 1936.

⁷⁴ ANOM C 15, dr. 75, Letter, Le Commissaire aux Colonies to M. le Secrétaire Général du Comité Français de la Libération Nationale, 1945.

⁷⁵ ANOM C 56, dr. 366, *Rapport de la Commission chargée d’étudier le moyen d’installer les colonies dans la nouvelle Constitution Française*, 12 July 1944, Pg. 6.

⁷⁶ ANOM C 56, dr. 366, *Note sur le rapport de la Commission chargée d’étudier la place des colonies dans la constitution française à venir*, 25 July 1944, Pg. 2.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, Pg. 3.

Postwar policy planning for autonomous local governments in the overseas territories, while appealing to colonial populations seeking self-determination, additionally appealed to international anticolonial actors. During the Hot Springs conference in 1945, the United Kingdom and United States advised France to allow for “self-government” in its colonies.⁷⁸ Looking to its fellow colonizer, the United Kingdom, France recognized that colonization could occur in a more indirect form while still possessing “the same moral reasons on its surface, the same reasons of economic expansion at the base.”⁷⁹ Legal autonomization via the creation of local legislatures with partial representation in a metropolitan assembly served as a tool to continue exploiting colonial populations while appeasing rising calls to decolonize. In this manner, the application of varied “politics of emancipation” by colonial powers to their colonies after World War II cannot be said to be an exclusively French phenomenon. The growing unacceptability of economic and political domination in the postwar era led to the implementation of long debated philosophy on the restructuring of empire.

Libération: Transcending Theory

The tone of postwar constitutional reform had already been set when the First National Constituent Assembly was elected on 21 October 1945. Successfully reelected as a Deputy from the Drôme after his exile in Switzerland during the war, Moutet retook his post as Minister of Overseas France under the government of Félix Gouin in January 1946. His colonial administration and his participation in the Commission on the Overseas Territories under the Provisional Government continued his legacy of encouraging fraternal solidarity through the

⁷⁸ ANOM C 62, dr. 428, Charles Robequain, La Conférence de Hot Springs (janvier 1945), Communication à l'Académie des Sciences Coloniales, 16 March 1945.

⁷⁹ ANOM C 62, dr. 428, Letter, L'Administrateur des Colonies détaché au Service de Presse de New York to M. le Ministre des Colonies, 2 March 1945.

politics of emancipation and attraction. His legacy from the *Front populaire* had helped ensure the trajectory of the French Empire in the postwar. Moutet had assisted in creating a political system in which symbolic gestures of humanism were idolized while the rhetoric of civilizational *évolution* continued behind the scenes. Under the Constituent Assemblies, his symbolic humanism transcended theory and entered policy.

The Constituent Assemblies of 1945-46 represented an era of consensus politics resembling that of the *Front populaire*. Left afraid and vulnerable by the war, the left-leaning governments of the postwar turned to authority within their coalition for guidance: in terms of reforming colonial policy, Moutet's opinion thus carried great weight. Radicalized by the work of Guernier and speculation after the Brazzaville Conference, his ideas of *libération* created an environment in which symbolic politics and terminological manipulation served as concrete policy.⁸⁰ The natural symbolic move: the creation of a federation, the *Union française*, and the recognition of a blanket political citizenship. Both of which served as tools to unite the empire. Operating within this theoretical landscape of "colonial humanism," Moutet set the agenda for the postwar reforms of the Constituent Assemblies.

⁸⁰ The Brazzaville Conference, as will be discussed in depth at the end of Chapter III, enunciated a number of promises to colonial peoples (such as the end of the *Indigénat* and *corvée*), superficially holding metropolitan representatives and colonial officers to a trajectory of reform.

CHAPTER III: Lamine Guèye, Negritude, and the Right to Vote

Today we speak a lot about independence. I am for independence, but for the independence of the individual.⁸¹

—Lamine Guèye, 1957.

Until Senegal achieved independence from France in 1960, Lamine Guèye remained fiercely loyal to tenets of French Republicanism while criticizing “the autocratic and discriminatory aspects of the colonial system.”⁸² Having been educated in France, at his core, he believed in the value of republican ideals applied in what he perceived as the proper manner.⁸³ He was not alone in this belief. During his tenure as representative of Senegal during the 1945-46 Constituent Assemblies, Lamine Guèye fought alongside other colonial delegates, including Léopold Sédar Senghor, Félix Houphouët-Boigny, and Aimé Césaire, for the expansion of these republican rights to the colonies.

Born in Soudan (now Mali) to *Originnaire* parents, Lamine Guèye possessed a unique status compared to his Sudanese compatriots. As a child of parents from the *Quatre Communes*, under the *Loi du 29 septembre 1916* Lamine Guèye was a French *citoyen*.⁸⁴ As a French citizen, he was entitled to representation in the *Chambre des Députés* and was able to vote and run in parliamentary elections. The *citoyens* of the *Quatre Communes* were certainly privileged in their ability to vote; however, they represented an additional inequality in the colonial legal system, which enumerated different rights based not only on title but geography.

Lamine Guèye was faced with this inequality from the beginning of his professional career in the late 1920s. During the completion of his legal training, he worked in the Réunion

⁸¹ Amady Aly Dieng, *Lamine Guèye*, 118.

⁸² Irving Markovitz, “The Political Thought of Blaise Diagne and Lamine Gueye, *Présence Africaine* 72 (1969), 79.

⁸³ Lamine Guèye defended a thesis in law in 1921 and received diplomas in private law in 1929 and the history of law in 1931 from the University of Paris.

⁸⁴ La Troisième République Française, *Loi du 29 septembre 1916*. Note: This was one of the *Lois Blaise Diagne*, which expanded citizenship to the *Quatre Communes* and negotiated citizenship for former military servicemen.

Court of Appeals, one of France's "*vieilles colonies*." Working on the island, he remarked that although the colony possessed a population "a tenth of that of Senegal," it was represented by two representatives in the *Chambre des Députés* as opposed to the *Quatre Commune*'s single *député*. Lamine Guèye remarked that he hoped to see one day the entirety of Senegal benefit from "the same...readjusted parliamentary representation...given the size of [Senegal's] population."⁸⁵

Pan-Africanism, which Lamine Guèye was exposed to in the early 1920s, doubtlessly influenced his ideals on proportional representation. In 1921, having just begun his training as a lawyer in Paris, Lamine Guèye assisted W.E.B. Du Bois in the organization of the Second Pan-African Congress' session in that city.⁸⁶ The Second Pan-African Congress, the Brussels and London legs of which ended with the adaptation of the infamous London Manifesto, proclaimed the importance of self-governance in Africa. While directed towards Britain and not France, the London Manifesto harshly criticized colonialism for not allowing black Africans to have a voice in their government. Stating, "England...has systematically fostered ignorance among the natives, has enslaved them, and is still enslaving them," the manifesto argued, colonial peoples should not be "enslaved" and thereby excluded from their government, but needed a proportional voice in determining their future.⁸⁷

The idea of extending suffrage to the colonies was not entirely new. Also present at the Second Pan-African Congress was Blaise Diagne, the man who proposed the *loi du 29 septembre*

⁸⁵ Lamine Guèye, *Itinéraire Africaine* (Paris: Présence Africaine, 1966), 57.

⁸⁶ Dieng, *Lamine Guèye*, 58.

⁸⁷ Everett Jenkins Jr., *Pan African Chronology, Vol. III: A Comprehensive Reference to the Black Quest for Freedom in Africa, the Americas, Europe and Asia, 1914-1926* (Jefferson, NC and London: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 2001), 269. In Lamine Guèye's autobiographical work, *Itinéraire Africaine*, he remarked that voting for republican representatives was necessary to "define the problems of Africa tomorrow." See: Lamine Guèye, *Itinéraire Africaine*, 130.

1916 and was responsible for Lamine Guèye's own inclusion in the French *citoyenneté*.⁸⁸ Diagne, however, infamously disagreed with the sentiment behind the London Manifesto, becoming the only member of the Congress to denounce it as too extreme. He advocated instead for "blacks and whites to develop Africa" together.⁸⁹ While Diagne disapproved of the radicalism of Pan-Africanism and sympathized more strongly with the potential of French Republicanism, Lamine Guèye recognized Pan-Africanism as a tool to expand republican rights in Africa.⁹⁰ Although Lamine Guèye's Islamic upbringing led him to doubt the true cultural unity of Africa, Pan-Africanism advocated for the equality of all African peoples with each other and their colonizers, declaring the "absolute equality of the races."⁹¹ The next logical step in this ideology for Lamine Guèye was granting equal republican rights, particularly the right to vote, to all colonial peoples.

Although Lamine Guèye never took an official public stance on Pan-Africanism in title, he was a true Pan-Africanist in his belief in the universal right to vote and thus self-govern.⁹² With his belief in the necessary universality of self-government he began to diverge from Blaise Diagne's politics, becoming increasingly critical of his representative. While both men praised the tenets of French Republicanism, Lamine Guèye criticized Diagne for his assimilationist laws that divided the "black race."⁹³ Lamine Guèye did not disagree with Diagne's successful efforts to integrate the *Originaires* into the French *citoyenneté* because they were assimilationist, but because they divided the people of France's African colonies into *citoyens* and *sujets*. He

⁸⁸ One of the *Lois Blaise Diagne*, this law was responsible for the granting of citizenship to inhabitants of the *Quatre Communes*. See discussion on Page 12-13.

⁸⁹ Jenkins, *Pan African Chronology*, 266.

⁹⁰ For evidence of Diagne's commitment to republicanism see for instance Alice Conklin, "Who Speaks for Africa?: The René Maran-Blaise Diagne Trial in 1920s Paris" in Sue Peabody and Tyler Stovall, *The Color of Liberty: Histories of Race in France* (Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 2003), 302-337.

⁹¹ Jenkins, *Pan African Chronology*, 268.

⁹² Dieng, *Lamine Guèye*, 121.

⁹³ Lamine Guèye, *Itinéraire Africaine*, 33-34.

rejected granting citizenship on the basis of geographic particularity, instead insisting on the absolute equality of all Africans with metropolitan nationals.

Lamine Guèye's conception of absolute republican equality included the right to be ruled by local legal codes. He criticized Diagne for failing to allow for the primacy of Islamic law in the *Quatre Communes*.⁹⁴ He stated that it was an absolute illegality to subject the *citoyens* of the Communes to French civil code when the majority of the population preferred the continuation of Islamic law in personal affairs. He concluded, "it is possible to be a French citizen all while holding a personal status as Senegalese: one can be a polygamous Muslim and still be French."⁹⁵ In other words, citizenship and inclusion in the voting French *citoyenneté* allowed inhabitants of the *Quatre Communes* to self-govern and retain a sense of autonomy. This recognition of equality did not necessitate the forced subjugation of a population to a foreign legal code; rather, it permitted the *Quatre Communes* an equal voice in determining their own future. Being recognized as equal citizens by the metropole ensured that their voices could not be silenced and their autonomy justified by popular mandate.

Lamine Guèye's Politics and Negritude

In many ways, Lamine Guèye's 1920s politics served as a precursor to the emerging ideology of Negritude amongst young black students and intellectuals in Paris during the 1930s.⁹⁶ Accredited to Aimé Césaire, Léopold Senghor, and Léon-Gontran Damas, from its

⁹⁴ For his 1921 law thesis at the University of Paris, Lamine Guèye critically engaged with the *Lois Blaise Diagne* of 19 October 1915 and 29 September 1916 on this exact topic.

⁹⁵ Lamine Guèye, "De la situation politique des Sénégalais originaires des communes de plein exercice telle qu'elle résulte des lois des 19 octobre 1915, 29 septembre 1916 et de la jurisprudence antérieure. Conséquences au point de vue du conflit des lois françaises et musulmanes en matière civile" (Doctoral law thesis, Université de Paris, Faculté de Droit), 1921.

⁹⁶ Negritude has been credited to exist in many forms. Reiland Rabaka cites Damas, Senghor, Césaire and Fanon as having their own brands of Negritude in her *The Negritude Movement*. For the purpose of this chapter, the individual

inception the Negritude movement represented “a rejection of assimilation, an identification with blackness, and a celebration of African civilization.”⁹⁷ Césaire, Senghor, and Damas’ politics greatly evolved due to their experiences as students in Paris.

The three founders of the Negritude movement came from different corners of the French Empire, and this doubtlessly influenced their thinking. Césaire hailed from the “*vieille colonie*” of Martinique, Senghor from Senegal, and Damas from French Guiana. To paraphrase Gary Wilder, while in Paris, colonial students were able to practice their citizenship with fewer constraints. Although these young intellectuals experienced racial discrimination, being in the metropole allowed colonial immigrants to claim citizens’ rights through “protesting, persuading, and sometimes voting.”⁹⁸ The young intellectuals of the Negritude movement found it difficult to reconcile the rights and duties expected in the metropole with the reality of civic life in the colonies.

While the movement was geographically inclusive, Negritude was not intended to be a popular movement in the colonies themselves, at least at the beginning. It was an ideology created by intellectuals for intellectuals, advocating for the equality of cultures. More directly, Césaire, Senghor, and Damas saw themselves as culturally equal, if not superior, to their white, metropolitan peers. Nonetheless, Senghor’s vision of Negritude argued “for a synthesis with French institutions.”⁹⁹ The “assimilation” the movement rejected was the mental and cultural assimilation of the individual, not the political assimilation of a people into the republic. It

philosophies will be addressed as a singular “Negritude,” with some particular references to Senghor’s branch due to his significant participation in postwar reform and influence on his compatriot, Lamine Guèye.

⁹⁷ Wilder, *The French Imperial Nation-State*, 156.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 159.

⁹⁹ Markovitz, *Léopold Sédar Senghor*, 45.

“spoke to alienation and not to exploitation, to the individual not the mass.”¹⁰⁰ In other words, Senghor primarily spoke out against the racially motivated political exclusion of the individual.

Falling within the Pan-African tradition, intellectuals involved in the movement spoke of “Africa,” not individual colonies or geographic locations.¹⁰¹ While initially solely for intellectuals, Senghor’s Negritude grew to push for the unification of the “black race” regardless of level of education or assimilation.¹⁰² However, this unification was not to occur around the notion of self-governance or local control over resources, but through a universal pride of and solidarity in African culture and “blackness.”¹⁰³ Lamine Guèye saw these unifications as one in the same. Only through self-governance and suffrage could an individual preserve his or her own culture and beliefs. Africans should aim to “assimilate, not be assimilated.”¹⁰⁴ For Lamine Guèye, Negritude’s insistence on solidarity regarding culture implied a preference for the Pan-African ideals of regional autonomy and self-government. Senghor’s vision of Negritude therefore mirrored Lamine Guèye’s conclusions in his 1921 thesis: “one can,” and in fact should, “be a polygamous Muslim and still be French.”

The politics of Negritude reinforced Lamine Guèye’s belief that colonial peoples were unjustly alienated from the French republic. Like the founders of the Negritude movement, he believed in the validity of local custom. His critique of Blaise Diagne for his laws bestowing citizenship upon the inhabitants of the Four Communes illustrates his view. Lamine Guèye believed that local custom and customary law could exist within the confines of the French Republic. Like Senghor, he was against the alienation of the individual. Lamine Guèye viewed

¹⁰⁰ Markovitz, *Léopold Sédar Senghor*, 45.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 40.

¹⁰² Gary Wilder, “Panaficanism and the Republican Political Sphere” in Sue Peabody and Tyler Stovall, *The Color of Liberty: Histories of Race in France* (Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 2003), 240.

¹⁰³ Rabaka, *The Negritude Movement*, 203-204.

¹⁰⁴ Cooper, *Citizenship between Empire and Nation*, 36.

the political alienation of the individual as preventing the accurate portrayal of local needs and desires. In his 1951 *Discourse on Colonialism*, Césaire stated the necessity of decolonizing the mind, arguing that the colonizer himself becomes “decivilized” through colonization and therefore the culture of the colonizer should not be privileged over that of the colonized.¹⁰⁵ Via assimilation into the republican state, through suffrage and thereby the right to public expression, Lamine Guèye attempted to “decolonize” the individual while maintaining a base republican structure.

Lamine Guèye and Senghor during the World War

World War II transformed Lamine Guèye from a legal scholar into an unrelenting politician. Although he ran for election to the *Chambre des Députés* several times during the interwar period, he was never elected into office. Blaise Diagne represented the Four Communes in the *Palais Bourbon* until his death in 1934. In the elections to fill Diagne’s seat, Galandou Diouf, who had represented the Communes before Diagne, defeated Lamine Guèye due to his support from rural and ex-military elites.¹⁰⁶ Galandou Diouf held this seat until the fall of the Third Republic in 1940. After fleeing metropolitan France with other prominent anti-Vichyists, Galandou Diouf died in August 1941.¹⁰⁷ It was not until the elections for the First Constituent Assembly in 1945 that Lamine Guèye won his seat in Paris representing the Four Communes,

¹⁰⁵ Aimé Césaire, *Discourse on Colonialism* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972), 35.

¹⁰⁶ Dieng, *Lamine Guèye*, 51, 53.

¹⁰⁷ Sagnes, Jean. “Le refus républicain: les quatre-vingts parlementaires qui dirent ‘non’ à Vichy le 10 juillet 1940,” *Revue de l’Histoire moderne et contemporaine* Vol. 38, No. 4 (Oct.-Dec. 1991), 566. Note: Galandou Diouf was one of the infamous “24,” including the sitting Minister of Colonies, Georges Mandel, and Paul Bastid, who would come to play an important role in the postwar Constituent Assemblies, who fled on the ship *Massila*. They were bound for Morocco to set up a government in exile, but were halted and detained in the South of France.

servicing alongside Léopold Senghor, who represented the remainder of the Senegalese population in the drafting of the *Constitution du 19 avril 1946*.¹⁰⁸

The war thrust Lamine Guèye into a position of power in colonial affairs. He was nominated to the cabinet of Georges Mandel in 1940 as a member of the Commission on African Law, a committee created during the administration of Marius Moutet.¹⁰⁹ Lamine Guèye's time in the Ministry of Colonies was cut short, however, by the Nazi invasion of France. After Mandel's failed flight to Morocco to establish a Free French government and his subsequent imprisonment, Lamine Guèye resigned his position and returned to Dakar as an attorney.¹¹⁰ While in Dakar during the war, Lamine Guèye experienced first hand the brutality and injustice of the Vichy government's military tribunals. He noted, "the African population as a whole did not consider that it was then, on the part of [Vichy] France, the prelude to a politics of racial discrimination."¹¹¹ Reflecting on the first three years of the war, Lamine Guèye remarked,

It has been, and it will be one of the fundamental duties of the French Committee of National Liberation [*Comité français de la Libération nationale, CFLN*] to display to us that racial prejudices are foreign to the French heart and spirit. I will not tolerate anyone forgetting this.¹¹²

Lamine Guèye therefore represented a broader spirit amongst African elites during World War II. He demanded immediate change, not only because of the "racial prejudices" of Vichy but also because of the military service African soldiers provided to France.¹¹³

As one of these African soldiers during the war, Léopold Senghor developed political demands closely tied to the ideology of Negritude. From June 1940 until February 1942, Senghor

¹⁰⁸ Cooper, *Citizenship between Empire and Nation*, 67.

¹⁰⁹ Dieng, *Lamine Guèye*, 42.

¹¹⁰ Lamine Guèye, *Itinéraire Africaine*, 103-105.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 110.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 113.

¹¹³ As Gregory Mann illustrates, African veterans of World War II were an important political force in and of themselves. Lamine Guèye's calls to combat "racial prejudice" were therefore direct appeals to African veterans, who experienced racism first hand during the war. See: Mann, *Native Sons*, 23-24.

was a prisoner of war in Nazi-occupied France.¹¹⁴ These years were doubtlessly formative in the development of his political ambition, coming to accept his identity as “African and French.”¹¹⁵ Senghor’s early interpretation of Negritude was a militant “anti-racist racism” proclaiming the innate superiority of the “black race.”¹¹⁶ However, the violent domination of the Nazis during the war led Senghor to change his interpretation of Negritude from “racial differences” involving an innate “superiority or inferiority” to “cultural differences” with race as an indicator.¹¹⁷ Nazism had caused Senghor to abandon his “anti-racist racism” and he, in-turn, expected the Free French to denounce a continuation of racist politics, such as those seen under the Nazis and Vichy France. African dissatisfaction with colonial rule led Charles de Gaulle to proclaim the need for a conference at Brazzaville in January and February 1944.¹¹⁸

The Promises of the Brazzaville Conference

Pan-African and Negritude ideologies were entirely excluded from the Brazzaville Conference, as not a single African delegate was invited to attend.¹¹⁹ However, Lamine Guèye, while excluded directly from the discussions in Brazzaville, met briefly with de Gaulle during the General’s brief layover in Dakar on his way to the conference.¹²⁰ During their meeting, Lamine Guèye highlighted the need for reforms promoting self-governance in the colonies stating,

¹¹⁴ Raffael Scheck, “Léopold Sédar Senghor Prisonnier de Guerre Allemand: Une nouvelle approche fondée sur un texte inédit,” *French Politics, Culture & Society*, 32, 2 (Summer 2014), 76. The term “African and French,” however, originated in the title of Janet Vaillant’s *Black, French, and African: A Life of Léopold Sédar Senghor* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990).

¹¹⁵ Scheck, “Léopold Sédar Senghor Prisonnier de Guerre Allemand,” 93.

¹¹⁶ Markovitz, *Léopold Sédar Senghor*, 50. Note: “Anti-racist racism” is a phrase coined by Jean-Paul Sartre, *Black Orpheus*, trans. S.W. Allen (Paris: Présence Africaine, 1976), 59.

¹¹⁷ Markovitz, *Léopold Sédar Senghor*, 50.

¹¹⁸ Eric Jennings, *Free French Africa*, 106-107.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 250.

¹²⁰ Lamine Guèye, *Itinéraire Africaine*, 117.

In French Africa...there would not be any progress that would be [actual] progress, if men, on their own native land, would not gain from it, morally and materially, if they could not...be capable of participating...in the management of their own affairs. It is the duty of France to ensure this will be so.¹²¹

Despite Lamine Guèye's words to the leader of the Free French, the Brazzaville Conference was relatively conservative. Ideas of possible federation with the African colonies proposed by René Pleven, Commissioner for the Colonies under de Gaulle, and Henri Laurentie, Director of Political Affairs under the Colonial Commissariat in Algiers, were outright rejected.¹²² While Eric Jennings depicts popular historiographical interpretations of the conference as a dichotomy of "hailing its 'implicit universalism'" and "a cynical attempt to counter American anticolonial pressure," there in fact exists a third interpretation.¹²³ The Brazzaville conference was an extension of the "fraternal solidarity" and "colonial humanism" politics of Moutet's *Front populaire* administration faced with having to respond to international anticolonial movements and vocal discontent from within the empire. As Martin Shipway states on the Brazzaville Conference, "Even in the face of world war, eight years is not a long time in the life of a bureaucracy...continuities in the formulation of policy...between 1936 and 1944 should therefore not surprise us."¹²⁴

Although African political figures, including Lamine Guèye, would come to denounce the Brazzaville conference as discarding the "even distant" possibility of "self-government in the colonies," the immediate resolutions of the conference were somewhat promising.¹²⁵ Although many important figures in Moutet's *Front populaire* administration were absent from the Brazzaville Conference, there was a strong continuity "between the 'spirit' of 1936-37 and the

¹²¹ Lamine Guèye, *Itinéraire Africaine*, 118.

¹²² Jennings, *Free French Africa*, 251. Note: It is worth additionally mentioning that Laurentie became an integral player under Moutet's Ministry of Overseas France.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 251.

¹²⁴ Martin Shipway, "Reformism and the French 'Official Mind,'" 133.

¹²⁵ Lamine Guèye, *Itinéraire Africaine*, 118.

revived sense of purpose and innovation...which prevailed at Brazzaville.”¹²⁶ This continuity could be attributed to the “ethos of the Colonial Corps as a whole,” which had accepted and built upon the reformist “emancipation” spirit of Moutet.¹²⁷ In fact, on paper, Brazzaville built heavily upon Moutet’s *Front populaire* platform, obliterating the *Code de l’Indigénat*, the *corvée*, and establishing semi-autonomous assemblies in the colonies despite its conservative membership.¹²⁸

The promises of the conference, however, were not immediately enforced under de Gaulle’s Provisional Government. In May 1945, Lamine Guèye wrote to Pleven, now serving as Minister for Overseas France under de Gaulle, expressing his discontent,

The Brazzaville conference...had raised much hope. It has been dashed since the publication in West Africa of the indigenous legal code inspired from its recommendations [...] this code retains many of the least popular and most tyrannical dispositions of the indigenous legal code promulgated by the Vichy government in French West Africa in 1941.¹²⁹

While the failure of de Gaulle to immediately uphold the resolutions of Brazzaville damaged the African leader’s confidence in the French Republic, Lamine Guèye was additionally impacted by the massacre of several dozen *Tirailleurs Sénégalais* at Thiaroye in December 1944.¹³⁰ The African soldiers, who had recently been demobilized and were in the process of being repatriated, revolted against French officers in a technical mutiny after being docked “back-pay and demobilization premiums.”¹³¹ For Lamine Guèye, who defended the *tirailleurs* at trial, the massacre represented a horrible betrayal of African peoples who had shown loyalty to the French

¹²⁶ Most notably the former Director of the *École coloniale* Robert Delavignette and Governor of the A.O.F. Marcel de Coppet were absent from the Conference. Shipway, “Reformism and the French ‘Official Mind,’” 136.

¹²⁷ Shipway, “Reformism and the French ‘Official Mind,’” 136.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 138-140

¹²⁹ Jennings, *Free French Africa*, 251.

¹³⁰ Dieng, *Lamine Guèye*, 91-93.

¹³¹ Myron Echenberg, “‘Morts Pour la France’: The African Soldier in France During the Second World War,” *The Journal of African History* 26, 4. (1985), 376.

Republic.¹³² Lamine Guèye's exacerbation over the failure of the resolutions of the Brazzaville Conference and the Massacre of Thiaroye led him to a head-on confrontation with de Gaulle's Provisional Government in March 1945.

The *Sénégalaises* and Lamine Guèye's Conception of Citizenship

While World War II did not truly radicalize Lamine Guèye's politics in the sense that he demanded policies different from those earlier in his career, he was emboldened by the events of the war. As Brazzaville demonstrated, colonial bureaucrats under de Gaulle were desperate to maintain the empire. Recognizing this desperation, Lamine Guèye began to demand immediate structural reforms in 1945. The earliest, and most clear, instance of this was Lamine Guèye's demand for the extension of suffrage to the *Sénégalaises* (Senegalese women) of the *Quatre Communes*. By the CFLN's Ordinance of 21 April 1944, *citoyennes* (female citizens) in the French metropole were able to vote in national elections for the first time. This right, however, was not immediately expanded to *citoyennes* in the colonies. In particular, the *Sénégalaises* of the *Quatre Communes*, *citoyennes* under Blaise Diagne's 1916 Law, were bared from voting in the upcoming 1945 elections for the First Constituent Assembly by the *Décret du 19 février 1945*. Lamine Guèye was greatly opposed to this unjust action. The Provisional Government's reaction to his appeals on behalf of the *Sénégalaises*, however, taught Lamine Guèye a way to gain unjustly withheld political rights: through citizenship.

While before World War II, Lamine Guèye seldom fought directly with colonial officers, his advocacy on behalf of the *Sénégalaises* represented his willingness to fight colonial administrators when he saw their actions as counter to republican values. After it was announced

¹³² Myron Echenberg, *Colonial Conscripts: The Tirailleurs Sénégalais in French West Africa, 1867-1960* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc., 1991), 102.

that the *Sénégalaises* would not be allowed to vote in the upcoming election, Lamine Guèye wrote to the Governor General of the A.O.F., Pierre Cournarie, stating that the exclusion of the *Sénégalaises* was an offense “as unjustifiable as outrageous” under a “democratic regime.”¹³³ Strongly opposing the Governor, Lamine Guèye took his case to the streets of Dakar, organizing several protests.¹³⁴ The protests stretched nearly two weeks and were accompanied by written protests sent to Cournarie, including one anonymous manifesto which read: “This isn’t...about a purely electoral problem and the Senegalese, but...the question [of] representation in the A.O.F.”¹³⁵ His organization of protests in Dakar caused Lamine Guèye to be portrayed in direct opposition to the French administration. “Lamine Guèye has expressed an opinion diametrically opposed [to the Provisional Government] and launched an agitation which, today, took on significant importance and turned...to violence,” Cournarie wrote in a memo to the Colonial Commissariat.¹³⁶

Ultimately, however, this direct confrontation showed the willingness of the metropole to negotiate political policy with its colonies. A little over two weeks after Lamine Guèye began organizing his protests, Cournarie’s administration backed down, sending an urgent secret telegram to Paris “affirming the necessity of not applying the Decree of 19 February.” Cournarie warned, “if the decree is upheld, it will [cause us to] lose all police measures for assuring order.”¹³⁷ While Cournarie cites the violence as the cause for backing down, he additionally cited in previous telegrams that he feared “a foreign, particularly American” intervention in A.O.F. if

¹³³ ANOM AP 211, dr. 15, Letter, Lamine Guèye to M. le Gouverneur Général, 1 March 1945.

¹³⁴ As is stated in an intelligence briefing from “indigenous sources” on the protests in Dakar given to the Governor on 4 March 1945, “Lamine Guèye is at the origin of this demonstration”: ANOM AP 211, dr. 15, *Reseignements* (Source Indigène), 4 March 1945.

¹³⁵ ANOM AP 211, dr. 15, *Mémoire présenté à M. le Gouverneur Général au sujet de la question de vote des citoyennes du Sénégal*, 6 March 1945.

¹³⁶ ANOM AP 211, dr. 15, P. Cournarie, le Gouverneur Général de l’Afrique Occidentale Française, *Au droit de vote des citoyennes d’origine sénégalaise*, 8 March 1945.

¹³⁷ ANOM AP 211, dr. 15, Telegram, Dakar to Colonies Paris, 19 March 1945.

they continued denying the *Sénégalaises* the right to vote.¹³⁸ The Governor's request was honored, and the Decree of 30 May gave female *Originaires* the right to vote in the November 1945 elections.¹³⁹

The title of *citoyen* gave enormous power to an individual. Although rights could initially be withheld, demands were perceived as valid when the title of *citoyen* could not be denied to an individual. Lamine Guèye had mentioned this pattern in his 1921 thesis, where he remarked upon the *Originnaire's* ability to maintain aspects of Islamic law. In the same strand, Lamine Guèye's interpretation of the term *citoyen* in his 1945 letters on the *Sénégalaises* implicitly used the central notion behind his 1921 thesis: citizens could possess voting rights in the republic while maintaining local customary law. This idea was complicit with the ideologies of Negritude and Pan-Africanism he had been exposed to in the previous decades of his political career. The expansion of the *citoyenneté* did not mean the assimilation of the individual into the state; rather, it allowed for the participation of an individual in the state to maintain the "cultural differences" prized by Senghor's Negritude. It additionally unified the whole of the empire's "black race" on a singular plane, under a singular title, with equivalent rights and duties. The expansion of voting rights to the *Sénégalaises* in 1945 proved to Lamine Guèye that rights could be demanded if colonial *sujets* were seen as titular equals: this idea, abstracting Guernier, meant a singular *citoyenneté* for the metropole and colonies alike.

The flexibility of de Gaulle's regime to his demands displayed to Lamine Guèye the responsiveness of the republic after the war. He saw this period as the opportunistic moment to

¹³⁸ ANOM AP 211, dr. 15, Telegram, Dakar to Colonies Paris, 7 March 1945. It is also worth noting that the French Press had turned in Lamine Guèye's favor. Jules Tétty, a reporter for *Combat*, a Paris-based periodical, wrote to the Minister of Colonies, "the brutal decision that isolated *la citoyenne Sénégalaise* from political life...is unpopular and unjust." Tétty compared the decision to the "racist and authoritarian" politics of France under Vichy, imploring Commissioner Pleven to reverse the 19 February decision. ANOM AP 211, dr. 15, J. Tétty, Président du "Combat," to M. le Ministre des Colonies, 14 March 1945.

¹³⁹ ANOM AP 211, dr. 16, Letter, Henri Laurentie to M. le Secrétaire Général du Front Nationale, not dated.

push for his long-held belief in the expansion of suffrage to the colonies. His use of the term *citoyennes* to refer to the *Sénégalaises* solidified his plan to accomplish this goal under the First Constituent Assembly. By expanding the *citoyenneté*, he expanded the right to vote. He believed that de Gaulle's acceptance of his argument in 1945 implied an acceptance of his terminological use and that it would additionally be readily adapted by the "colonial humanists" present in the Assembly and the Ministry of Overseas France. In the Constituent Assemblies that followed, Lamine Guèye attempted to use the same terminology for the same purpose: the extension of universal suffrage to the colonies.

CHAPTER IV: The Constituent Assemblies and the *Loi du 7 mai*

The First and Second National Constituent Assemblies, spanning 1945 and 1946, served as the platform for the collision of the prewar philosophical ideologies of Moutet's colonial humanism and Lamine Guèye's Negritude. Although these ideologies evolved and solidified before World War II, most notably under the *Front populaire*, the war allowed the two often opposed factions to briefly align their policy ambitions. The wake of war allowed for a moment in time in which both parties desired the same policies, but for vastly different reasons. After the Massacre at Thiaroye and his 1945 clashes with de Gaulle's Provisional Government over the *Sénégalaises*, Lamine Guèye was determined to push his agenda for the expansion of voting rights at any cost. On the opposing side, Moutet and many of his lingering sympathizers from the *Front populaire* aimed to continue a "politics of emancipation" based on the manipulation of terminology, only radicalizing due to the promises of Brazzaville. The confrontation of these ideologies led to direct conflicts over the redefinition of citizenship in the empire, and the ambiguously worded law, the *Loi Lamine Guèye*.

The French Union: Fraternity in Difference

In the early months of the First Constituent Assembly, Moutet launched a campaign for a radical revision of the political structure of the empire. He was elected the first President of the assembly's *Commission des territoires d'outre-mer* (Commission on Overseas Territories) in December 1945 and as the former Minister of Colonies wielded immense influence over the commission. Created to determine the place of the colonies in the postwar empire, the commission contained delegates from across metropolitan France and the empire. In addition to

Moutet, Lamine Guèye sat on the commission and came to play an equally significant role in the debates over the redefinition of the French Empire.

Coming into the First Constituent Assembly, it was uncertain what form the empire would take in the postwar era. It was largely the job of Moutet's commission to define the new polity and the role that former colonial subjects would play in it. In one of his first speeches on the commission, Moutet compared the potential political structures that the French Empire could take, including the continuation of a paternalist structure and a "politics of association."¹⁴⁰ At the end of his speech, Moutet stated definitively, "the politics of association, of union, is the only type that conforms to the interests" of both colonial officers and peoples.¹⁴¹ This revelation was not revolutionary. In order to retain Indochina, in March 1945 the Provisional Government under de Gaulle had promised the creation of a French Union, later reaffirming this promise before the U.N.¹⁴² However, this meeting was not solely a reiteration of de Gaulle's promises. It is impossible to understand this statement independently from the man who made it. Moutet's position firmly set the Commission on Overseas Territories on a trajectory towards the creation of the French Union. However, Moutet was intentionally ambiguous regarding the structure of this political entity. Moutet's early statements in the commission proposed a restructuring without mentioning specific changes. This omission allowed for the continuation of a similar political structure under the guise of complete regeneration, including the legal distinction of *citoyens* and *sujets*.

Lamine Guèye was quick to point out the lack of tangible changes in political rights under Moutet's propositions. During a session in late December 1945, Lamine Guèye submitted a proposal to counter the continuation of the *double collège*, which separated metropolitan

¹⁴⁰ ANF C//15293, M. Moutet, *Séance de la Commission des territoires d'outre-mer*, 12 December 1945, Pg. 3.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, Pg. 4.

¹⁴² Gary Wilder, *The French Imperial Nation-State*, 140.

citizens and colonial *sujets* in elections. His proposal advocated that the two populations should vote in the same electoral college for identical candidates, based on the “absolute principle of equality for all.” This idea, however, was met with some resistance. René Malbrant, a Conservative delegate, rebutted Lamine Guèye during the séance stating that his system would not distinguish necessarily between “*évolués, citoyens français, indigènes* [that] have not yet had but little to do with us” and “*indigènes* that have never been in contact with our civilization.”¹⁴³ Far from buying into the ideology of “equality for all,” Malbrant’s principles centered on the idea of *évolution*. While, notably, Malbrant did not object to Moutet’s proposal for the creation of the French Union, like other metropolitan-born delegates, he remained resistant to invoking palpable changes in political rights.

Colonial representatives framed their arguments in the language of French Republicanism to fight back against metropolitan delegates. The representative from French Guiana, Gaston Monnerville, countered Malbrant stating, “if we do not pose now the principle of absolute equality for all, this principle will never again be picked up and the National Constituent Assembly will have [made]...an insufficient constitution...we must make a constitution that displays that there is no longer any difference between men.”¹⁴⁴ Senghor additionally objected to Malbrant, pointing out: “when Frenchmen began to exercise the right to vote, most of them were illiterate,” demonstrating that the degrees of *évolution* were not altogether different.¹⁴⁵ Framing their arguments in this way allowed colonial delegates such as Monnerville and Senghor to increase their influence on the commission. On 15 January, encapsulating the ideas of Lamine Guèye, Monnerville, and Senghor, the commission approved a list of recommendations to the

¹⁴³ Malbrant, interestingly, additionally represented an African population: the *premier collège*, or electoral college including pre-1946 citizens, of A.E.F. (French Equatorial Africa). ANF C//15293, *Séance de la Commission des territoires d’outre-mer*, 26 December 1945 and Cooper, *Citizenship between Empire and Nation*, 70.

¹⁴⁴ ANF C//15293, *Séance de la Commission des territoires d’outre-mer*, 26 December 1945.

¹⁴⁵ Cooper, *Citizenship between Empire and Nation*, 70.

Commission on the Constitution entitled *Constitutional Problems Relating to the Overseas Territories*. The first resolution stated, “Every member of the union has the quality of *citoyen* and practices all rights [*l’intégralité des droits*] to which it [the title *citoyen*] is attached.”¹⁴⁶ Equating the rights of all peoples present in the future union, this resolution achieved the universalization Lamine Guèye desired in the republican language that made it credible. However, the meaning of the term “*la qualité de citoyen*” (the quality of citizen) remained legally ambiguous.

After Moutet was appointed to reprise his role as Minister of Overseas France in late January 1946, he attempted to cement his legacy in the Constituent Assembly during his last week as President of the Commission on Overseas Territories. During this time, Moutet often supported representatives from the colonies, particularly Gabonese representative Gabriel d’Arboussier.¹⁴⁷ D’Arboussier argued for autonomous local assemblies in the overseas territories, stating that “autonomy is a consequence of our theory of liberty” and that both association and assimilation “recognize the special interests of indigenous [*autochtones*] populations.”¹⁴⁸ Moutet’s support for this idea was not surprising. On a theoretical level, d’Arboussier’s “autonomy” roughly approximated Moutet’s public pronouncements of his “politics of emancipation” leading to eventual self-rule. Moutet’s support of colonial representatives at the end of his tenure on the Commission bridged the gap between the competing factions. However, his support implied that this work was theoretical and would not yield tangible results. Instead of seeing colonial delegates as fundamentally opposed to them on a

¹⁴⁶ ANF C//15293, Commission des territoires d’outre-mer, *Problèmes Constitutionnels Relatifs aux territoires d’outre-mer*, 15 January 1946.

¹⁴⁷ Cooper, *Citizenship between Empire and Nation*, 67.

¹⁴⁸ ANF C//15293, M. d’Arboussier, *Séance de la Commission des territoires d’outre-mer*, 23 January 1946 and ANF C//15293, M. d’Arboussier, *Séance de la Commission des territoires d’outre-mer*, 24 January 1946.

practical level, metropolitan delegates began to absorb colonial delegates' ideas as a tool for terminological and theoretical manipulation.

The extent to which Moutet's reforms were theoretical is clearly seen in his final days as President of the commission. During this time, the commission adopted a liberal form of association, the idea of compounding autonomy with assimilation through voting: an idea for which Lamine Guèye advocated. "In a declaration of principle," stated Moutet during a presentation of his commission's resolutions to the Commission on the Constitution, "the commission recognizes...inhabitants of overseas territories [have] the same rights as inhabitants of the metropole...we must put an end to racism, conscious or unconscious, and create a new climate so that overseas inhabitants can no longer feel that they are considered as inferiors."¹⁴⁹ This "declaration of principle" was clearly a continuation of his *Front populaire* vision of a "politics of emancipation." As in 1936, he argued for an "end to racism" and the generation of a "new climate." These were the words of a masterful politician, empty without proper implementation. Moutet, in fact, was quite literal. A "declaration of principle" does not explicitly necessitate equal political rights. Moutet's statement recognized the continuation of the "politics of attraction."

While Moutet's "declaration of principle" seemed highly sympathetic to Monnerville, d'Arboussier, and implicitly Lamine Guèye, Moutet's resolutions allowed for the continuation of racist politics, namely the *double collègue*, masked by political bravado. Near the end of his speech Moutet recommended, "in France [overseas populations'] rights will be equal to those of citizens. In the Overseas Territories, the elections will be on a basis of universal suffrage, but the suffrage will be exercised in distinct manners in each territory and will not always be direct."¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁹ ANF C//15287, M. Moutet, *Séance de la Commission de la Constitution*, 25 January 1946, Pg. 3-4.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, Pg. 13.

Moutet did not advocate for a *collège unique* (singular electoral college) in this speech, indicating his aversion to granting tangible political changes. However, it is worth noting that he did agree with the resolutions of 15 January, including the extension of the “quality of a citizen” to colonial populations.¹⁵¹ For Moutet, the extension of citizenship was merely symbolic in that colonial populations would possess equal rights but could not exercise them in the same manner as metropolitan citizens. Moutet’s vision of citizenship thus was purely political and ultimately a “fraternity in difference.”

The Formulation of the Citizens of 1946

Continuing the sentiments expressed during the final weeks of Moutet’s presidency over the commission, Lamine Guèye was elected to replace Moutet when he stepped down in February 1946. As Moutet exclaimed in his farewell speech, Lamine Guèye’s election was “symbolic.” It was “the expression...of the sentiments of all the French that do not accept any difference between the races.”¹⁵² While Moutet’s sentiment was certainly nothing more than political propaganda, Lamine Guèye’s chairmanship of the commission did demand attention and corresponded with an increase in attempts to define the place of the colonies under the Commission on the Constitution.

This attention, however, did not elicit sympathy for Lamine Guèye’s cause. In early February 1946, the Commission on the Constitution again reviewed the Commission on Overseas Territories’ resolutions concerning the expansion of citizenship to the colonies, at first meriting great concern in the commission. Several delegates ultimately agreed, however, “there is no contradiction in giving the quality of citizen to all inhabitants of the French Union and

¹⁵¹ ANF C//15287, M. Moutet, *Séance de la Commission de la Constitution*, 25 January 1946, Pg. 16.

¹⁵² ANF C//15293, M. Moutet, *Séance de la Commission des territoires d’outre-mer*, 1 February 1946.

maintaining, at the same time, specific laws depending on the degree of *évolution* of the populations.”¹⁵³ This idea fell heavily within Moutet’s “politics of attraction,” promising a degree of symbolic equality while maintaining the ideal of *évolution*. As Paul Coste-Floret, deputy from Hérault and future Minister of Overseas France, explained, “citizenship, if it implies the possession of certain rights, does not necessarily imply the capacity to exercise these rights.”¹⁵⁴ In other words, stipulations could still be attached to the “quality of citizen.”

The sessions of the Commission on the Constitution stretching throughout February grappled with the place of colonial *sujets* in the French Union. Various solutions were proposed including the idea that the French Union had “a double nationality, comparable...to that of the inhabitants of Canada.”¹⁵⁵ This idea fell in line with the content of Lamine Guèye’s 1921 thesis, in that inhabitants of Canada were “at the same time Canadian subjects and British subjects”: inhabitants of the French Union could remain French while expressing their individual “*nationalité*.”¹⁵⁶ Indeed, Pierre Cot, a noted politician under the *Front populaire*, declared that “all inhabitants of the French Union are citizens and equal citizens” but “diverse nationalities will be respected.”¹⁵⁷ Cot’s involvement in the *Front populaire* government suggests this statement was somewhat duplicitous. At Cot’s suggestion, the commission adopted a text reading, “all *nationaux* and *ressortissants français* of the metropole and overseas territories exercise the political rights attached to the present Constitution to the *qualité de citoyen*.”¹⁵⁸

This adopted text was significant as it provided further justification for dividing the rights of metropolitan and colonial citizens. More precisely, it separated “*nationaux*” and

¹⁵³ ANF C//15287, *Séance de la Commission de la Constitution*, 5 February 1946.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁵ ANF C//15287, *Séance de la Commission de la Constitution*, 6 February 1946.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

“*ressortissants*” into two distinct categories unlike earlier variations that simply stated *ressortissants* were to gain the “*qualité de citoyen*.”¹⁵⁹ This change implied that under the constitution there were two brands of *citoyen*, the former *ressortissants* and the *nationaux*. The category of *nationaux* did not include former *ressortissants* as this would overstep the boundaries of assimilation. By establishing these two categories, the commission provided a pathway to apply further stipulations to non-nationals, as would transpire regarding voting rights under the Second Constituent Assembly. Colonial peoples could “exercise the political rights attached to the present Constitution.” Of course, these rights could be devised based on *évolution* or geography.

The Commission on the Constitution also created a distinct French Union citizenship entirely separate from French citizenship that generated a great deal of confusion. By the end of February 1946, the Commission on the Constitution accepted that “inhabitants from the overseas territories...cannot be in any fashion considered as *sujets*”; however, it remained ambiguous “if they [were] *citoyens français* or *citoyens* of the [French] Union.”¹⁶⁰ The resolutions of the commission “remained imprecise.”¹⁶¹

Regardless of whether the citizens of 1946 were *citoyens français* or *citoyens* of the French Union, the Commission on Overseas Territories spent much of March and early April 1946 defining additional rights for these new citizens. In early April, Houphouët-Boigny, the representative from Côte d’Ivoire, crafted a law finally putting an end to the *corvée*.¹⁶² This law was the natural conclusion of Moutet’s attempts under the *Front populaire* to abolish forced

¹⁵⁹ The most significant earlier variation cited here was the 15 January 1946 resolutions of the Commission on Overseas Territories, quoted on Page 47. ANF C//15293, Commission des territoires d’outre-mer, *Problèmes Constitutionnels Relatifs aux territoires d’outre-mer*, 15 January 1946.

¹⁶⁰ ANF C//15287, *Séance de la Commission de la Constitution*, 22 February 1946.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁶² Cooper, *Citizenship between Empire and Nation*, 68.

labor and the *Indigénat*. In fact, during his tenure as chairman of the Commission on Overseas Territories, Moutet advised the creation of such a law, a project unilaterally supported and passed unanimously in the assembly.¹⁶³

While all factions supported Houphouët-Boigny's law concerning the *corvée* as a direct successor of the spirit of the *Front populaire*, colonial delegates struggled to find the same degree of support when it came to voting rights in the future union. In April, Lamine Guèye proposed a law to his commission to create local assemblies in the territories based on a principle of universal and direct suffrage in a *collège unique* for "a mixed representation of Europeans and *autochtones*."¹⁶⁴ However, remembering Moutet's final comments on the *double collège* as President of the Commission on Overseas Territories, metropolitan delegates quickly rejected the proposal. In a report written by the commission and presented to the First Constituent Assembly in late April, it is evident that the theoretical basis of Lamine Guèye's proposal had been rewritten, with the singular electoral college limited to territories with a high degree of *évolution*.¹⁶⁵ This separation based on *évolution* came directly from Moutet's politics.

After this defeat, on 25 April Lamine Guèye presented what would become the *Loi Lamine Guèye* for examination in the séances of the Commission on the Constitution and the Commission on Overseas Territories. Disregarding the changes made in the Commission on the Constitution separating *ressortissants* from *nationaux*, Lamine Guèye worded his law as follows:

Beginning on the 1st of June 1946, all inhabitants of the overseas territories (including Algeria) have the quality of citizen, of the same title as French nationals from the metropole and overseas territories. Specific laws will establish the conditions under which they will exercise their rights as citizens.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶³ Cooper, *Citizenship between Empire and Nation*, 68 and ANF C//15293, *Séance de la Commission des territoires d'outre-mer*, 27 February 1946.

¹⁶⁴ ANOM AP 212, *Rapport fait au nom de la Commission des territoires d'outre-mer sur la proposition de Loi de Lamine Guèye*, 17 April 1946.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁶ *L'Assemblée constituante de la Gouvernement Provisoire de la République Française*, Loi n° 46-940, 7 Mai 1946.

The Commission on Overseas Territories pushed the law proposal through with no changes and without debate.¹⁶⁷ A short debate took place in the Commission on the Constitution over the exact definition of *citoyen* in the law, as it was no longer written next to *nationaux*, but the commission quickly moved on. Pierre Cot declared, “there does not appear to be any contradiction between the proposition of the law and the Constitutional project being voted on by the assembly.”¹⁶⁸ The *Loi Lamine Guèye* was adopted in the National Constituent Assembly on the same day without debate, and made into law on 7 May.

The *Loi Lamine Guèye* passed the assembly so quickly both because of logistical factors and the ideological cohesion of the chamber. Most obviously, the time crunch played a role in ratifying the law. The draft of the constitution had already been completed by the time Lamine Guèye proposed his law to the Constituent Assembly. Therefore, the law was hurriedly pushed through as a last-minute addendum. However, this should not be viewed as the core instigating factor. It should be noted that both commissions had already accepted that inhabitants of overseas territories were *citoyens* of some sort. This concession fit within a larger acceptance of a politics of *libération* lingering from the *Front populaire*. Just as Lamine Guèye expected that once equal in title former colonial *sujets* would be able to push for rights, practitioners of “colonial humanism” realized that titles could be redefined or stripped of significance. Moutet’s supporters found basis for this in the final sentence of Lamine Guèye’s law: “Specific laws will establish the conditions under which they will exercise their rights as citizens.” To metropolitan delegates, the importance of a title lay in how it could be exercised. However, in the time crunch of the final days of the First Constituent Assembly, this was tabled for later discussion.

¹⁶⁷ ANF C//15293, *Séance de la Commission des territoires d’outre-mer*, 25 April 1946.

¹⁶⁸ ANF C//15288, *Séance de la Commission de la Constitution*, 25 April 1946.

French Union Citizenship and the *Double Collège*

Lamine Guèye intended his 7 May law to formally recognize self-determination and government in the overseas territories, but interpretations of the law varied. Building upon the success of the *Originaires* with interpreting the *Lois Blaise Diagne* to allow for the continuation of Islamic law while retaining French citizenship, Lamine Guèye expected to extend this tradition to the remainder of France's colonial possessions. The African delegates of the First Constituent Assembly additionally recognized the equalizing power of the title *citoyen*, harkening back to their involvement with Pan-Africanism. Léopold Senghor, for one, pushed for more autonomy from the metropole, considering that "the character" of the Union did not "exclude the possibility of a federation."¹⁶⁹ Both Lamine Guèye and Senghor believed that citizenship would be a tool for simultaneously obtaining political equality and autonomy. Moutet's Ministry, however, did not readily adapt this interpretation.

Setting himself in firm opposition to the African delegates, Moutet believed that the *Loi Lamine Guèye* justified the continuation of the *double collègue*. Soon after the law passed the assembly, he telegraphed African governors that they should not worry about the implementation of the law in their territories as the "planned local assemblies" would still consist of a "*double collègue*" of "*citoyens français*" and "*citoyens [of the] Loi 7 mai 1946.*"¹⁷⁰ Moutet reasserted this plan in an August circulatory to all governors in West Africa.¹⁷¹ As seen in this telegram and circulatory, Moutet intended to extend unequal rights under the guise of equality.

African representatives, however, refused to give in and accept Moutet's interpretation. After the Constitution of 19 April failed to be ratified by popular vote, a Second National

¹⁶⁹ ANF C//15287, *Séance de la Commission de la Constitution*, 22 February 1946.

¹⁷⁰ ANOM AP 212, Telegram, Marius Moutet to Haussaire, Tananarive, Dakar, Brazzaville, Djibouti, 25 May 1946.

¹⁷¹ ANOM AP 212, Circulaire août 1946 à Messieurs les Gouverneurs des Colonies du Groupe du Haut Commissaire de la République Gouverneur Général de l'A.O.F., August 1946.

Constituent Assembly was called to draft another constitution. Upon the gathering of this assembly in June 1946, Lamine Guèye, Senghor, Houphouët-Boigny, and Césaire pounced on the injustice of the *double collège*.¹⁷² The subject was immediately brought up in both the Commission on Overseas Territories and the Commission on the Constitution, with African delegates using the *Loi Lamine Guèye* as evidence of the illegality of the *double collège*. The arguments immediately turned towards the extension of citizenship under the Law of 7 May, with Coste-Floret stating that he did not “understand how one could not have French nationality and yet be a French citizen.”¹⁷³ Malbrant built on this notion insisting that many overseas territories instead desired “their own citizenships” thus excluding overseas populations from French citizenship.¹⁷⁴

Senghor and his compatriots fought back against Malbrant and Coste-Floret, critiquing their monocultural vision as antithetical to the tenets of French Republicanism. Senghor rebutted the notion of separating the “citizens of 1946” from French nationals entirely, stating, “My mother...who is Senegalese, of which nation can she become a citizen, if not France?”¹⁷⁵ Senghor insisted that African delegates knew what they desired from the *Loi Lamine Guèye*, arguing, “if tomorrow we are not *citoyens français*, [you] will pull out an argument to deny us access to all sorts of situations.” He knew that without absolute equality rights could continue to be denied. If this equality were denied, Senghor stated he would demand a repeal of the *Loi Lamine Guèye* to regain “the trust of the colonies.”¹⁷⁶

Senghor’s rhetoric spiraled into direct confrontations between African delegates and Moutet’s sympathizers with open accusations of racism and manipulation. Lamine Guèye and

¹⁷² Cooper, *Citizenship between Empire and Nation*, 72.

¹⁷³ ANF C//15309, *Séance de la Commission de la Constitution*, 26 July 1946.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁵ Wilder, *Freedom Time*, 142-143.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

Senghor continued to fight for recognition that the citizens of 1946 were in fact *citoyens français*, if not in title then in equal rights. During a heated argument on this topic in July, Senghor exclaimed, “We got rid of the formula ‘having the *qualité de citoyen français*’ but we did not renounce all the liberties and all the rights ‘attached to the *qualité de citoyen français*.’ We are not to be held to the word, but to the reality.”¹⁷⁷ By September, Moutet’s Ministry had begun to parrot this rhetoric, officially arguing for a separate French Union citizenship while advocating for an equality of rights. Moutet declared before the Commission on Overseas Territories, “it is certain that all the individual groups of the French Union should be able to practice the same liberties and rights guaranteed by the Constitution.”¹⁷⁸ Moutet’s conception of separate French Union citizenship distanced individuals in the metropole from colonial peoples, adding an additional degree of titular distinction, which could be turned into political difference through policy. African delegates immediately rejected Moutet’s presentation of this unique French Union citizenship to the Commission on the Constitution in September 1946. When Lamine Guèye pointed out the injustice of this distinction, Moutet responded simply that French Union citizenship did not nullify the title of the *Originaires* or the rights accorded by the constitution, appealing to his constituents rather than his Pan-African vision.¹⁷⁹

Moutet’s speech regarding French Union citizenship overtly shifted the assembly strongly in his favor. Although African delegates continued to speak out against the *double collège*, metropolitan deputies believed colonial peoples could be tricked into seeing French Union citizenship as a benevolent gesture. Malbrant declared firmly, “they will thus have their own citizenship and the citizenship of the French Union that will assure their rights under the constitutional preamble.” Coste-Floret and Paul Bastid, a Socialist Republican, backed Malbrant,

¹⁷⁷ ANF C//15309, *Séance de la Commission de la Constitution*, 31 July 1946.

¹⁷⁸ ANF C//15313, Moutet, *Séance de la Commission des territoires d’outre-mer*, 4 September, 1946.

¹⁷⁹ ANF C//15309, *Séance de la Commission de la Constitution*, 11 September 1946.

agreeing that the Law of 7 May only gave “the practice of rights,” not the title of *citoyen français*.¹⁸⁰ In response, Lamine Guèye pleaded,

Why would we refuse anyone the title of *citoyen français*, seeing as the last draft of the constitution, starting back with the Law of 7 May, gave us the quality of citizen, in the same title as nationals of the metropole? [...] We would like for this to be publically established, otherwise tell us frankly that you are creating a regime exclusively for *nationaux français* that have white skin...If you do not want us, tell it to us plainly and we will head for the door.¹⁸¹

Lamine Guèye’s argument, however, fell upon deaf ears. During a later session of the Constituent Assembly, he attempted to personalize his argument for the possibility of maintaining local nationalities under the umbrella of French citizenship, stating that Coste-Floret himself had a “double authority” as general secretary of the Commission on the Constitution and law professor.¹⁸² Neither position, he stated, interfered with or nullified the other. Clearly envisioning universal suffrage, Lamine Guèye struggled to understand Moutet and his allies’ position. In his concluding remarks to the assembly, he desolately hypothesized the theory behind propagating a unique French Union citizenship:

To be a citizen of the union is all the same as finding oneself on an inferior level, in relation to a *citoyen français*, and, in these conditions, you would not be able to make a singular and indivisible Republic because in it one would find two categories of citizens. Or maybe the terms “*citoyen de l’Union*” and “*citoyen français*” are equivalent and...it would be better to not encumber the vocabulary. Or once more, as a third hypothesis, you measure that the term *citoyen français* is larger than that of citizen of the union and...we will conserve the larger term, the most comprehensive.¹⁸³

To Lamine Guèye, the evident answer to his three hypotheses was that Moutet meant to keep French Union citizenship in an inferior position. Houphouët-Boigny agreed with Lamine Guèye lamenting, “all the inhabitants of overseas territories to which [the Law of 7 May] gave

¹⁸⁰ ANF C//15309, *Séance de la Commission de la Constitution*, 17 September 1946.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁸² La deuxième Assemblée nationale constituante, 2ème séance, 18 September 1946.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*

citizenship should know that they will always be in a position of *sujets*.”¹⁸⁴ This manipulation of terminology fell in the same strain as the continuation of the *double collègue*: a continuation of an actual inferiority of rights while proclaiming equality.

Only three days after Lamine Guèye’s lengthy expository at the *Palais Bourbon*, Paul Bastid submitted an article to the Commission on the Constitution constitutionalizing the *double collègue* in the future French Union. The article was narrowly adopted, and Senghor, Césaire, Lamine Guèye, and Ferhat Abbas, a representative from Algeria, stormed out of the meeting room. Senghor forcefully exclaimed, “We cannot constitutionalize a racism such as this!”¹⁸⁵ In the absence of the African representatives, the exact text of the *Loi Lamine Guèye* was inserted into the working draft for the future constitution under the section on the French Union.

The Lasting Ambiguity of the *Loi Lamine Guèye*

Lamine Guèye spent the remainder of the Second Constituent Assembly attempting to abolish the qualifier “of the French Union” attached to his citizenship. While the text itself was ultimately revised to a variant more appealing to Lamine Guèye, it remained under a category applying only to the French Union when constitutionalized in October 1946. The terminology of the law, however, remained refuted and ambiguous. Was its position in the constitution significant? What type of citizenship was actually being discussed? This ambiguity remained unsettled throughout the life of the French Union. In 1950, the Assembly of the French Union sent an opinion to the French National Assembly “inviting the Government to dispense at the shortest delay the *projets de loi* establishing the conditions under which the *ressortissants* of

¹⁸⁴ ANF C//15309, 2ème Séance de la Commission de la Constitution, 19 September 1946

¹⁸⁵ ANF C//15309, 1ère Séance de la Commission de la Constitution, 20 September 1946.

Overseas Territories will exercise their rights as citizens.”¹⁸⁶ Borrowing language directly from the *Loi Lamine Guèye*, the opinion represented the frustration of representatives in the Assembly of the French Union with the imprecise nature of their *citoyenneté*. The opinion stated, “it is unreasonable that four years after the vote on the constitutional text we are still waiting for a law to determine the exact content of the notion of *citoyenneté de l’Union Française*.”¹⁸⁷ Four years after debating the *Loi Lamine Guèye*, no one understood clearly its conception of citizenship.

The contentious divide between metropolitan and African interpretations of the *Loi Lamine Guèye* was never truly resolved through discourse. As seen, metropolitan representatives, drawing from the philosophy of “colonial humanism,” and African representatives, influenced by the ideals of Pan-Africanism and Negritude, sought different definitions of the postwar French state. While the metropole was eager to make promises, it seldom followed through on them. However, this lack of follow-through does not invalidate the intentions of Lamine Guèye or other colonial delegates sitting in the Constituent Assemblies. They had a clear vision of republicanism centered on equal voting rights, which they believed would better the lives of their constituents. When the debates of the Constituent Assemblies are analyzed through the lens of interwar political philosophies, it becomes apparent that the *Loi Lamine Guèye* was doomed from the start: a singular policy meant to enshrine two competing political philosophies.

¹⁸⁶ ANOM AP 217, dr. 1, No. 184, Assemblée de l’Union Française, Année 1950, 4 July 1950.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid.

CONCLUSION

The path that leads [to an effective and just French Union] can only be an immense and frank confrontation of points of view by interested parties, in a climate of good faith and mutual comprehension and on absolutely equal footing. Clemenceau said with reason: “Glory to a country where we speak: Woe to a country where we keep quiet.”¹⁸⁸

—Lamine Guèye, 1956.

Until the dissolution of the French Empire, Lamine Guèye was not a supporter of political independence from France, believing instead in the potential of French Republican structures to promote meaningful change. His call for a “frank confrontation of points of view by interested parties,” however, delegitimized the French Union, which had failed to provide colonial peoples with their desired rights. These failures radicalized anticolonial movements from reform to revolution. In 1961, only five years after Lamine Guèye published the work containing the quote above, Frantz Fanon judged that colonial peoples could not “speak” within French parliamentary structures, writing in his *The Wretched of the Earth*,

The colonized peoples, these slaves of modern times, have run out of patience. They know that such madness [violence] alone can deliver them from colonial oppression. A new type of relationship is established in the world. The peoples of the Third World are in the process of shattering their chains, and what is extraordinary is that they succeed.¹⁸⁹

In many ways, Fanon’s words have come to represent the struggle for decolonization; yet, his philosophy would not have existed without the failures of earlier struggles for internal political reform. Relative to Lamine Guèye, Fanon’s fame is enormous. However, his work was a reaction to Lamine Guèye, simply representing the next stage of Negritude. Instead of working with the colonizer, Fanon advocated for a complete rejection of the colonial system through violent revolution. Although Lamine Guèye is seldom discussed in correlation with Negritude, his policies were important precursors to Fanon’s vision. Fanon’s insistence on the need for

¹⁸⁸ Lamine-Guèye, *Étapes et perspectives de l’Union Française* (Paris: Éditions de l’Union Française, 1956), 10. Note on translation: it is likely that Lamine Guèye misquoted Clemenceau in this instance, using the word “*malheur*,” meaning “woe” or “misfortune,” in place of the widely quoted “*honte*,” meaning “shame.”

¹⁸⁹ Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (New York: Grove Press, 2004), 34.

violence to deliver a population from colonial oppression grew directly out of Lamine Guèye, Léopold Senghor, Félix Houphouët-Boigny, Aimé Césaire and others' failed attempts to meaningfully change colonial populations' political and material status within the confines of French Republican structures. It is because of these failures that Fanon ultimately came to the conclusion that only violence could “shatter [the] chains” of colonial peoples. This idea, which Lamine Guèye never fully accepted, did not exist amongst African elites in 1946. At the time of the *Loi Lamine Guèye*, no one on the French political scene was thinking of independence. Instead, the failures of this law and the general failings of the French Union to promote change gave rise to a movement to force “a new relationship” through extra-parliamentary means. Senghor, like Lamine Guèye, supported some level of French control in West Africa, highlighting the difference between “independence of the spirit” and political independence until as late as 1958.¹⁹⁰ Yet even Senghor realized that operating within the French political system was not always productive:

They learned that all the French political parties, even those on the Left, were national parties formed by national realities and oriented towards national interests, and they discovered that the French proletariat directly benefited from colonial exploitation.¹⁹¹

Nonetheless, this national zeal did not prevent African delegates from attempting to force tangible political change under the Constituent Assemblies. While claiming after 1960 that he supported independence as early as 1946, Senghor only developed his belief in political independence because of his frustration with trying to achieve political reform from within.¹⁹² Therefore, it is additionally important not to present Fanon and Lamine Guèye's ideals as dialectical, as this is anachronistic. Rather, Lamine Guèye's actions and failures had a profound

¹⁹⁰ Markovitz, *Léopold Sédar Senghor*, 102, 107.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 103.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, 102.

impact on the development of postwar Negritude and the colonial push for political independence, even though this was not what he himself desired.

Lamine Guèye was a French Republican at his core and certainly a political assimilationist. However, it is imperative to contextualize these characteristics within the political framework in which he operated. As a young man, he witnessed the ability of the *Lois Blaise Diagne* to promote cultural autonomy within the empire and sought to extend this ability to the rest of the empire through suffrage. Like Diagne, he did not believe in the mutual exclusivity of French citizenship and cultural and legal autonomy. He was a radical in the scope of his demands; but he was careful enough to reinforce his claims with legal precedent. All of this is impossible to capture accurately without examining Lamine Guèye's intellectual development through the interwar period.

Likewise, Lamine Guèye's conception of citizenship can be clearly understood by examining his opposition, Moutet and the colonial humanists. Historians seldom remark on the role of African delegates and how their individual philosophies coalesced in the *Loi Lamine Guèye*.¹⁹³ Credit for the law is frequently given to manipulative colonial authorities without properly analyzing the motives of African delegates, thus degrading the intentions of all parties behind the law. Lamine Guèye's law was far from a simple completion of the *mission civilisatrice* or a straightforward manipulative policy: this law represented a direct fight against the colonial system from within. It was an attempt by African leaders to erase, or at least lessen, the artificial divisions of political boundary, class, and *évolution*.

To understand the obsession with citizenship during the Constituent Assemblies, one must first examine the prevailing philosophies from the interwar. Britain, suffering its own crisis

¹⁹³ See, for example, James Genova, "Constructing Identity in Post-War France" and Eric Jennings. *Free French Africa*.

of empire after the war, responded in a vastly different manner than France. Rather than focusing on symbolic moves, the British expanded the role of local government.¹⁹⁴ The turn to rebranding citizenship was not inevitable for a colonial power: it was a specifically French model that can most readily be explained by the lingering political culture of the interwar *Front populaire* matched with open demands from colonial peoples.¹⁹⁵ Moreover, the choice of citizenship is significant to the development Fanon's vision of Negritude. Citizenship dichotomizes insiders and outsiders, *citoyens français* and "others." These exclusionary principles, which had their origins in the interwar, directly affected the radicalization of anticolonial sentiments and the trajectory of decolonization.

Many historians see World War II as creating the moment in which the revision of empire was inevitable; in reality, the war simply permitted this revisionist moment to happen.¹⁹⁶ The moment's seed had been planted before the war. Nazi domination of France during the war revealed that domination was no longer acceptable; however, this only necessitated a superficially benevolent colonial ruler. Moutet recognized that colonial reform was necessary, but ultimately did not see French colonial rule as domination, but elevation. Thus the political culture of colonial administration remained virtually the same, with identical players before and after the war. While during the interwar redefining the concept of citizenship had been purely theoretical, the postwar, under the auspices of constitutional crisis, offered an opportunity for

¹⁹⁴ William Rodger Louis, *Introduction in The Oxford History of the British Empire, Volume IV: The Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

¹⁹⁵ This, of course, is not to say that there were not other, more structural factors, at play, such as the differences between French and British parliamentary government, values of republicanism, democratic tradition, and indirect colonial government. These, however, are not the objects of this paper as it is not comparative in nature. The British case is introduced simply to explain that citizenship debates are treated as inevitable in the French case, but this is not an organic response to colonial crisis; rather, it occurred in a specific context that needs to be explained via prewar philosophies.

¹⁹⁶ This is seen most clearly in the work of James Genova, "Constructing Identity in Post-War France." However, by excluding thorough discussion of interwar political philosophy, Frederick Cooper's *Citizenship between Empire and Nation* also adopts this stance.

these philosophic constructs to be applied. The idea of redefining citizenship for political gain was not new in 1946. Rather, it was an opportunistic move promoted by interwar precedent. World War II clarified existing political philosophy; it was not a tool for the genesis of altogether new ideas regarding the structure of empire.

Ultimately, the case of the *Loi Lamine Guèye* challenges our understanding of how colonial peoples interacted with the metropole on the road to decolonization. Far from seeking complete independence after the war, Lamine Guèye sought to integrate the colonies closer to the metropole through citizenship and voting while maintaining the autonomy of the individual. In line with Césaire's notion of the "decolonization of the individual," Lamine Guèye attempted to promote multiculturalism through law. While his 7 May law is widely seen as a failure, the very fact that a black African man sat in the *Palais Bourbon*, fought for universal citizenship, and nearly won challenges our preconceived notions of the relationship between colonizer and colonized during this period. There was simply no contemporary comparable: nowhere else in the world could you find a colonial person fighting with a metropolitan individual at the same political level over core concepts of republicanism. Lamine Guèye and the other African delegates portrayed in this essay knew French law incredibly well. They were entirely aware of their ambitions, which must not be misconstrued due to metropolitan interference. The *Loi Lamine Guèye* failed to create positive change on the ground because of differing terminological interpretations and a politically engrained ideology of colonial manipulation, not due to the shortcomings or republican sympathies of Lamine Guèye and his compatriots. To ignore this fact is to misinterpret the narrative arc of decolonization: ignoring the failure of internal political reform misplaces the origins of Fanon's violence. Violent revolution was not the first choice for

colonial peoples to obtain their rights, it was the tool of peoples too long manipulated and ignored.

Word Count: 16,535.

WORKS CITED

Archival Sources:

*Les Archives nationales d'outre-mer (ANOM), Aix-en-Provence, France**Affaires Politiques (61 Col)*

AP 211, dossier 15, 16

AP 212

AP 215, dr. 1

AP 217, dr. 1

AP 513, dr. 12

AP 553

Fonds du Cabinet (171 Col)

C 15, dr. 75

C 56, dr. 366, 367

C 62, dr. 428

C 73, dr. 575

C 75, dr. 587

Fonds Privées de Marius Moutet

60 APOM 2, dr. 1

Papiers d'Agents: Marius Moutet

28 PA 1, dr. 1

28 PA 3, dr. 93

28 PA 4, dr. 124, 128

28 PA 5, dr. 132, 138, 145, 147

28 PA 8, dr. 176

*Les Archives nationales de France (ANF), Pierrefitte-sur-Seine, France**Sezième Legislature, Commissions*

ANF C//15150, *Procès-Verbaux* of the Séances of the Commission for the commission and the sous-commissions of economic mobilization, the military, Indochina and the Indies, the Inquiry in the A.O.F., and information on Algeria, 16 June 1936 – 14 March 1940.

ANF C//15152, Report of the Sous-Commission on the Inquiry in A.O.F., 11 January – 18 February 1937.

Assemblées nationales constituantes, Commissions

ANF C//15287, *Procès-Verbaux* of Séances and appendixes. Dossier of Work for the Commission on the Constitution 30 November 1945 - 28 February 1946.

ANF C//15288, *Procès-Verbaux* of Séances and appendixes. Dossier of Work for the Commission on the Constitution 5 March 1946 - 26 April 1946.

ANF C//15293, *Procès-Verbaux* of the Commission on Overseas Territories, 4 December 1945 - 26 April 1946.

ANF C//15309, *Procès-Verbaux* of the Commission on Overseas Territories, 20 June - 3 October 1946.

ANF C//15313, *Procès-Verbaux* of the Commission on Overseas Territories, 5 July - 8 October 1946.

Published Primary Sources:

Césaire, Aimé. *Discourse on Colonialism*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972.

Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press, 2004.

Lamine-Guèye. *Étapes et perspectives de l'Union Française*. Paris: Éditions de l'Union Française, 1956.

Lamine Guèye. *Itinéraire Africaine*. Paris: Présence Africaine, 1966.

Lamine Guèye. "De la situation politique des Sénégalais originaires des communes de plein exercice telle qu'elle résulte des lois des 19 octobre 1915, 29 septembre 1916 et de la jurisprudence antérieure. Conséquences au point de vue du conflit des lois françaises et musulmanes en matière civile" doctoral thesis in law, Université de Paris, Faculté de Droit, 1921.

Secondary Sources:

Cohen, William B. "The Colonial Policy of the Popular Front." *French Historical Studies* Vol. 7, No. 3. (Spring, 1972): 368-393.

Conklin, Alice L. *A Mission to Civilize: the Republican Idea of Empire in France and West Africa, 1895-1930*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1997.

———. "Who Speaks for Africa?: The René Maran-Blaise Diagne Trial in 1920s Paris." In Sue Peabody and Tyler Stovall, *The Color of Liberty: Histories of Race in France*, 302-337. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 2003.

Cooper, Frederick. "Alternatives to Nationalism in French West Africa, 1945-60." In Marc Frey and Jost Dülfer, eds., *Elites and Decolonization in the Twentieth Century*, 110-37. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

———. *Citizenship between Empire and Nation: Remaking France and French Africa, 1945-60*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014.

Coquery-Vidrovitch, Catherine. "Nationalité et Citoyenneté en Afrique Occidentale Française: Originaires et Citoyens dans le Sénégal Colonial." *The Journal of African History* Vol. 42, No. 02. (2001): 285-305.

———. "The Popular Front and the Colonial Question. French West Africa: An Example of Reformist Colonialism." In Tony Chafer and Amanda Sackur, *French Colonial Empire and the Popular Front: Hope and Disillusion*, 155-169. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.

Crowder, Michael. "Indirect Rule – French and British Style." *Africa*, Vol. 34. (July 1964): 175-205.

Dieng, Amady Aly. *Lamine Guèye: une des grandes figures politiques africaines, 1891-1968*. Dakar, Senegal: L'Harmattan Sénégal, 2013.

- Diouf, Mamadou. *Une histoire du Sénégal: le modèle islamo-wolof et ses périphéries*. Paris: Maisonneuve & Larose, 2001.
- Echenberg, Myron. *Colonial Conscripts: The Tirailleurs Sénégalais in French West Africa, 1867-1960*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc., 1991.
- . “‘Morts Pour la France’: The African Soldier in France During the Second World War.” *The Journal of African History* Vol. 26, No. 4. (1985): 363-380.
- Firmin-Sellers, Kathryn. “Institutions, Context, and Outcomes: Explaining French and British Rule in West Africa,” *Comparative Politics* Vol. 32, No. 3. (April 2002): 253-272.
- Foster, Elizabeth. *Faith in Empire: Religion, Politics, and Colonial Rule in French Senegal*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2013.
- Genova, James. “Constructing Identity in Post-War France: Citizenship, Nationality, and the Lamine Guèye Law, 1946-1953.” *The International History Review* Vol. 26, No. 1. (2010): 56-79.
- Jackson, Julian. *The Popular Front in France, Defending Democracy, 1934-1938*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Jenkins, Everett, Jr. *Pan African Chronology, Vol. III: A Comprehensive Reference to the Black Quest for Freedom in Africa, the Americas, Europe and Asia, 1914-1926*. Jefferson, NC and London: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 2001.
- Jennings, Eric. *Free French Africa in World War II: The African Resistance*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Lambert, Michael C. “From Citizenship to Négritude: ‘Making a Difference’ in Elite Ideologies of Francophone West Africa.” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* Vol. 35, No. 2. (April 1993): 239-262.
- Louis, William Rodger. *The Oxford History of the British Empire, Volume IV: The Twentieth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Mamdani, Mahmood. *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Mann, Gregory. *Native Sons: West African Veterans and France in the Twentieth Century*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006.
- Markovitz, Irving Leonard. *Léopold Sédar Senghor and the Politics of Negritude*. New York: Atheneum, 1969.
- . “The Political Thought of Blaise Diagne and Lamine Gueye: Some Aspects of Social Structure and Ideology in Senegal.” *Présence Africaine* Vol. 72. (1969): 21-38.
- Rabaka, Reiland. *The Negritude Movement: W.E.B. Du Bois, Leon Damas, Aimé Césaire, Léopold Senghor, Frantz Fanon, and the Evolution of an Insurgent Idea*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2015.
- Saada, Emmanuelle. *Empire’s Children: Race, Filiation, and Citizenship in the French Colonies*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2012.
- Sagnes, Jean. “Le refus républicain: les quatre-vingts parlementaires qui dirent “non” à Vichy le 10 juillet 1940.” *Revue de l’Histoire moderne et contemporaine* Vol. 38, No. 4 (Oct.-Dec. 1991): 555-589.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage, 1979.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Black Orpheus*, trans. S.W. Allen. Paris: Présence Africaine, 1976.
- Scheck, Raffael. “Léopold Sédar Senghor Prisonnier de Guerre Allemand: Une nouvelle approche fondée sur un texte inédit.” *French Politics, Culture & Society* Vol. 32, No. 2 (Summer 2014): 76-98.

- Shipway, Martin. "Reformism and the French 'Official Mind': The 1944 Brazzaville Conference and the Legacy of the Popular Front." In Tony Chafer and Amanda Sackur, *French Colonial Empire and the Popular Front: Hope and Disillusion*, 131-151. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.
- Thiam, Doudou. *La portée de la citoyenneté française dans les territoires d'outre-mer*, Université de Pontiers, Faculté de Droit, 1951.
- Vaillant, Janet G. *Black, French, and African: A Life of Léopold Sédar Senghor*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Wilder, Gary. *The French Imperial Nation-State: Negritude and Colonial Humanism between the two World Wars*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- . *Freedom Time: Negritude, Decolonization, and the Future of the World*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015.
- . "The Politics of Failure: Historicizing Popular Front Colonial Policy in French West Africa." In Tony Chafer and Amanda Sackur, *French Colonial Empire and the Popular Front: Hope and Disillusion*, 33-55. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.
- . "Panafrikanism and the Republican Political Sphere." In Sue Peabody and Tyler Stovall, *The Color of Liberty: Histories of Race in France*, 237-258. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 2003.