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This dissertation examines how French officials, welfare specialists, and social service providers in the city of Marseille responded to North African immigration during the period roughly between 1945 and 1975. It traces the origins of the project they launched in late colonial Marseille, initially under the auspices of a specialized welfare network for Muslim North African clients, to “integrate” Muslims from the Maghreb region of North African (Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia) into French society, and follows this project as it continued into the postcolonial era. The central goal of this integrationist project, conducted through services such as welcome centres, professional job training courses, socio-educative family assistance programs, and social housing, was to guide Maghrebis to replace their supposedly inferior and backward customs and habits with the “Western” ways of living followed by France’s majority ethnic population.

Using a wide array of research material from several archives in France, including government documents, official reports and correspondence, and the records of Marseille welfare specialists and social service providers, this dissertation compares the ideas, strategies, and practices that informed the project to integrate Muslim North Africans in Marseille during the late colonial era and decolonization to those that shaped this project after decolonization. Special focus in this comparison is given to unpacking the complex issues of continuity and change related to
the attitudes and actions of welfare specialists and providers in areas such as shantytown clearance, social housing development, and family and youth integration. Attention is also given to the lived experiences of the city’s North African immigrant population, including how the Muslim North African clients of integrationist action sociale initiatives viewed, responded to, and even shaped the kinds of social aid they received. What an examination of these issues shows is that, throughout the period in question, French officials, welfare specialists, and social service providers in Marseille remained fixated on the presence of Maghrebis as a “problem” that required their special attention and assistance.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADBR</td>
<td>Archives départementales des Bouches-du-Rhône</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMM</td>
<td>Archives Municipales de Marseille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOM</td>
<td>Archives Nationales d’Outre-Mer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC</td>
<td>Centre d’Archives Contemporaines, Archives Nationales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADN</td>
<td>Centre des Archives Diplomatiques de Nantes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHTP</td>
<td>Institut d’Histoire du Temps Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFNA</td>
<td>Association des Foyers Nord-Africains de Provence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAM</td>
<td>Agence d’Urbanisme de l’Agglomération Marseillaise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARENA</td>
<td>Association pour la Réinsertion de l’Enfance et de l’Adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATOM</td>
<td>Aide aux Travailleurs d’Outre-Mer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS</td>
<td>Bureau d’Aide Sociale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BST</td>
<td>Bureau des Questions Sociales Tunisiens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANA</td>
<td>Centre d’Accueil Nord-Africain de Marseille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDIN</td>
<td>Comité Départemental d’Information pour les Nomades des Bouches-du-Rhône</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIMADE</td>
<td>Comité Intermouvements Auprès des Évacués</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARB</td>
<td>Comité de Liaison pour l’Aide et la Résorption des Bidonvilles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPM</td>
<td>Centre de Préformation de Marseille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSNA</td>
<td>Contrôle Social de la main-d’œuvre Nord-Africain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTAM</td>
<td>Conseillers techniques pour les affaires sociales musulmanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESNA</td>
<td>Études Sociales Nord-Africains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAS</td>
<td>Fonds d’Action Sociale pour les Travailleurs Algériens en Métropole et leur Familles, later the Fonds d’Action Sociale pour les travailleurs étrangers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLN</td>
<td>Front de Libération Nationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLM</td>
<td>Habitations à Loyer Modéré</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFNA</td>
<td>Immobilière Familiale Nord-Africain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGAME</td>
<td>Inspecteurs généraux de l’administration en mission extraordinaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INED</td>
<td>Institut National d’Études Démographiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOGIREM</td>
<td>Logements et Gestion Immobilière de la Région Méditerranéenne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNA</td>
<td>Mouvement National Algérien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAS</td>
<td>Organisation Armée Secrète</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSR</td>
<td>programme social de relogement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>Service d’Assistance Technique, later the Service des Rapatriés Musulmans-Français de Marseille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCINA</td>
<td>Service de Coordination des Informations Nord-Africains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFJA</td>
<td>Service de Formation des Jeunes en Algérie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLPM</td>
<td>Service de Liaison et de Promotion des Migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSM</td>
<td>Service Social Marocain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONACOTRA</td>
<td>Société Nationale de Construction de Logements pour les Travailleurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONACOTRAL</td>
<td>Société Nationale de Construction de Logements pour les Travailleurs originaires d’Algérie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

From the late 1940s to the early 1960s, a number of reports were produced on the development and activities of a network that delivered social welfare, or *action sociale*, to Muslims of North African origin living in Marseille. One report on “l’action sociale spécialisée dans les Bouches-du-Rhône en faveur des populations musulmans algériennes,” written in 1960 by Alfred Martin, a local specialist in Algerian affairs, described this network as “one of the most complete in France.” Made up of government institutions, public sector welfare organizations, and private charitable associations that administered services including welcome centres, job training courses, socio-educative family assistance programs, and social housing, this network responded to the so-called “difficulties” or “problems” that came to be associated with the presence of Muslims from the Maghreb region of North Africa, or Maghrebis,¹ in metropolitan France. According to Martin, these “problems” included, among other things, Maghrebis’ “partial or general ignorance of the French language” and “their maladjustment to our [French] institutions and way of life.” In responding to these “problems,” officials, specialists, service providers, and other experts who worked within this network sought, through a “transitional approach” to social welfare, to support the social, cultural, and economic “advancement” of Muslims from France’s colonies in the Maghreb—Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia—and to facilitate their “integration” into modern French society.²

This dissertation explores how French officials, welfare specialists, social service providers, and other experts responded to North African immigration in France’s second largest

¹ Muslims originating from the Maghreb, or western region of North Africa containing Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia, are commonly referred to as Maghrebis. In this study, I use the term Maghrebi interchangeably with Muslim North African, predominantly because both terms, as well as variances on those terms, were used during the period in question by French officials, welfare experts, and social service providers.

² Alfred Martin, “Note sur l’action sociale spécialisée dans les Bouches-du-Rhône en faveur des populations musulmanes algériennes,” 20 May 1960, 4-15. Archives départementales des Bouches-du-Rhône (hereafter ADBR) 138 W 47. All citations in French have been translated by the author.
city and main Mediterranean port during the period roughly between 1945 and 1975. It traces the origins of the project they launched in late colonial Marseille, initially under the auspices of a specialized—or North African-focused—welfare network for Muslim North African clients, to integrate Maghrebis into French society, and follows this project as it continued into the postcolonial era. My central concern is to understand the nature, extent, and implications of integrationist welfare services that targeted Maghrebi clients, as well as to question how the attitudes and goals that informed these services developed over time. For the officials and experts who became involved in North African-focused action sociale in Marseille, Muslim North Africans who migrated to France brought a set of behaviours, practices, and presumed deficiencies with them that needed to be managed and corrected before they could be fully welcomed into the communauté métropolitain. As such, “integration,” under the guise of social welfare, entailed the elimination of ethno-cultural difference. It was about convincing Muslim North Africans to replace their supposedly inferior and backward customs and habits with the “Western” ways of living followed by France’s majority ethnic population.

To explore these issues, this dissertation makes use of a wide array of research material from several archives in France, including government documents, official reports and correspondence, and the records of Marseille welfare specialists and social service providers. It thus relies heavily on material produced by officials and experts who participated in the project to integrate Maghrebis into French society. Though this material is invaluable to a study of this kind, it only represents the official—and thus partial—narrative of the French response to North African immigration in Marseille. Largely absent from the official narrative are the voices of the Muslim North African recipients of integrationist action sociale services and programs, a serious gap that should not be left unexplored. In an effort to fill this gap, this dissertation examines letters written and interviews given by Maghrebi men and women who interacted with, and received assistance
from, welfare specialists and providers in Marseille. It also analyzes literature produced outside of the official narrative that comments on the Maghrebi encounter with French metropolitan and colonial institutions. Finally, it employs the analytical strategy of reading within the official narrative—a strategy popularized by Gayatri Spivak and other members of the Subaltern Studies group—to offer further insight into the lives of the recipients of North African-focused integrationist action sociale.³ By engaging with these sources and strategies below, this dissertation also questions how Muslim North Africans experienced, responded to, and even shaped the kinds of social assistance they received.

**Marseille and Action Sociale for Maghrebi Clients**

The use of social welfare as a tool to integrate Maghrebis into French society after World War II has already received considerable scholarly focus.⁴ In this scholarship, four main arguments are articulated. First, scholars argue that, from the outset, North African-focused action sociale exclusively targeted Muslims of Algerian origin, who, in acquiring French citizenship in the aftermath of World War II, became a special group within the French nation. Second, they argue the effort to integrate Muslim Algerians living in metropolitan France, referred to by Amelia Lyons

---


as a “transformed civilizing mission,” was the counterpart of the overseas “modernization mission” launched by French authorities after 1945 to prevent the collapse of France’s colonial empire. In this view, social welfare was employed in metropolitan France to address the “problem” of Algerian decolonization, particularly during the war over Algerian independence that lasted from 1954 to 1962. As the special targets of integrationist action sociale services and programs, Muslim Algerians were encouraged to “embrace France,” not anti-colonial nationalism and independence. Third, scholars contend that after the loss of French rule over Algeria in 1962, it became impossible in France to maintain specialized services exclusively for Muslim Algerian clients. Far from completely dismantling these services, however, the French state repackaged them into a social aid system open to all immigrant groups. Finally, as a consequence of this postcolonial shift, scholars assert that Muslim Algerians became undifferentiated from other immigrants in France, and thus no longer attracted the special attention they had garnered before decolonization.

This dissertation builds off this scholarship, using the case study of Marseille to bring new perspectives to our understanding of integrationist action sociale initiatives that targeted Maghrebis living in France in the late colonial and postcolonial eras. It argues that in Marseille North African-focused action sociale was more than just the product of an exclusively “Algerian problem.” As France’s principal Mediterranean port city, Marseille served after 1945 as the primary gateway for Muslims travelling between the metropole and French North Africa. It also became a central site of Muslim North African settlement, containing by the early 1950s a “particularly dense” Maghrebi population that ranged from workers and families wishing to


establish themselves locally to “poor vagabonds” who did not have sufficient means to leave the city. For both of these reasons, French officials, welfare specialists, and social service providers widely believed that Marseille had an “essential” role to play in setting the stage for the successful integration of Muslims from all three of France’s North African colonies. As a result, from the early years of its existence, the specialized welfare network that targeted Maghrebs living in Marseille responded to a larger “North African problem,” offering an array of services and programs designed to simultaneously assist and integrate Muslims of Algerian, Moroccan, and Tunisian origin. It was only after the outbreak of the Algerian War of Independence that the integrationist gaze of the specialized welfare network narrowed to specifically focus on Muslim Algerian clients.

This dissertation also argues the North African-focused integrationist project that was launched in Marseille during the late colonial era did not end with decolonization. Into the postcolonial era, Maghrebs remained a significant presence in the city, numbering over 40,000 by 1975. Locally, moreover, their ongoing presence remained a subject of ongoing anxiety. Even as French officials and welfare experts widely extolled the successes achieved by integrationist action sociale initiatives that targeted Maghrebi clients, many also continued into the 1970s to express concerns about the ethno-cultural differences of Muslim North Africans and their ability to adjust to life in France. They also continued to blame North African immigrants and their descendants for causing a number of local “problems.” Thus, in postcolonial Marseille, “Muslims,” “North Africans,” or “Maghrebs” did not disappear into an undifferentiated mass of immigrants. Though officials and experts were no longer able to justify operating a welfare network in the city that

---

exclusively catered to Maghrebi clients, they still consistently singled out Muslims of North African origin as a special group that required their specialized assistance. In this regard, the project to integrate Maghrebis living in Marseille into French society became a self-perpetuating process beyond its original colonial context, underscored by the ongoing identification of the integration of Muslim North Africans as a problem that needed solving.

In furthering these arguments, this dissertation follows Yaël Simpson Fletcher and Minayo Nasiali in emphasizing the “liminal” or “hybrid” position Marseille occupied within France’s colonial empire. During the interwar era, as Simpson Fletcher demonstrates, Marseille was a city in which the boundaries between metropole and colonies were porous, where colonial products and workers were an increasingly visible element of the local urban environment. Far from decrying Marseille’s position within the empire, local business and political elites embraced it. What’s more, they engaged in a number of initiatives, such as promoting Marseille as the “natural” location for France’s National Colonial Exposition of 1922, to cultivate the city’s centrality to French imperialism and image as a “definitive colonial metropolis.” After World War II, as Nasiali argues, Marseille’s close relationship with empire remained intact, so much so that it functioned as a “mediated place” where national, regional, local, and colonial forces interacted to influence local postwar modernization efforts, as well as to inform local understandings about social citizenship and difference. This study also underscores the important place of empire in

---


Marseille after 1945, particularly with regard to the key position it occupied in relation to France’s North African colonies until the early 1960s. Moreover, this study emphasizes that Marseille’s relationship with French imperialism did not expire but, instead, intensified with decolonization, a situation owing to the extensive efforts that were made there in the aftermath of World War II to deliver specialized welfare services and programs to local Maghrebi residents.

Social Welfare for Maghrebis in Historiographical Context

By exploring French efforts to integrate Muslim North Africans in late colonial and postcolonial Marseille, this dissertation looks to contribute to two interconnected fields of research. Scholars in the first field of research concentrate on identifying and examining the “legacies” of empire in postcolonial France. In doing so, they give analytical weight to the notion, recently characterized as the “colonial fracture” in postcolonial French society, that decolonization was not a hard historical rupture but a fluid historical transition rife with ongoing processes, tensions, and effects. Scholarship in this field of research can be separated into three main categories. The first category of scholarship questions how both memories of, and efforts to forget, the colonial past have shaped France politically, socially, and culturally, and also affected

---

the lived experiences of immigrants from France’s former colonies and their descendants. The second category of scholarship explores how the experience of colonialism and decolonization, as well as how the ongoing presence of immigrants from France’s former colonies, has shaped postcolonial French culture. Finally, the third category of scholarship examines the ways in which colonial practices and forms of prejudice have informed the policies of French republican institutions. Scholars are particularly interested in understanding how ex-colonial administrators turned postcolonial bureaucrats shaped the Fifth Republic’s approach towards immigration. Though, as Herman Lebovics points out, ex-colonial administrators brought the empire “home” in other ways as well, shaping the various practices and policies of the Fifth Republic’s Culture Ministry from its founding in 1959 into the 1990s.

Also included in the third category of scholarship on French colonial legacies are studies that explore the subject of social welfare for Maghrebis in metropolitan France. These studies highlight how the French state, in an effort to forget the colonial past, renamed several Algerian-focused government-run welfare agencies and organizations that remained in operation after

---


Algerian independence. At the same time, though, these studies stress that the officials and experts who led the charge to address France’s “Algerian problem” through specialized social welfare continued well after decolonization to occupy leading positions within the French welfare state. The result, according to these studies, was continuity in the attitudes and approaches associated with the state’s handling of immigrant welfare. As Neil MacMaster asserts in relation to social housing for immigrants in France after decolonization: “key policy statements and practices […] developed in the cockpit of the war in Algeria […] continued to inform postcolonial state policy, particularly during the decade 1962-72.”

This study is also concerned with unpacking the legacies of late colonial welfare services and programs for Maghrebis clients in Marseille. However, in placing focus on the self-perpetuating nature of the French project to integrate Muslim North Africans in the city after decolonization, I am particularly interested in examining the specific ways in which North African-focused action sociale carried over into the postcolonial era. What attitudes and strategies informed the late colonial development and actions of Marseille’s specialized welfare network for Maghrebi clients? Did officials, welfare specialists, and service providers remain consistent in their response to North African immigration and their handling of the so-called “North African problem” in the city after decolonization, or did their attitudes and strategies change? Whether or not their attitudes and strategies changed, what specific factors led these officials and experts to continually fixate on the Maghrebi presence in Marseille as a special point of focus?

My goal in asking these questions is to highlight the complex issues of continuity and change related to the French effort to integrate Muslim North Africans in Marseille during the three decades following World War II. Answering these questions involves showing that the

---

16 In particular, see: Lyons, The Civilizing Mission in the Metropole, 207-219.
targets of North African-focused *action sociale*, not to mention who French officials, welfare specialists, and social service providers categorized as “North African” or “Muslim,” fluctuated depending on circumstance. In addition, it involves revealing that even though some of the attitudes and practices associated with North African-focused *action sociale* remained consistent throughout the period in question, others did not.

Exploring the legacies of late colonial efforts to integrate the Maghrebi population of Marseille also entails questioning the levels of influence wielded by leading experts in North African-focused *action sociale* after decolonization. Recently, scholars such as Melissa Byrnes and Ed Naylor have examined this issue through the lens of municipal politics.\(^\text{18}\) Naylor, for example, reveals how, when it came to the issue of housing in postcolonial Marseille, local political agendas and practices sometimes clashed with the ongoing actions of formerly North African-focused welfare experts, ultimately affecting the social aid that was delivered to Maghrebris and other immigrant groups.\(^\text{19}\) As this study shows, by the late 1960s, the social housing assistance received by the Maghrebi residents of Marseille was also shaped by the emergence of new welfare associations run by a different set of experts who followed alternative integrationist models that diverged from late colonial precedents. By examining the contrasting effects late colonial and alternative postcolonial approaches to social housing had on North African immigrant settlement patterns in Marseille after decolonization, this dissertation offers new insights into the spatial geography of North African-focused *action sociale* in the city.

The second field of research this dissertation looks to contribute to focuses on analyzing the paradox associated with the republican model of the French nation and its treatment of racial and cultural difference. Following the principles of Enlightenment universalism, the republican

---


\(^\text{19}\) Naylor, “‘Un âne dans l’ascenseur,’” 439-445.
model does not recognize racial or cultural difference, an approach underscored by “colour-blind” or “race-neutral” policies and laws that enforce uniformity in the public sphere. However, as a growing number of scholars demonstrate, by placing an insistence on uniformity, the French Republic has, historically, politicized the differences of various groups and sought to eliminate these groups’ differences by assimilating them into supposedly better ways of living.\(^{20}\) Thus, in the words of Gary Wilder, the republican model is at once “universalizing and particularizing” in its approach to racial and cultural difference, solidifying the boundaries of the particular and envisioning the elimination of its supposed incompatibilities while at the same time denying its existence altogether.\(^{21}\) According to Wilder and others,\(^ {22}\) moreover, the fact that this same paradox existed at the heart of the French colonial project underscores that French republicanism and colonialism are part of the same linked system, aptly labelled by Wilder the “imperial nation-state.”

The simultaneously universalizing and particularizing aspects of the French effort to integrate Muslim Algerians through specialized welfare services and programs in the context of decolonization have already been noted by scholars like Lyons. According to Lyons, the officials and experts who participated in this effort engaged in a type of “soft racism” that involved underscoring Muslim Algerians’ supposed backwardness and stressing the elimination of their particularities as the basis for welcoming them to France and helping them adjust to life there.\(^ {23}\) In


placing specific focus on efforts to deliver integrationist *action sociale* services and programs to Maghrebis living in one city over a longer period of time, I aim to highlight some of the long-term, and often unintended, consequences of ongoing attempts to eliminate Maghrebis’ ethno-cultural differences. This includes demonstrating how, in responding to the Maghrebi presence in Marseille, officials and experts often ended up creating the very “problem” they set out to solve.

**Social Welfare for Maghrebis in Historical Context**

Though an important development historically, the effort to integrate Maghrebis living in metropolitan France after World War II was not an altogether new phenomenon. In fact, the effort to bring Muslim North Africans into French civilization was a key aspect of France’s colonization of North Africa, which began in 1830 in the lands that would eventually become Algeria and continued with the establishment of protectorates over Tunisia in 1881 and Morocco in 1912. At its core, the French overseas civilizing mission represented the conviction that France had a duty to uplift and transform non-European societies by imbuing them with French cultural values and principles, which were believed to be superior and universal.\(^2^4\) How this mission unfolded in France’s North African colonies, however, was far from uniform.\(^2^5\)

In Algeria, for example, the French sought to create a political, social, cultural, and economic extension of metropolitan France across the Mediterranean Sea, or *Algérie française*. As early as 1848, Algeria was declared an integral part of France and administratively transformed into three French departments (Algiers, Constantine, and Oran). Modelled after the departments in metropolitan France, each Algerian department contained *communes de plein exercice* (municipal

---

\(^{2^4}\) An insightful analysis of the relationship between French colonialism and universalism, particularly through the lens of effort to transfer French republicanism to France’s West African colonies in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, can be found in 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).

administrative districts with full status) governed by the same municipal laws as metropolitan French cities. This approach to colonial governance reflected the ideals of the classic nineteenth-century French colonial doctrine of assimilation, under which the French sought to remove all differences between the societies they colonized and the metropole by replacing the institutions of the former with the institutions of the latter. Part of the assimilationist approach in colonial Algeria also included granting indigenous Muslims French nationality in 1865. The vast majority of colonial Algeria’s Muslim population, however, would have to wait until after World War II to obtain full French citizenship in the form of voting and other political rights. This delay was in part a product of the laws governing “naturalization” in the colony before World War II. These laws only granted full citizenship to indigenous Muslim men who met a number of requirements, such as renouncing their Quranic or customary civil status in personal and civil matters, that most could not or outright refused to meet.

In contrast to Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco were not made integral parts of France. Instead, after they were colonized, they remained supposedly sovereign countries under French

---


28 Muslims in colonial Algeria maintained their Quranic or customary civil status as a result of what amounted to a policy of “coexistence,” which, as Shepard argued, encoded their legal difference from European settlers while maintaining the overall promise of assimilation: Shepard, *The Invention of Decolonization*, 22-26.

29 Between 1865 and 1899, only 1,309 Muslim Algerian men completed the application process to become “naturalized” French citizens. By 1901, the indigenous Muslim population of Algeria totalled around four million: Shepard, *The Invention of Decolonization*, 27. In contrast to indigenous Muslims, the indigenous Jewish population of Algeria was granted French citizenship through the Crémieux Decree of 1870: Pierre Birnbaum, “French Jews and the ‘Regeneration’ of Algerian Jewry,” in *Jews and the State: Dangerous Alliances and the Perils of Privilege*, ed. Ezra Mendelsohn (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 93; see also Sophie B. Roberts, “Jews, Citizenship, and Antisemitism in French Colonial Algeria, 1870-1943” (PhD, University of Toronto, 2011).
“protection.” The protectorate systems established in both countries kept pre-colonial institutions, including indigenous state administrations, tax systems, and courts, in place. This approach to colonial governance reflected the ideals of the French colonial doctrine of association, which developed out of late nineteenth-century criticisms of the validity and effectiveness of assimilation.

In contrast to assimilation, association held that France should preserve the institutions of the societies it colonized, allowing colonized peoples to develop on their own while remaining under French tutelage. Accordingly, under association, France’s overseas civilizing mission was predicated not on equality, but on a strong type of cooperation or fraternity. In theory, association was a “contract” between colonizer and colonized under which each group worked within the general framework of indigenous institutions while doing what best suited their supposedly different abilities and stages of development. In practice, however, true power rested in the colonial administrations which grew alongside indigenous institutions. In short, the former systematically intervened to strip the latter of its authority and place it in the hands of colonial bureaucrats whose job it was to ensure the economic and social “betterment” of colonial society.

Through this approach, the French still believed that colonized peoples would become “civilized” and “French,” just at a much slower pace than what was envisioned under assimilation.


32 The presence of this uneven power relationship in the French Protectorate of Tunisia has led Mary Lewis to suggest rethinking the way in which France’s assimilationist and associationist approaches to colonial rule are studied. Lewis, *Divided Rule*, 10-11.
Despite the different approaches to colonial rule employed in French North Africa, important similarities can still be noted in indigenous Muslims’ engagement with France’s overseas civilizing mission and its “agencies of change,” to borrow from Eugen Weber. A good example comes from the domain of colonial education. Before World War II, all three colonies contained European-styled schools that followed the metropolitan French curriculum (with the addition of instruction in North African history and geography). For the most part, though, these schools were attended by children from European settler families and only a small number of Muslim children from mostly elite indigenous families. Most Muslims who were educated under French colonial rule instead attended “indigenous” schools either run publically by French instituteurs (teachers) under the authority of colonial administrators or privately by indigenous educational or religious associations. Apart from a few colonial schools for Muslim “notables” in Morocco, most French-run “indigenous” schools focused on teaching basic vocational skills. This approach to colonial education amounted to what Jonathan Gosnell refers to as a “two-tiered system of colonial instruction,” one designed with the purpose of preparing a select number of indigenous Muslim students for careers as colonial administrative or military officials. This two-tiered system would only begin to change after World War II, when colonial administrators, in the context of the postwar “modernization mission,” made efforts to reform the education received by colonized Muslim North Africans.

33 Weber in particular uses “agencies of change” to identify the various institutions, including schools and the military, that were employed by the Third Republic in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to integrate and republicanize the supposedly underdeveloped populations of rural France into the French nation: Eugen Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870-1914* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1976).


35 Following the principles of association, these schools combined instruction in “traditional” values and “modern” administrative practices to prepare indigenous Muslim elites for positions in the indigenous Sharifian government: Miller, *A History of Modern Morocco*, 100.

36 In colonial Algeria after 1945, for example, Gosnell notes that the two-tiered system of colonial instruction was replaced by a common education system open to children from both indigenous and European settler families: Gosnell, *The Politics of Frenchness in Colonial Algeria*, 47.
Before World War II, Muslims of North African origin had also interacted with the French welfare state, largely as a result of their involvement in metropolitan France’s foreign labour force. Although Muslims from France’s North African colonies, especially Algeria, began working in France in small numbers in the late nineteenth century, World War I was the true watershed moment, contributing to what amounted to a noticeable migratory movement. During the war, authorities in France and French North Africa recruited or conscripted large contingents of North African workers to support the French war effort. Official statistics place the number of Maghrebis who worked in France between 1914 and 1918 at over 130,000.37

After World War I, as a result of the Third Republic’s maintenance of an extensive system of foreign labour recruitment,38 Maghrebis remained a noticeable group in the metropole. In 1931, official census data placed the number of North African migrants living there at 102,000. In the years leading up to the outbreak of World War II, this number remained between 100,000 and 160,000.39 This interwar migrant population was predominantly composed of men who worked in France for short periods of time as a means of supporting their families back home in North Africa, leading many commentators to characterize their presence in the metropole as “temporary.”40 Nevertheless, their presence in interwar France still prompted the development of a series of paternalistic social aid services, including job placement resources, unemployment assistance,

37 Clifford Rosenberg, Policing Paris: The Origins of Modern Immigration Controls between the Wars (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2006), 109-114. As Rosenberg notes, North African soldiers were also brought to France between 1914 and 1918 to support the French war effort.


social housing programs, and medical care facilities, that specifically targeted Muslim North African clients.

The first of these services was created by politicians in Paris who, in 1925, established a special North African Brigade within the city’s police prefecture, as well as a Service des Affaires Indigènes Nord-Africains (SAINA, North African Indigenous Affairs Service). Within a few years, the SAINA was active in other cities with large Maghrebi populations, including Marseille, Lyon, and Bordeaux. Far from benevolent sources of assistance, however, these services were employed, as Clifford Rosenberg and Mary Dewhurst Lewis have shown, predominantly as a means of policing the political and social activities of Muslim North Africans in France. Indeed, their development was initiated as a response to a number of anxieties that came to be associated with Maghrebis, including anti-colonial nationalism, Communist agitation, and the spread of crime and disease. Thus, even though the administrators of these services professed the need to uplift and “civilize” their Muslim North African clients, in reality their actual goal was to gather intelligence on the identities, movements, and activities of the individuals they came into contact with. Over the course of the interwar era, the North African Brigade gained a reputation for employing brutality and repression, while the SAINA largely narrowed its focus to facilitating the deportation of Muslims back to North Africa.41

After 1945, informed by the experience of World War II, French authorities dismantled North African-specific services with origins in the interwar era that had gained reputations for racist policing and surveillance.42 In their place, a completely new set of specialized services and programs formed in regions with large Maghrebi populations that, at least initially, had no connections to French policing and surveillance operations. Instead, the government bureaucrats,

specialists, and welfare providers who developed and delivered these services and programs widely agreed that to successfully solve the “problems” of the Maghrebi presence in France, “assistance” had to be kept separate from “repression.” Still paternalistic in their insistence that Muslim North Africans required French guidance to adjust to their new lives in the metropole and become French, these authorities and experts couched their paternalism in the language of acceptance. Leading welfare specialists and providers in particular emphasized the need to welcome migrants from the Maghreb with “open hearts,” a sign of good will and inclusiveness meant to make their integrationist project easier, notably by convincing their Muslim North African clients of the benefits of integrating into French society.43

During the period in question, the separation between assisting Maghrebis and policing and monitoring them was not always clear-cut. From the mid-1950s to the early 1960s, this separation would more or less disappear as France came face to face with decolonization and the collapse of its colonial empire. After the outbreak of the Algerian War of Independence, experts with previous experience in the colonial administrations of French North Africa became involved in coordinating and overseeing repressive actions targeting anti-colonial nationalist groups like the Front de Libération Nationale (FLN, National Liberation Front). In Marseille, experts like Alfred Martin even partook in developing an entire surveillance and repression network to monitor and police the local activities of Algerian nationalists. Run out of the prefecture of the Bouches-du-Rhône, this surveillance and repression network existed alongside the city’s specialized welfare network for Maghrebi clients. By the end of the war, moreover, it gathered intelligence from local service providers on the moods and attitudes of their Muslim Algerian clients.44

In addition to opening avenues through which “assistance” and “repression” once again intermingled in the French response to the Maghrebi presence in Marseille, the Algerian War brought changes to the North African-focused integrationist project. In particular, after the French protectorates over Morocco and Tunisia ended in 1956, the individuals and organizations who operated within Marseille’s specialized welfare network for Muslim North Africans began to prioritize Algerian-focused social aid, a shift in focus underscored by the creation of a social housing program in 1959 that exclusively targeted poorly housed Muslim Algerian families. Although Muslims of Moroccan and Tunisian origin continued to interact with the welfare network, they largely became an afterthought amid efforts to integrate Muslim Algerian clients and keep Algeria “French.”

Decolonization had lasting consequences for North African-focused integrationist *action sociale* initiatives in Marseille. After Algerian independence in particular, leading officials and experts who championed the project to integrate Maghrebis in the city could no longer justify maintaining Algerian-focused—let alone North African-focused—services and programs. Nevertheless, efforts to integrate Maghrebis into French society continued unabated under the auspices of an expanded postcolonial immigrant welfare network. Formerly North African-focused welfare associations, but also newly-established welfare associations with no direct ties to North African-focused welfare initiatives, remained steadfast in treating “North Africans,” “Muslims,” or “Maghrebis” as a distinct, and altogether problematic, immigrant group. What’s more, a combination of factors, including Marseille’s geographic position, an unresolved housing crisis, and an ongoing immigration crisis, provided these associations with the fuel they needed to constantly single out North African immigrants and their descendants in this way. As a result, the idea that Maghrebis remained in some way ethno-culturally inferior and backward continued to
inform the French response to North African immigration in postcolonial Marseille, almost ensuring their integration would stay in a constant state of deferral.

**Roadmap to the Dissertation**

The following study is divided into five chapters. Each contributes not only to our understanding of how Maghrebis remained a special point of integrationist focus in Marseille from the mid-1940s to the mid-1970s, but also to unpacking the complex issues of continuity and change related to the French project to facilitate their integration. Chapter 1 focuses on explaining how and why Marseille became an essential site for the delivery of integrationist *action sociale* services and programs to Muslim North Africans. It does this by tracing both the history of Muslim North African migration and settlement in Marseille and the origins and development of the city’s North African-focused welfare network in the nine years between the end of World War II and the beginning of the Algerian War of Independence. In the process, it highlights the different public and private sector welfare associations that made up this welfare network, examines the integrationist services and programs they delivered to Maghrebi men and families, and analyzes the goals and ideals that guided their early integrationist efforts. Some insight is also given into the efforts that were made to coordinate the actions of the welfare network.

Chapter 2 addresses the issue of decolonization and how it affected North African-focused *action sociale* initiatives in Marseille, specifically during the Algerian War years. It is in this chapter that the late colonial shift in focus from North African to Algerian-focused welfare is explored. This chapter also provides insight into the role decolonization played in bringing the “assistance” and “repression” of Maghrebis together, including what this meant for integrationist efforts in Marseille. When combined, Algerian-focused welfare and repression informed the
development of the first serious social housing program for poorly housed Muslim North African families in Marseille.

Chapter 3 extends this study’s exploration of the integrationist response to North African immigration in Marseille into the postcolonial era. Even though decolonization brought about the end of the specialized welfare network for Maghrebis living in Marseille, the integration of North African immigrants remained a significant point of focus for local welfare specialists and providers. In particular, they continued into the 1970s to raise concerns about North African immigration and its relationship to the ongoing presence and growth of shantytowns. In examining how these specialists, service providers, and other experts responded to these concerns, this chapter actively engages in questioning the legacies of late colonial North African-focused action sociale services and programs in the city. It shows how a distinctly colonial approach to shantytown clearance and social housing development known as the “Marseille method” persisted in Marseille at the same time a new group of experts began to promote different solutions to the shantytown “problem.” It also shows that this development resulted in the implementation of two divergent approaches to re-housing poorly housed Muslim North Africans, one based on late colonial precedents that supported moving this population to social housing complexes in Marseille’s northernmost arrondissements, the other based on an alternative goal of localizing this population in the neighbourhoods of inner city Marseille.

Chapter 4 continues this study’s exploration of the French response to North African immigration in postcolonial Marseille, particularly through the lens of ongoing socio-educative family assistance initiatives. Of particular concern in this chapter is a shift that local welfare experts made in their efforts to address the issue of Maghrebi family integration. What began in the early 1950s as an initiative centered on the Westernization of adult Muslim North African women morphed by the late 1960s into an initiative that targeted the “global” care and integration
of entire Muslim North African families, a shift underscored by the expansion of services and programs for Muslim youth. In examining this shift, this chapter underscores how after decolonization the integration of Muslim youth became a prime concern for welfare specialists and providers, who came to view the integration of young people from immigrant families as an essential means of shaping their families’ behaviours and values. Attention is also paid in this chapter to questioning the changing attitudes and approaches of local welfare experts, namely in relation to their views of what constituted an ideally integrated Maghrebi family.

Finally, Chapter 5 provides a more in-depth analysis of the so-called problem of the integration of Muslim youth. In doing so, it analyzes the efforts that were made by the administrators of one welfare association, the Centre d’Accueil Nord-Africain de Marseille (CANA, North African Welcome Centre of Marseille), to integrate young Muslim North African men and boys from the early 1950s to the mid-1970s. The chapter functions as a coda to the four chapters preceding it, using the lens of specialized services and programs that targeted male Muslim youth to further emphasize the special attention the project to integrate Maghrebis received in Marseille throughout the late colonial and postcolonial eras, as well as to underscore the continuities and changes associated with that project over time.
Chapter 1
An Essential Site of Action Sociale: The Formation of a Specialized Welfare Network for Maghrebis in Marseille

In a report she submitted to the prefect of the Bouches-du-Rhône in 1952, Simone Belpeer, who, together with her husband Louis Belpeer, ran the private welfare association Aide aux Travailleurs d’Outre-Mer (ATOM, Aide to Overseas Workers), addressed the issue of the increasing presence of Maghrebi families, particularly from Algeria, in the department. Describing their presence as the “natural extension” of the migration of male workers, Belpeer explained that “every time a worker brings his wife and children, it can be assumed that he will not return to his native land.” Far from lamenting this development, she argued the settlement of entire families represented a positive sign of Maghrebis’ recognition that the social and economic conditions of life in France, including the country’s “high salaries, progress, schools, independence, [and] army,” were superior to those of their societies of origin. More importantly, in her opinion, it demonstrated that Maghrebis not only desired to evolve and integrate “à la vie occidentale,” but that they had already begun to do so. On their own, though, Belpeer believed that Muslim North Africans could only progress so much. While she insisted that some of their more “conservative” customs would disappear the longer they lived in France, she also asserted their overall integration relied heavily on the “métropolitain”: “we must open our doors and our hearts! Not responding to the call of the North Africans would be a failure of the educational role that falls on us.”

It is hard to imagine that Belpeer was not thinking about Marseille when she made this assertion. After World War II, the city’s role as France’s main point of entry for Muslim migrants from French North Africa made it a prime location for the formation of a project centered on the delivery of integrationist action sociale services and programs to Maghrebi clients. Maghrebis who

settled in Marseille during the late colonial era had access to a growing network of specialized welfare services and programs created by government ministries and agencies and private welfare associations to respond to their perceived problems and needs. Initially, this network exclusively targeted Muslim North African men. Soon though, the scope of its focus expanded to include Muslim North African families, a development underscored by the establishment of an *action familiale*—socio-educative family assistance initiatives that targeted adult women. In the end, whether the officials and experts who worked within this network administered services to men or women, their goal remained consistent: to facilitate the integration of Maghrebs into modern French society. Through French guidance and assistance, they envisioned the network’s clients would follow an evolutionary path to Westernization, underscored by the rejection of certain aspects of their pre-migratory ethno-cultural milieus and the acceptance of French civilization.

The methods leading officials, specialists, and social service providers employed to achieve this goal, however, were far from uniform. Instead, the approaches they took to delivering integrationist *action sociale* varied as a result of a number of factors, most notably the outcomes they sought to produce. In the case of Maghrebi men, for example, officials and experts made special efforts to transform them into workers capable of contributing to France’s postwar economic development. In the case of Maghrebi women, they placed an emphasis on creating homemakers capable of running modern European households and raising Europeanized children.² Assessments of Maghrebs’ ability to adapt to life in France and willingness to integrate also informed a variety of different integrationist approaches. As Belpeer noted in relation to Maghrebi families, “in some cases the entire household will have to be taken care of, educated à

---
² Ibid., 2-6.
*l’occidentale*, when it is certain the desire of the interested parties is to live and die in the West; in other cases, teach them to establish a budget; in others, teach them how to eat properly.”³

Thus, the project launched in Marseille after 1945 to integrate Magrebi migrants into French society was at once social, cultural, economic, and gender-determined. For the most part, the officials and experts who operated within the city’s North African-focused welfare network during the late colonial era refrained from trying to transform Muslim religious beliefs. Some even went so far as to support their clients’ celebration of Islamic festivals. At the same time, though, they did oppose and discourage the perpetuation of certain customary religious traditions and practices.⁴ Finally, they anticipated that Magrebis’ adherence to Islam would eventually lessen the longer they lived in France and adapted to a “Western” lifestyle.⁵

My goal in this chapter is to trace the late colonial origins of the project that was carried out by French officials, welfare specialists, and social service providers in Marseille in the three decades following World War II to integrate Magrebis into French society. It focuses on the formation and development of the city’s North African-focused welfare network during the period between the end of World War II in 1945 and the beginning of the Algerian War of Independence in 1954. Since this network emerged at the same time as, and in many ways in response to, an increase in the migration of Muslim North Africans to metropolitan France, this chapter begins by offering an overview of the factors that contributed to this migratory movement. This overview is followed by an analysis of the Magrebi population that settled in Marseille in the late colonial era, with particular attention paid to the residential and social dynamics of their presence in the city. The remainder of the chapter explores the formation of the North African-focused welfare

³ Ibid, 6.
network. It provides an examination of the various services and programs that were developed by national, regional, local, and colonial government institutions to simultaneously assist and integrate Maghrebi men, as well as the role private charitable organizations played in the delivery of integrationist action sociale. It then briefly outlines the efforts that were made to coordinate the various North African-focused welfare services in Marseille before ending with an analysis of welfare services that targeted Maghrebi women and families.

**Muslim North African Migration to France after 1945**

The aftermath of World War II was marked by an important period of growth for the Maghrebi population of France. After passage to the country by airplane and ferry was re-established in early 1946, Muslims from French North Africa began to migrate to the metropole in growing numbers. Despite maintaining a high degree of turnover into the 1950s, this influx of migrants contributed to a substantial increase in the overall number of Muslims of North African origin living in France. Totalling approximately 112,000 at the end of 1945, the Maghrebi population surpassed 250,000 by January 1954. Muslims of Algerian origin constituted a clear majority of this population, more than doubling in number during this period from around 100,000 to over 230,000. In contrast, the number of Muslims of Moroccan and Tunisian origin remained relatively small—totalling as much as 18,000 and 3,000 respectively by 1954—and fluctuated yearly as a result of tight postwar regulations on the movement of people between France and its two North African protectorates. One demographic study conducted in 1952 by the Office of the

---

Moroccan Protectorate in France, for example, estimated that the total number of Muslim Moroccans living in the metropole grew from just under 10,000 in 1945 to close to 17,000 by 1949. The following year, this number dropped below 16,000 before increasing again to over 17,000 in 1951.9

The disparity that existed within the Maghrebi population between the number of Algerians and the number of Moroccans and Tunisians can be attributed to the different juridical statuses and rights held by these groups in the late colonial era. The substantial influx of Muslim Algerians to France after 1945, for example, was largely a consequence of laws passed by the Fourth Republic on 7 May 1946 and 20 September 1947. Both laws granted “French Muslims from Algeria” (or français musulmans d’Algérie) full French citizenship, while the latter, known formally as the Organic Statute of Algeria, went a step further in permitting freedom of movement between Algeria and the metropole.10 Though a growing climate of anti-colonialism in Algeria in the late 1940s was arguably the major impetus behind the issuance of these laws, it can still be considered part of the long history of French efforts to assimilate Algeria and its people into French territory. The Organic Statute reasserted the long-held claim that Algeria was, legally and territorially, an extension of France across the Mediterranean Sea. Thus, legally, the movement of français musulmans d’Algérie to France, as well as their settlement in the metropole, did not represent an example of immigration. Instead, it was considered part of a process of internal migration from one part of France to another.11

---

9 Devillars, L’Immigration Marocaine en France, 13. The numbers provided by Devillars incorporate estimations of the number of Muslim Moroccans who migrated to France clandestinely from the mid-1940s to the early 1950s to avoid French immigration controls.
In contrast to *français musulmans d’Algérie*, Muslims from Morocco and Tunisia who wished to migrate to France after World War II were legally classified as “protected” French nationals (or *protégé français*). As such, they did not experience the same freedom of movement as their Algerian coreligionists. The responsibility for “introducing” them to the metropole was given to the Office National d’Immigration (ONI, National Office of Immigration), a new immigration agency created in 1945 to recruit labour from France’s colonies and other countries.

On metropolitan French soil, though, Muslim Moroccan and Tunisian migrants did receive special privileges not given to other foreign migrant populations, colonial or otherwise. Following an ordonnance passed by Charles de Gaulle’s provisional government on 2 November 1945, they were classified as “privileged residents,” a category of migrant that experienced fewer legal restrictions than “temporary” or “ordinary” residents, including the ability to stay and work in France for longer periods of time. As Interior Minister Henry Queuille explained in 1950, the “privileged” status attributed to Muslims from Morocco and Tunisia in the metropole stemmed from the close “links” that existed between “France on the one hand, and Tunisia and Morocco on the other.” In that year, the Interior Ministry went a step further, granting Muslim Moroccan and Tunisian migrants special ten-year identity cards that were “different from the residency cards issued to foreigners” and allowed them “to justify their identity and the regularity of their presence in France.”

As Neil MacMaster and others have demonstrated, the Fourth Republic’s decision to allow uninhibited movement between Algeria and France came at a crucial time for Algeria’s indigenous

---

12 This status was granted to Muslims of Moroccan and Tunisian origin by the Third Republic in 1938 and reaffirmed by de Gaulle’s provisional government in November 1945: Note from Interior Minister Henri Queuille to the prefects of France on “Carte d’Identité des Marocains et Tunisiens,” 3 August 1950, 1. CADN 1MA200, article 444.

13 Devillars, *L’Immigration Marocaine en France*, 138. Outside of the ONI’s recruitment of Muslim workers from Morocco and Tunisia, late colonial France also handled a small migratory current of students from both protectorates: See the files on late colonial services for Moroccan and Tunisian students studying in France in the CADN 1MA200, article 480 and CADN 1TU/2V, article 796.

14 Note from Interior Minister Henri Queuille to the prefects of France, 3 August 1950, 1-8.
Muslim population.\textsuperscript{15} The Organic Statute officially brought an end to a fifteen-year period during which the global depression of the 1930s and World War II largely hindered the migration of Muslim Algerians to France. More importantly, it provided an outlet for a growing number of Muslims who, during this period, experienced worsening levels of impoverishment when a cycle of significant economic crisis hit Algeria. Due to this crisis, the colony’s Muslim population—which grew from around 5.5 million in 1931 to over 7.6 million by 1948—faced a lack of employment opportunities, an increase in food prices, and, for those who did find work, a decline in wages. No group experienced these conditions more acutely than the poor Arab inhabitants of Algeria’s rural plains, especially those who lived in the High Plains area of Northeastern Algeria near the urban centres of Sétif and Constantine. The consolidation of large amounts of farmland by wealthy European and indigenous landowners during the interwar period forced Arabs in the High Plains to shift from a life of sharecropping to a life of wage labour. This transition placed them in a state of economic precariousness that was further compounded by a lack of alternative sources of income in the region.\textsuperscript{16}

The precarious situation the poor Arab inhabitants of rural Algeria faced is underscored here because, by the mid-1920s, this group began to engage in both internal migration to different parts of the colony and emigration to France as a means of improving their economic prospects. Before World War II, the number of Arabs who departed Algeria for France remained small. After 1945, however, the number of departures increased significantly, and Arabs gradually replaced Kabyle-Berbers—traditionally the largest group of Muslim Algerians in France—as the face of

\begin{footnotesize}

\end{footnotesize}
Algerian migration to the metropole. This shift in the makeup of France’s Muslim Algerian population represented an important aspect of what sociologist Abdelmalek Sayad labels the second stage, or “generation,” of Algerian migration to France, particularly with regard to the concern Arab migrants had for establishing themselves in the metropole. In contrast to the first stage of Algerian migration, which was dominated by Kabyle-Berber men who temporarily migrated to France during the interwar years to secure additional resources for their families and farms or properties back in Algeria, Arabs arriving in France during the second stage were not bound by strong land ties or family duties. This made them more likely to decide to stay in the country for longer periods of time, despite the fact they did not benefit from the more established social and economic networks of their Kabyle-Berber counterparts.

In providing an outlet for Algeria’s increasingly desperate Muslim population, the Organic Statute also played an important role in the thirty year period of economic recovery and expansion—the Trente Glorieuses—that France entered following World War II. Muslim Algerians’ ability to move freely between Algeria and France made them prime candidates to fill the growing demand for low-wage labour associated with postwar reconstruction projects. This was especially true for single male workers, who made up the largest segment of Muslim Algerians living in France in the late colonial era. In general, they settled in the country’s major industrial

17 Ibid., 175-181.
regions, where they found employment in the metal production, coal mining, mechanical and electrical engineering, and construction industries.\textsuperscript{20}

Moroccans and Tunisians also worked in industries associated with France’s postwar reconstruction. In 1952, the Office of the Moroccan Protectorate in France estimated that between 10,000 and 12,000 Muslim Moroccans were employed as factory workers in several industrial enterprises, including metal production, car manufacturing, and airplane manufacturing.\textsuperscript{21} However, unlike Muslim Algerian workers, who freely moved between France and Algeria without restriction, the time most Muslim Moroccan and Tunisian workers spent in the metropole was limited by short-term contracts they signed under the auspices of the ONI’s program of foreign labour recruitment. Between 1946 and 1948, for example, the ONI recruited 3,856 Muslims from Morocco to work for a period of eighteen months in the coal mines of the Lorraine basin and the departments of the Loire, Nord, and Pas-de-Calais. Of that number, 2,074 (or 53.8 percent) were sent back to Morocco when their contracts expired.\textsuperscript{22}

Overall, statistics produced by the Labour and Social Security Ministry in June 1954 show that the largest number of \textit{travailleurs Nord-Africains} in France—47,425 (or 31.6 percent) of 150,222 recorded workers—worked in public works and construction enterprises. In departments like the Bouches-du-Rhône, the overall percentage of Maghrebi men who found employment in the construction industry was even higher. The same Labour and Social Security Ministry statistics indicate, for example, that 44.8 percent of all male Maghrebi workers in the department were employed by construction or building companies.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{20} INED, \textit{Les Algériens en France}, 63-82; see also Rager, \textit{L’émigration en France des musulmans d’Algérie}, 75-80.
\textsuperscript{21} Devillars, \textit{L’Immigration Marocaine en France}, 76-79.
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., 7-8.
\textsuperscript{23} INED, \textit{Les Algériens en France}, 63-82; see also Rager, \textit{L’émigration en France des musulmans d’Algérie}, 75-80.
At the same time it ushered in the presence of a large number of travailleurs Nord-Africains, the late colonial era was marked by the migration and settlement of a growing population of Maghrebi families. According to the Paris-based private welfare association Études Sociales Nord-Africains (ESNA, North African Social Studies), the migration of Maghrebi families to France began in earnest in 1949. Within three years, it estimated that around 100 “familles musulmanes” were entering the metropole each month.\textsuperscript{24} Estimations made by demographers in 1955 indicate that, alone, the number of Muslim Algerian women living in France grew from approximately 3,400 in 1952 to as many as 6,000 by the end of 1954. During this same period, the number of Algerian children grew from under 10,000 to between 14,000 and 15,000.\textsuperscript{25} Available statistics for Muslim women who migrated to France from Morocco and Tunisia indicate that their numbers also increased in the years immediately following World War II.\textsuperscript{26}

French officials, welfare experts, and demographers provided three reasons to explain the growing presence of Maghrebi families in France after World War II. First, they explained that, much like it did for male workers, migration to France offered families the opportunity to find economic stability. Many married male Algerian workers who originally migrated to the metropole alone, for example, were later joined by their families when they could no longer financially


\textsuperscript{25} INED, Les Algériens en France, 58-62. As Amelia Lyons has pointed out, pinpointing the exact size of the North African family population in late colonial France is rather difficult given the shortcomings of studies that counted the number of women and children living in France: Lyons, “The Civilizing Mission in the Metropole,” 497-498.

\textsuperscript{26} An amalgamation of French government statistics compiled by Jeanne Singer-Kerel indicates that the number of Muslim Moroccan women living in France rose from 272 in 1946 to 1,002 in 1954, while the number of Muslim Tunisian women grew from 162 to 1,181 over the same period: Jeanne Singer-Kerel, “Mobilisation et mobilité des forces de travail: système rotatif et intégration salariale,” in Maghrébins en France: émigrés ou immigrés, ed. Labri Talha (Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1983), 84-85.
support “two households.” For a number of families, the right to collect government-administered welfare benefits, including monthly family allowances (or allocations familiales), offered additional economic motivation to migrate. Indeed, though the families of Algerian migrant workers living in either France or Algerian both received this benefit, the former did so at a higher rate. When it came to the families of workers from Morocco and Tunisia, eligibility to receive family allowances was restricted to those living in France. According to colonial administrators, this eligibility strategy functioned to “encourage” Moroccan and Tunisian workers to bring their families to France.

The second reason given by French officials and welfare and demographic experts to explain the migration of a growing number of Maghrebi families to France in the late colonial era was the emotional and psychological stability that came with family settlement in the metropole. Demographers at the French Institut National d’Études Démographiques (INED, National Institute of Demographic studies) argued, for example, that women joined their husbands in the metropole to “avoid the suffering of remoteness and solitude.” But welfare experts also made it clear that this development benefitted Muslim North African men. Indeed, in her 1952 report to the prefect of the Bouches-du-Rhône, Simone Belpeer supported the settlement of the entire Muslim “family unit” on mainland French soil, considering it an important development that could prevent the formation of “loneliness” and “sadness” among male Muslim North African workers and the

---

27 INED, Les Algériens en France, 58.
28 For a detailed analysis of the family allowance system in the late colonial era, particularly during the Algerian War, see: Lyons, The Civilizing Mission in the Metropole, 94-98; see also Susan Pedersen, Family, Dependence, and the Origins of the Welfare State: Britain and France, 1914-1945 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
29 Note from Pierre Devillars to the Director of the Interior to the resident general of Morocco on the “Venue en France de familles d’ouvriers marocains,” 1 June 1949. CADN 1MA200, article 444. In the early 1950s, plans were made by civil servants in the Labour Ministry to extend the family allowance system to the families of migrant workers from Morocco and Tunisia that did not live in France. These plans went unrealized until after decolonization, when the French state’s approach towards the immigration of North African families changed (see Chapter 4): M. Crouzet, “Note d’information sur la situation des salaries Tunisiens en France,” 7 November 1952, 3. CAC 19860271, article 2.
negative “repercussions” that could potentially arise from such feelings. Finally, officials, welfare experts, and demographers all agreed that more Maghrebi families were migrating to France to experience “more advantageous conditions of life.” As the INED asserted in its 1955 study *Les Algériens en France*, even families that encountered difficulties living in the metropole chose to stay “because there is work for the men and school for the children.”

Whatever the reason, the settlement of entire families represented a new dynamic in the migration of Muslim North Africans that was not present before World War II. More importantly, as Lyons has observed, this new dynamic was increasingly encouraged by officials and welfare experts in France and its North African colonies. Well into the 1950s in France and Algeria, for example, radio broadcasts advertised support for the reunification and settlement of Muslim Algerian families in the metropole, and also provided information to help make this process easier. Overall, officials and welfare experts associated the migration of women with Maghrebis’ proper adjustment to life in France, arguing that their presence would not only bring discipline to male workers and a sense of attachment to metropolitan French territory, but would also facilitate the “creation of […] households] in the Western sense of the word.”

---

31 She did not cite what these repercussions were: Belpeir, “Note sur le problème des familles nord-africaines dans le département des Bouches-du-Rhône en 1952,” 2.
Maghrebis in Late Colonial Marseille

As France’s main Mediterranean port city, Marseille became an important site for the massive migratory influx of Maghrebis outlined above. Of all of France’s major cities, Marseille was the principal “point of transit” through which Muslims from the Maghreb entered or exited the metropole during the late colonial era.37 Some even labelled the city the “port of France” for North African immigration.38 In 1952 alone, close to 210,000, or 75 percent, of all Muslims of Algerian origin who entered and exited France by boat and plane did so through Marseille.39 Only one year later, the city’s share of the total number of Muslim Algerians who entered and exited the metropole grew to 88 percent.40

But late colonial Marseille was more than just the principal gateway between France and its North African colonies. Many Maghrebi migrants who entered the metropole after World War II ended up settling there. This contributed to the growth of a local Maghrebi population that numbered around 15,000 by 1954.41 The majority of this population was comprised of single men who mainly found employment as labourers at Marseille’s old and new ports,42 or as tradesmen in the local construction industry.43 This population also included a growing contingent of families, mostly from Algeria, that numbered approximately 350 in 1951 and over 500 by 1954.44

38 Devillars, L’Immigration Marocaine en France, 63.
40 INED, Les Algériens en France, 60.
41 Meeting of the cabinet of the prefect of the Bouches-du-Rhône regarding the elimination of the shantytowns of Marseille, 30 October 1964. While the exact number of Maghrebis living in late colonial Marseille is difficult to determine, statistics compiled in the early 1950s indicate that the city housed the majority of the Maghrebi population of the entire Bouches-du-Rhône, which by 1954 numbered approximately 16,500: INED, Les Algériens en France, 57.
42 By the 1950s, the old port largely served as the site of a fish market and also accommodated some small-scale commercial activity, while the new port functioned as a large-scale commercial and cruise ship port.
43 While statistics compiled by the Labour and Social Security Ministry placed the number of “travailleurs musulmans” in Marseille at 7,540 by 1954, other observers argued that this number was in reality much higher, particularly when the number of “floating” North African labourers who worked in the city was taken into account: Pitrou, “Le logement des Nord-Africains à Marseille,” 9.
44 Ibid., 7.
By the mid-1950s, Maghrebis were a highly visible group in Marseille. Residually, they were spread widely throughout the city. A clear indication of their presence in this regard is provided by a map of the residential patterns of local Muslim Algerian families (Fig. 1). Published by the INED in its 1955 study on Algerians in France, the map shows that Muslim Algerian families could be found living in most areas of Marseille. Still, the Maghrebi presence in the city was stronger in certain areas compared to others. As one report submitted to the General Council of the Bouches-du-Rhône in 1953 explained, the majority of Marseille’s Algerian population had settled in one of two areas following World War II: neighbourhoods located north of inner city Marseille—or “Marseille centre”—near the new port, or neighbourhoods surrounding the old port and St. Charles rail station in inner city Marseille.45

The Maghrebi presence in late colonial Marseille was more than just residential. In many of the neighbourhoods in which they lived, Maghrebi residents worked to build communities that recalled the social climate of their countries of origin, establishing restaurants that served “couscous at all hours” and other North African “specialties,” as well as bars that played “une musique arabe.”46 Near these establishments, North African merchants often opened small shops that sold shoes, clothing, and suitcases, among other items.47 Muslims from French North Africa who arrived in Marseille after World War II arguably felt the greatest sense of community in the neighbourhoods of “Marseille centre,” particularly those that comprised the city’s first, second, and third arrondissements. It was in this area of Marseille that a veritable “Arab quarter” formed in the vicinity of the Porte d’Aix in the neighbourhood of Belsunce. There, the presence of a

---

47 Ibid.
growing number of North African merchants and artisans selling items from the Maghreb and other products at cheap prices functioned to attract a daily stream of male and female Muslim customers.

By the early 1950s, the establishment of “Arab” restaurants, bookstores, and music shops in Belsunce only served to enhance its popularity among the local Maghrebi population.48

Figure 1. The distribution of Muslim Algerian families in Marseille, 1954. Source: ADBR 138 W 77. Reprinted with the permission of the Archives départementales des Bouches-du-Rhône.

In recognition of the significant presence of Maghrebs in “Marseille centre,” a committee of North African and French “notables” led by Charles Mourre, the long-serving president of Marseille’s Chamber of Commerce, launched a project to build a mosque there in 1948. The specific site chosen for the Mosquée de Marseille was a piece of land located at the intersection of the Boulevard des Dames and the rue des Grands Carmes in the neighbourhood of Les Grands

Carmes. Just a short distance from the popular “Arab quarter” of Belsunce, the committee envisioned that this site, after the completion of the Mosquée de Marseille project, would become a central gathering site for the city’s “Muslim believers.” Supporters of the project also believed the presence of a mosque in central Marseille would “consolidate” the city’s reputation as “the door to the Orient.” To bolster this effort, the committee made additional plans in the early 1950s to construct a restaurant and steam room (hammam) near the still-to-be-built mosque that they argued would be “open to all.”

Despite the effort of Mourre’s committee, however, a number of issues—from conflicts between the committee’s North African members to growing concerns in official circles that the mosque could become a site of anti-colonial propaganda and rebellion—prevented the Mosquée de Marseille project from being realized. As a consequence, the main religious site for Maghrebis living in late colonial Marseille became the Muslim section of city’s largest cemetery, the cimetière Saint-Pierre, located in the neighbourhood of La Timone. Opened in November 1945 on the financial backing of the Interior Ministry and the General Government of Algeria, it featured a white kouba (or dome) adorned with a gold crescent that, according to prefectoral authorities, recalled “the ambiance of our Muslim cemeteries in North Africa.”

A study of 101 Algerian families in Marseille conducted in 1954 by social workers (or assistantes sociales) from the private welfare association ATOM offers some insight into how
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49 Note from Alfred Martin to the prefect of the Bouches-du-Rhône on the “projet de la création d’une mosquée à Marseille,” 12 November 1953, 2-6. ADBR 138 W 49.
50 Note from J. Vaudeville to Prime Minister Michel Debré on the “Requête de Chérif Moula Sidi Saïd en faveur de la création d’une mosquée à Marseille,” 13 August 1959, 1-3. ADBR 138 W 27; see also Martin, “Au sujet du projet de la création d’une mosquée à Marseille,” 2.
Maghrebis adjusted to life in the city. Reflecting the emerging trend in longer term Maghrebi settlement, the study noted that although some families “do not desire to adapt” and hoped “to save enough money to return to Algeria,” the majority intended to stay in France and adapt “to their new existence.” According to the study, signs demonstrating that families were on the “path” to integration included: a clean and well-managed household, a father who regularly worked, a “tidy” wife, and well-behaved children. The social workers who conducted the study even labelled one of the families they evaluated “a Europeanized family without any difference from native European families. The household is very clean. The children have French names.” In the same study, other families were simply described as being “well adapted to la vie métropolitaine.”

For most Maghrebi families, the presence of a well-entrenched Muslim community in Marseille made the decision to stay longer in France easier. Outside of the presence of this community, however, their decision to stay longer was also motivated by the relatively good relations they established with their European neighbours. ATOM’s 1954 study, for example, reported only three cases of tension between Algerian and European families. One year later, commenting on the recent arrival of a group of Muslims from southern Algeria in the neighbourhood of La Calade, INED observed that, despite being initially greeted with apprehension, they eventually established friendly relations with their “metropolitan” neighbours. As INED explained, it was not uncommon to find Muslim Algerian men drinking coffee at local bars and cafés and playing cards with French patrons. In general, social workers underscored that, in the case of Maghrebi men, the ability to speak “sufficient” French was a key factor in the establishment of such friendly relations. At the same time, they pointed out that, due to minimal

52 Out of the 101 families studied, one was a mixed marriage between an Algerian man and a Belgian woman: INED, Les Algériens en France, 136-137.
53 Ibid., 145-146.
54 Ibid. Emphasis mine.
interaction with the French-speaking world, very few Maghrebi women had a satisfactory knowledge of the French language. In this regard, they claimed that if Muslim women learned to speak French well, it would contribute to the expansion of positive relations between the Maghrebi and “metropolitan” French populations of Marseille.55

Although it certainly made their decision to settle in Marseille easier, the presence of a well-entrenched Muslim community and the establishment of friendly relations with Europeans did not preclude Maghrebis from experiencing difficulties adjusting to life in the city. Reflecting a trend that emerged after 1945 in other French cities with large migrant populations from North Africa, an acute housing shortage prevented many Maghrebis who settled in late colonial Marseille from finding adequate housing.56 As a result, an increasing number of Maghrebis were forced to take up residency in slums (taudis) or shantytowns (bidonvilles).

In her analysis of this development in 1961, sociologist Agnès Pitrou argued that the formation of slums and shantytowns in late colonial Marseille had a lot to do with the city’s “geography.” According to Pitrou, in the aftermath of World War II,57 Marseille was left with a particular abundance of vacant lots on the outskirts of the city (due to the city’s star-shaped construction and the rather loose development of its suburbs) and sometimes within the city; the existence of properties once frequented by wealthy families […] but now more or less abandoned […] and which offer in addition to land, an old house in which one can squat; [and] the abundance of old premises, blockhouses, and barrack which constitute a pre-existing nucleus in many shantytowns.58

55 INED, Les Algériens en France, 143-146, 153-156; see also MacMaster, Colonial Migrants and Racism, 190.
56 By the early 1950s, the presence of inadequate housing conditions for Muslim North African immigrants was noted in the cities of Paris, Lyon, and Marseille, as well as in the areas of North African immigration in the northeast: Joseph Leriche, “Le Logement des Nord-Africains,” Cahiers Nord-Africains 11-12 (January-February 1951): 7-9.
57 A major factor that contributed to the formation of slums and shantytowns in Marseille was the war itself. Near the end of the war, the city’s oldest inner city neighbourhood, Le Panier, was dynamited by the Germans, while allied bombings contributed to the destruction of other areas of the city. It was in these destroyed spaces that many slums and shantytowns formed: Crane, Mediterranean Crossroads, 111-154; Nasiali, Native to the Republic, 4.
Official statistics from 1954 estimated that between 3,000 and 3,500 Muslims of Algerian origin alone were *sans logis* (homeless) and lived informally in slums or shantytowns in Marseille.\(^{59}\) Though they far from constituted the only ethnic or national group living in these settlements, French authorities and other observers like Pitrou used such statistics to assert that “North Africans” formed the “main core” of the city’s *habitats de fortune* (informal settlements).\(^{60}\) As such, they singled out poorly housed Muslim North Africans as a prominent point of concern.

According to studies of Marseille’s Maghrebi population conducted in the early 1950s, single male workers and families alike were negatively affected by limited access to “normal” housing. One report on “L’Emploi de la main-d’œuvre Nord-Africaine dans la région Marseillaise” produced in 1951 by the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies, for example, described the housing conditions of local *travailleurs Nord-Africains* as “deplorable.” According to the report, only 175 of the 4,500 workers it assessed were given sufficient housing assistance by their employers. The rest, it explained, settled in old neighbourhoods and industrial quarters near their places of employment, where, due to a lack of resources, they largely occupied crowded tenements (*hôtels* or *îlots insalubres*) “lacking in the most elementary aspects of hygiene.”\(^{61}\) Those who did not find shelter in tenements resorted to building their own habitations. In one shantytown which formed adjacent to an industrial park, the Parc du Capitaine Gèze, situated near Marseille’s new port, police officials noted the presence of around 150 “North African” and “Spanish” labourers living out of “constructions of wooden planks, old carriages, and truck cabs.”\(^{62}\)


\(^{60}\) Pitrou, “Le logement des Nord-Africains à Marseille,” 16-17.

\(^{61}\) Excerpt from a report published in the *Bulletin* of the Regional Directorate of Marseille by the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies, September 1951. CAC 19860271, article 11.

Many Maghrebi families faced similar, if not worse, housing conditions to those faced by single male workers. Of the 101 Algerian families studied by ATOM in 1954, only thirty-seven occupied dwellings the association deemed to be adequate. Another twelve resided in one-room dwellings that often lacked windows. The remaining fifty-two families lived in either ruined and abandoned homes or shacks made of wood and metal in makeshift shantytowns where, according to social workers, they demonstrated an inability to maintain satisfactory levels of cleanliness.63 For municipal and prefectoral officials, one particularly worrying place of settlement for local “homeless” Muslim North African families were the blockhouses of the “old” Battery of Cap Janet in northern Marseille. Described as a “bona fide clandestine village” of 150 people, this settlement was singled out in a report submitted to prefect André Pelabon in 1954 not only for its unsanitary and poorly-ventilated shelters that lacked plumbing and electricity, but also for its poor safety. According to the report, the settlement’s isolation from the rest of the city meant it “risked escaping all police enforcement and serving as the refuge of evildoers.”64 Moreover, the settlement was exposed to certain dangers related to World War II, “because the demining of this zone […] has not been subject to verification.”65

By the mid-1950s, most of the slums and shantytowns that housed Maghrebi residents were located near either the new port or factories and other industrial centres in northern Marseille. However, officials did note that a small number of these settlements could also be found in dilapidated inner city neighbourhoods that had been abandoned by their original “metropolitan” French residents after World War II.66 This included the Enclos Peyssonnel, an elongated block of

63 In general, social workers argued that the general hygiene of between 70 and 80 percent of all Muslim Algerian families in Marseille was satisfactory. In the shantytowns of Marseille, however, they claimed that this number was only 40 percent; INED, Les Algériens en France, 139-143.
64 Chief Civil Engineer of Marseille, Report to the prefect of the Bouches-du-Rhône, 27 April 1954. ADBR 1937 W 542.
65 Ibid.
dwellings spanning the neighbourhoods of La Villette and Saint-Lazare in Marseille’s third arrondissement that received significant official and media attention in the early 1950s for its apparent insalubrity (Fig. 2). In 1953, the Bouches-du-Rhône’s Council of Hygiene reported that sixty-four of the 136 dwellings that comprised the Peyssonnel shantytown were occupied by 305 “Arab” workers and families. Describing the shantytown, the Council explained that it “consists for the most part of squalid shacks of wooden boards and metal sheets. Only a few old buildings, shaken by the [wartime] bombings and patched up by their occupants, represent the consistent element of this patchwork of dwellings.” According to the Council, urban inspectors and health officials who visited Peyssonnel found dwellings that lacked sinks and toilets. Throughout the site, it also claimed “a foul odour rises from piles of garbage scattered on the ground.”

Figure 2. Peyssonnel shantytown, 1953. Source: ADBR 148 W 463. Reprinted with the permission of the Archives départementales des Bouches-du-Rhône.

---

67 For a thorough analysis of the attention the Enclos Peyssonnel received from the media and municipal techniciens, including efforts to re-house its residents in the context of postwar modernization efforts, see Nasiali, Native to the Republic, 62-82; see also Minayo Nasiali, “Ordering the Disorderly Slum: ‘Standardizing’ Quality of Life in Marseille Tenements and Bidonvilles,” Journal of Urban History, 38, no. 6 (2012): 1021-1035.


69 Ibid.
By the early 1950s, housing was referred to as the “black mark” of the Maghrebi presence in Marseille.70 However, a lack of adequate housing was not the only issue of concern associated with the city’s Maghrebi population. As a report on local français musulmans d’Algérie submitted to the General Council of the Bouches-du-Rhône in 1953 noted, despite demonstrating a willingness to adapt to French society, “their displacement, their frequent maladjustment to metropolitan life, and their isolation due in large part to their ignorance of the French language” remained “problems” that were “worthy of concern.”71 In the late colonial era, these concerns and others influenced the development of a specialized welfare network in Marseille, as French officials and local public and private sector welfare specialists and providers took action to deliver integrationist action sociale to Maghrebi clients.

**The Beginnings of a Specialized Welfare Network**

It was not long after the migration of Maghrebis to France resumed in 1946 that Marseille’s North African-focused welfare network started to take shape. The earliest associations to comprise this network were public sector associations created and operated by either national government ministries in conjunction with regional government agencies or local and colonial government institutions. They specifically targeted Muslim men who arrived in Marseille from French North Africa, largely as part of the Fourth Republic’s postwar effort to ensure the stability and effectiveness of its growing North African labour force. As Daniel Mayer, the Minister of Labour and Social Security, explained in 1948 in the case of Muslim Algerian men, many arrived in France “without monitoring, without professional qualifications, in a deficient physical state.” Moreover, according to Mayer, they often travelled “on their own initiative to major cities […] or industrial

---

and mining centres without being concerned about the employment and material possibilities they would find there.”\textsuperscript{72} In light of this situation, French officials and welfare experts alike feared that, without proper guidance, male Maghrebi migrants ran the risk of failing to find employment and becoming isolated from the rest of French society in “a poor sanitary and psychological state.”\textsuperscript{73} In such a state, they also feared that it would become impossible to “remedy” male Maghrebi migrants’ presumed vocational, linguistic, and educational “ignorance,” even as they insisted that the migrants themselves shared the same objective.\textsuperscript{74}

In Marseille, the effort to address these “problems” hinged on paternalistic social aid initiatives that welcomed Muslim North African men to France and offered them practical advice and guidance in everything from administrative issues to matters of job placement, all with an eye on helping them ease into their new lives in France. The effort to assist Muslim North African men also involved ensuring they acquired the professional skills that French officials and welfare experts believed they needed to properly contribute to France’s postwar redevelopment. Overall, the primary goal of integrationist action sociale for Muslim North African men was to ensure they transformed into properly qualified and efficient workers.\textsuperscript{75}

The first public sector North African-focused welfare association created after World War II to establish operations in Marseille was the Contrôle Social de la main-d’œuvre Nord-Africain (CSNA, Social Supervision of the North African Workforce). Founded by the Labour and Social

\textsuperscript{72} Letter from Daniel Mayer, Minister of Labour, to M. Chaussade, President of the Council of Ministers, 2 December 1948. CAC 19860271, article 2.
\textsuperscript{73} Pitrou, “Le logement des Nord-Africains à Marseille,” 15.
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid.
Security Ministry in 1946,\textsuperscript{76} it was mainly concerned with ensuring its clients had the knowledge and tools necessary to orient themselves socially and professionally in France. Referred to in government circles as a “social service specific to workers from North Africa,” it was run by social inspectors (or \textit{contrôleurs sociaux}) specializing in “questions nord-africains” whose stated mission was to improve the “material and moral conditions” of male Muslim workers from Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia who migrated to France. As one Labour and Social Security Ministry bureaucrat explained, \textit{contrôleurs sociaux} predominantly acted as intermediaries. On the one hand, they intervened on behalf of \textit{travailleurs Nord-Africains}, providing advice and solutions to “administrative” questions related to issues of worker migration and settlement. On the other, they lent their expertise to government officials, proposing measures they considered “useful to take in the interest of North African workers living in metropolitan territory.” Part of their effort to assist male Muslim North African workers in adjusting to life in France also included “facilitating” the observation of Muslim religious customs, notably the celebration of festivals like Eid al-Fitr and Eid al-Adha, a clear indication the CSNA did not expect its clients to undergo a religious conversion as part of their integration.\textsuperscript{77}

Between 1946 and 1954, the Labour and Social Security Ministry opened thirty-two different CSNA offices throughout metropolitan France, including one in Marseille in early 1948.\textsuperscript{78} Located near the quai de la Tourette in the inner city neighbourhood of La Joliette, it operated under the authority of the Bouches-du-Rhône’s Departmental Directorate of Labour and

\textsuperscript{76} The Labour and Social Security Ministry’s creation of the CSNA was ordered by de Gaulle’s provisional government on 17 November 1945. The order was contained in a decree restructuring services which the Vichy government had made available to North African immigrants during World War II: Le Gouvernement Provisoire de la République Française, “Décret du 17 Novembre 1945 portant suppression du service dont rélevent les travailleurs Nord-Africains résidant en France métropolitaine.” ADBR 150 W 171.

\textsuperscript{77} Marius Pa

Manpower, serving a dual purpose that reflected its position as France’s main port of Maghrebi migration. Indeed, its objectives included offering assistance to male workers who passed through Marseille to other parts of France and providing support to those who chose to settle in the city. To aid the former, CSNA social inspectors organized their reception on French soil, taking measures to welcome and guide them by “helping them in the choice of a subsequent destination and directing them towards regions or activities in which they could best be useful.”

When it came to assisting the latter, contrôleurs sociaux had the authority to supervise, inspect, and regulate the labour conditions in work sites operated by companies “prone to employing North Africans.” They also collaborated with the Labour Office of Marseille to help unemployed Muslim North African men find employment.

Even before the CSNA office of Marseille officially opened its doors, the Departmental Directorate of Labour and Manpower made efforts to supplement its mission. In 1946, for example, the Departmental Directorate opened a small shelter, the Centre d’hébergement nord-africain, on the rue Condorcet in the neighbourhood of Saint-André in northern Marseille. In the spring of 1948, it opened a second shelter at the Camp du Grand Arénas, an eighteen barrack transit camp located in the neighbourhood of Sormiou on the opposite end of the city. Both shelters provided short-term accommodation to hundreds of Muslim men from France’s North African colonies who arrived in Marseille under contract to work in the city and other parts of the metropole. They also
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80 Letter from P. Garret, the Minister of Labour and Social Security, to M. Vernet, the Departmental Director Labour and Manpower of the Bouches-du-Rhône, Marseille, 13 March 1950. CAC 19860271, article 11.
81 Note from M. Aymard, Divisional Labour Inspector of the General Labour Inspectorate, to the Fourth Republic’s Director of Manpower on the “Arrivé de Nord-Africains à Marseille,” 22 October, 1948, 2. CAC 19860271, article 11.
82 Ibid; see also Martin, “Les œuvres sociales en faveur des citoyens français musulmans,” 3.
83 Note from M. Rosier to the Bouches-du-Rhône’s Departmental Director of Labour and Manpower on the “Réquisition de l’immeuble sis 92, rue Condorcet à Marseille-Saint-André,” 28 April 1948. CAC 19860271, article 11.
84 Twelve of the eighteen barracks that comprised the Camp du Grand Arénas were used as part of the shelter. The others were used to help Jewish survivors of the Holocaust or to jail anti-colonial nationalist agitators: See Émile Temime and Nathalie Deguigné, Le camp du Grand Arénas: Marseille, 1944-1966 (Paris: Éditions Autrement, 2001).
offered access to CSNA social inspectors, who worked closely with shelter management and staff to assess the needs of incoming residents. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, colonial and municipal government institutions provided similar *action sociale* services to those offered by the CSNA office of Marseille. The offices of the Moroccan and Tunisian Protectorates in France, for example, both contained social welfare branches—respectively the Service Social Marocain (SSM, Moroccan Social Service) and the Bureau des Questions Sociales Tunisien (BST, Bureau of Social Questions for the Office of the Tunisian Protectorate in France)—that delivered job placement assistance to Muslim Moroccan and Tunisian workers in the city. The SSM and BST also offered jobless men emergency social aid, going so far as to help them move to other locations in France so they could find new employment opportunities. Finally, both agencies were charged with “repatriating” (deporting) unemployed and sick Moroccan and Tunisian migrants who experienced trouble adjusting to life in the metropole. Despite the emphasis they placed on assisting their clients, the fact that both agencies carried out deportations indicates they limited their services to only migrants who they considered fully capable of integrating into French society.
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85 Available statistics indicate that the Camp du Grand Arénas accommodated around 245 Muslim North African workers monthly, though the number of days each worker stayed in the shelter varied greatly. In April 1948, for example, the 245 workers accommodated by the shelter stayed a total of 1,409 days. In July 1948, the same number of workers stayed for only a total of 744 days. In addition to this group of short-term residents, the shelter also provided temporary beds to Muslim North African men who were deemed unfit for work in the metropole and scheduled for repatriation to their countries of origin: Aymard, “Arrivé de Nord-Africains à Marseille,” 3-4; see also the note from M. Rosier to the prefect of the Bouches-du-Rhône on the “Centre de passage nord-africain du Ministère du Travail à Marseille,” 18 May 1948. CAC 19860271, article 11.

86 The Office of the Moroccan Protectorate in France’s decision to establish a separate social aid service for Muslim Moroccan migrants in France was made in 1947: Office of the Moroccan Protectorate in France, “Note au sujet du Service Social Marocain,” 20 September 1947. CADN 1MA200, article 480.

87 The Bureau des Questions Sociales Tunisien was established in 1951 after the reorganization of the Office of the Tunisian Protectorate in France: Letter from Louis Périllier, French resident general in Tunisia, to the director of the Office of the Tunisian Protectorate in Paris, 9 July 1951. CADN 1TU/2V, article 796.

88 Letter from J. Sire, chief of social service of the Office of the Moroccan Protectorate in France, to the Governor General of Algeria on the creation of the Service Social Marocain, 9 April 1949. CADN 1MA200, article 480; Letter from Louis Périllier, French resident general in Tunisia, to the director of the Office of the Tunisian Protectorate in Paris, 9 July 1951.
The city of Marseille began delivering CSNA-style services in 1952. In that year, the municipal council created its own Bureau d’Aide Sociale (BAS, Social Aid Bureau), which provided social aid to the neediest “passagers musulmans.” Given the attention the aforementioned colonial government institutions gave to Muslim men of Moroccan and Tunisian origin, the BAS in particular sought to curb what Gaston Defferre, Marseille’s long-serving socialist mayor, referred to as the presence of Algerian “indigents.” In an effort to accomplish this objective, it provided Muslim Algerian men who settled in the city without a job and sufficient resources one month of emergency relief in the form of “housing vouchers, meal vouchers, and cash.”

Within the realm of public sector North African-focused welfare in late colonial Marseille, efforts to provide Maghrebi men advice and assistance in employment and settlement-related matters represented only one approach to their integration. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, public sector welfare providers also created a series of educational services to familiarize travailleurs Nord-Africains with acceptable ways of living and working in postwar France. Taking the lead in this effort was another institution of the French state, the National Education Ministry. Its actions in the city involved creating, together with the Bouches-du-Rhône’s Office of Academic Inspection, an education centre “for the usage of North African workers” that opened in 1947 on the rue François Leca in the neighbourhood of La Joliette. By 1954, the Ministry’s actions also included opening six night schools for travailleurs Nord-Africains that were run by the Bouches-

89 Defferre served as Marseille’s mayor from 1953 to 1986.
du-Rhône’s Office of Academic Inspection in conjunction with CSNA social inspectors; in total, they had the capacity to accommodate 148 clients.\(^\text{92}\)

In a note on “Travailleurs marocains en France” sent to the Director of the Offices of the Moroccan Protectorate in France in 1948, one high ranking bureaucrat from the Fourth Republic’s Department of Administrative Liaisons explained that the goal of North African-focused educational services was to provide Maghrebi men the “technical knowledge” they needed to become “qualified” workers capable of contributing to French industry. To accomplish this objective, the bureaucrat claimed, these services addressed the “dual concern of improving the social condition of individual North Africans and integrating them more closely into the communauté françiase.”\(^\text{93}\) The classes they offered were designed to deliver Muslim North African workers an integrationist education through lessons in reading, writing, and speaking French, as well as instruction in disciplines like arithmetic, history, geography, science and the natural sciences. The administrators of these services also placed special emphasis on delivering practical lessons they claimed were “applicable” to informing their clients about everyday life in French society. Reflecting the overall goal of these institutions, most of the practical lessons they delivered centered on teaching proper work habits—typically in construction sites and factories—and addressing “problems” related to “purchases, sales, and payrolls.”\(^\text{94}\)

Public sector welfare efforts to produce “qualified” Maghrebi workers did not stop at the creation of specialized educational services. They also involved the development of services that provided what most French authorities and welfare experts considered to be the best means of

---


\(^\text{93}\) Note from M. Petit, director of the Department of Administrative Liaisons, to the director of the Offices of the Moroccan Protectorate in France on “Travailleurs marocains en France,” 23 March 1948. CADN 1MA200, article 480.

ensuring the personal, social, and economic integration of Maghrebi men: professional job training (or *formation professionnelle*). As experts from Études Sociales Nord-Africains explained in 1954, most men who migrated to France from French North Africa were *manœuvres* (unskilled labourers) who typically lacked the knowledge to keep up with the “rapidly evolving economic environment” of metropolitan industry. In particular, they warned that the increasing adoption of American methods of industrial modernization and mechanization by French companies after World War II risked turning unskilled Maghrebi workers into victims of a “technological unemployment.”

Professional job training services for adult Maghrebi men sought to address this issue, the ESNA claimed, by facilitating their “qualitative professional improvement,” encouraging their development as *ouvriers spécialisés* (skilled workers) who could operate industrial machinery and perform other specialized tasks. Despite this claim, though, before they could receive a *formation professionnelle*, Maghrebi men were required to pass a “psycho-technical” exam that assessed whether or not their comprehension of the French language and topics related to a number of vocations, including metalwork and carpentry, was “bien assimilées.” This requirement suggests that, even before they began their integrationist efforts, the providers of professional job training services already expected a certain level of integration from their prospective Maghrebi clients.

---

95 ESNA, “Formation professionnelle des adultes nord-africains en métropole,” 7-23.
98 Potential Muslim North African clients of professional job training services were also assessed for their physical readiness to work in the metropole: Letter from Olivier Marin, director of the Offices of the Moroccan Protectorate in France, to director of the Interior of the French Protectorate of Morocco, 2 April 1949. CADN 1MA200, article 480.
Male Maghrebi workers in late colonial Marseille who were deemed ready to receive professional job training assistance did so through two Centres de Formation Professionnelle des Adultes (Adult Professional Job Training Centres) created by the Labour and Social Security Ministry. Underscoring the types of labour that were expected of travailleurs Nord-Africains in the city at the time, these training centres offered classes which exclusively prepared their clients for skilled labour in the French construction and metalworking industries.\textsuperscript{99}

**Private Welfare Associations in Late Colonial Marseille**

So far the origins of Marseille’s North African-focused welfare network have been explored through the various public sector welfare associations and services that targeted Muslim North African men. But these associations and services were not the only source of North African-focused action sociale in the city in the late colonial era. In 1950, the specialized welfare network expanded as a result of the creation of three private sector welfare associations, the aforementioned ATOM, the Centre d’Accueil Nord-Africain de Marseille (CANA, North African Welcome Centre of Marseille), and the Association des Foyers Nord-Africains de Provence (AFNA, Association of the North African Dormitories of Provence). These associations provided a mixture of specialized assistance ranging from services for travailleurs Nord-Africains that overlapped with those administered by public sector welfare providers to services for Maghrebi men and families that filled gaps in the existing welfare network. To provide these services, all three associations relied on funding from French metropolitan and colonial government institutions.\textsuperscript{100} Similar to the public welfare associations they operated alongside, their founding missions were at once paternalistic

\textsuperscript{100} Ibid., 4-5.
and integrationist, each pledging to help guide the Maghrebi population of Marseille to realize its social and professional “insertion” and “promotion” into French society.101

The largest, and arguably most important, of Marseille’s North African-focused private welfare associations was ATOM. Similar to a number of other major private charities established in France during the late colonial era, it was an organization whose actions were based in the traditions of social Catholicism.102 Louis Belpeer, its founder and long-serving director, completed his university studies in humanities and law at the Institut Catholique de Paris. In 1934, he was invited by the academic contacts he had established in the French capital to open a reception and accommodation centre for African students in Marseille. After World War II, Belpeer became directly involved in efforts to address the growing Maghrebi presence in Marseille when he was contracted by the president of the city’s Social Secretariat to conduct a study of immigrants living in local shantytowns.103 Upon completing this study, Belpeer, together with Simone Belpeer, his wife of apparent “Muslim origin,”104 decided to create ATOM as a way to encourage the development of “humane and cordial relations” and “a greater sense of familiarity” between metropolitans and Muslims of North African origin in Marseille.105 Under his direction, he

---


103 This information comes from the “Introduction” to ATOM and its history and the “Biographical Note” on Louis and Simone Belpeer included in the paper inventory of the ADBR’s series 237 J.

104 Though the ADBR’s “Biographical Note” on the Belpeers makes no mention of it, Simone Belpeer’s apparent “Muslim origin” is referenced in Lyons, The Civilizing Mission in the Metropole,” 102.

105 ATOM, “Statuts.”
envisioned that the association would become a specialized service “capable of taking over initiatives neglected by the state.”

At first, the services offered by ATOM closely resembled those run by public sector welfare associations like the CSNA in that they specifically sought to facilitate the reception and integration of male Maghrebi workers. Shortly after it was founded, the association opened an intervention office that counselled travailleurs Nord-Africains on juridical and administrative matters, and intervened on their behalf in their dealings with different government offices and authorities. It also created a socio-medical aid program that helped sick or injured workers who had been released from local hospitals enter facilities offering aftercare treatment or vocational rehabilitation services. Soon, however, the association expanded the scope of its operations, establishing services and programs that targeted Maghrebi families. The centerpiece of its effort in this regard was the service d’action familiale, a socio-educative family assistance program it created in 1951 to exclusively deliver action sociale to adult Muslim women, particularly of Algerian origin, living in Marseille and the nearby town of Aix-en-Provence.

To further expand its operations, ATOM opened reception centres at Marseille’s cruise ship terminal, airport, and St. Charles rail station between the fall of 1952 and the spring of 1953. At these centres, the association provided single male Muslim workers and Muslim families who arrived in the city from French North Africa with what it described as “moral and material” assistance. The association worked to ensure that new arrivals had their paperwork in order. It also

---

106 “Introduction” to ATOM and its history: Paper inventory of the ADBR’s series 237 J.
helped them avoid disputes with shipping companies, customs officials, local taxi and bus drivers, and the Société Nationale des Chemins de Fer Français (SNCF, French National Railway Corporation), France’s state-owned railway company.\(^{109}\)

As ATOM branched out to assist Maghrebi families, the CANA and the AFNA concentrated on developing services and programs specifically for Maghrebi men. In particular, both associations made their primary concern the delivery of social housing assistance to single male workers. In the aftermath of World War II, Marseille’s North African labour force was negatively impacted by a lack of adequate housing, a situation local employers of North African labour and public sector welfare providers did very little to alleviate. Given this situation, private sector welfare associations were relied upon to help develop solutions to the housing dilemma many Muslim North African workers faced upon their arrival in Marseille. The CANA, for example, was founded after prefect Jean Baylot entrusted ATOM’s top administrators—notably Marc Fraissinet, the association’s president, and the Belpeers—with establishing a new private welfare association under their leadership that would welcome and temporarily house “French citizens” of North African origin to the city.\(^{110}\) As a result, it largely focused on assisting incoming Muslim Algerian workers. The AFNA, meanwhile, was founded by a group of local businessmen and industrialists using a subsidy it received from the Labour and Social Security Ministry to “improve the housing conditions of travailleurs Nord-Africains” in Marseille and its surrounding region.\(^{111}\)

---


\(^{110}\) Note on the history and activities of the CANA provided to Prime Minister Michel Debré by the Office of the Prefect of the Bouches-du-Rhône, 4 June 1959. ADBR 138 W 57. While the historical note provided to Debré explains that Baylot’s efforts to establish the CANA began in 1951, the association was actually created one year earlier: CANA, “Statuts 1950.”

\(^{111}\) Letter from J. Plettner to F. Naves, chief of staff of the President of the French Union, on the AFNA, 25 June 1952. ADBR 148 W 193. While the letter notes that the AFNA was founded in 1951, like the CANA, it was created in 1950: AFNA, “Statuts et fonctionnement.”
The CANA operated in the same vein as the publicly-run shelters at Saint-André and Sormiou outlined above. Beginning in 1952, it ran a welcome centre offering short-term beds, meals, and shelter to newly arriving travaillers Nord-Africains, as well as two groups of “needy” Muslim North African men—those who were unemployed or homeless and those who were ordered by French authorities to return to their countries of origin. According to the CANA’s activity report for 1953, during the welcome centre’s first twelve months in operation, it sheltered 826 unemployed or homeless clients. Over the following twelve months, it accommodated another 1,560 clients. On average, the welcome centre sheltered its clients for six days, though some stayed as little as two days and as long as three weeks. During their stays, clients were given medical evaluations. They also had access to services in the form of emergency monetary allocations and assistance searching for permanent employment and housing. Underscoring an interest in the integration of Maghrebi youth, the welcome centre also ran a program that provided vocational pre-training assistance (or préformation professionnelle) to hundreds of young Muslim North African men between the ages of seventeen and twenty-five.

In contrast to the CANA, the AFNA engaged in the development of permanent social housing solutions. Led by a Mr. Boullet, the general secretary of the Society for the Defense of Commerce and Industry in Marseille, it worked closely with the Departmental Directorate of Labour and Manpower to build and operate low-rent dormitories for travaillers Nord-Africains. The association built its first dormitory, the 250-bed Foyer-Hôtel Viala, in the

---

115 Note on the history and activities of the CANA provided to Prime Minister Michel Debré by the Office of the Prefect of the Bouches-du-Rhône, 4 June 1959.
116 AFNA, “Statuts et fonctionnement”; Letter from J. Plettner to F. Naves, Chief of Staff of the President of the French Union, 25 June 1952.
neighbourhood of Saint-Louis in the fifteenth arrondissement in northern Marseille. Opened in 1953, it provided its residents with modern amenities like running water, electricity, and heating, as well as facilities for cooking, for a monthly rent of 20 francs. Not long after this dormitory opened, the AFNA made plans to expand its operations through the development of two additional dormitories—an extension of the Foyer-Hôtel Viala, the 70-bed Viala-Annexe, and an entirely new complex, the 185-bed Foyer-Hôtel Pont-de-Vivaux, in the neighbourhood of Sainte-Marguerite in southern Marseille. However, despite receiving a subsidy of 1 million francs from the Labour and Social Security Ministry to rapidly complete these complexes, the association was only able to open them in 1957. In this regard, by 1954, the housing assistance offered by the AFNA was only available to a small number of Muslim North African workers.

**Coordinating North African-Focused Social Welfare**

Apart from a few notable exceptions, the welfare associations that comprised the North African-focused welfare network of late colonial Marseille, whether public or private, operated independently of each other. However, this did not stop efforts from being made, principally by prefectoral authorities, to organize and coordinate the services and programs they provided. Given Marseille’s position in the grander scheme of North African immigration in France, the earliest efforts in this regard concentrated on ensuring North African-focused welfare associations

---

118 Martin, “Organisation actuelle de l’action sociale spécialisée dans la IXe région et dans le département des Pyrénées-Orientales de la Vᵉ région et perspectives pour l’année 1955.” All monetary figures contained in this dissertation are given in new francs. The new franc replaced the old franc when France revalued its currency in January 1960, with each new franc totalling one hundred old francs.
120 Note on the “Centres d’hébergement de Marseille” written by the director of the Caisse Nationale de Sécurité Sociale, 3 February 1954. ADBR 138 W 49.
121 AFNA, “Foyers-Hôtels à Marseille et dans la Région.”
122 These exceptions included the CSNA and the Bouches-du-Rhône’s Office of Academic Inspection working together to operate Marseille’s six night schools for Muslim North African workers, and the top administrators of ATOM also serving in positions of leadership at the CANA.
specializing in the delivery of reception and orientation services worked together to adequately assist newly arriving Maghrebi migrants. Shortly after the creation of ATOM in early February 1950, for example, its treasurer, Maurice Chaix-Bryan, attended a meeting organized by prefect Baylot that focused on developing a joint public-private mission to address the “problems” associated with welcoming Muslims of North African origin to Marseille.\textsuperscript{123} But as the late colonial era progressed, coordination efforts extended to other matters of concern, including the labour conditions of travailleurs Nord-Africains, housing for single men and families, and general social assistance.

During the period in question, the strongest push to organize and coordinate North African-focused action sociale came from the French state. Central to the state’s effort in this regard was the formation of two interministerial commissions, the Interministerial Advisory Commission for the Study of North African Questions and the Interministerial Commission for the Coordination of Muslim Social Affairs. Created respectively in 1949 and 1952, these commissions brought together representatives from the principal government ministries offering services to Muslim North Africans, as well as prefects from regions with large North African populations.\textsuperscript{124} Together, they formed an “administrative organization” that sought to encourage a streamlined approach to addressing the Maghrebi presence in metropolitan France.\textsuperscript{125} To accomplish this objective, they mainly focused on bringing an end to the problems that often plagued relations between different public sector welfare providers.\textsuperscript{126} At the national and regional levels, their members met regularly

\textsuperscript{123} Meeting organized by Jean Baylot, the prefect of the Bouches-du-Rhône, regarding the “mission à Marseille” to address the “problème de l’immigration des Nord-Africains dans la Métropole (Bouches-du-Rhône),” 18 February 1950. CAC 19860271, article 11.
\textsuperscript{126} For a thorough analysis of these problems and the efforts that were made to solve them through the coordination of welfare services for North African immigrants in France, see Lyons, The Civilizing Mission in the Metropole, 38-46.
to settle disagreements, to determine the “rational” use of government financial resources, to avoid the “fragmentation” and “duplication” of social aid initiatives, and to establish “emergency orders.”

The actions of both commissions also extended to promoting the creation and funding of private sector welfare services. For the Interministerial Advisory Commission in particular, this included instructing the Interior Ministry to support the expansion and monitoring of private associations that exclusively catered to Muslim North African clients. Another key government player in late colonial welfare for Maghrebis, the Interior Ministry carried out this task under the auspices of its Algerian and Overseas Departments Service, which established an office of Algerian Affairs—later the Service des affaires musulmanes et de l’action sociale (SAMAS, Muslim Affairs Service)—in Paris in the early 1950s.

As Études Sociales Nord-Africains explained in its 1953 “Guide to the Action Sociale Benefitting North Africans in the Metropole,” state-led coordination efforts mainly targeted the “activities of administrations principally interested in les migrations algériennes.” Part of the support the Interior Ministry provided to the Interministerial Advisory Commission, for example, involved ordering the prefectures to conduct surveys of “the status of Muslims originating from Algeria living in the metropole.” According to Interior Minister Léon Martinaud-Deplat, these surveys were designed to acquire knowledge of the living, working, and housing conditions of français musulmans d’Algérie, which he believed was essential to overcoming the various

---


128 Given Algeria’s assimilationist status as an extension of metropolitan France across the Mediterranean Sea, not to mention Muslim Algerians’ special legal status as French citizens, the Interior Ministry played a central role in determining policies concerning français musulmans d’Algérie in France and Algeria in the late colonial era: Lyons, The Civilizing Mission in the Metropole, 38-39, 43-44.

difficulties” that arose when structuring integrationist social welfare. Still, the predominant focus on Muslims from Algeria did not stop serious efforts from being made to monitor and coordinate welfare providers that targeted—either exclusively or as part of broader North African social aid initiatives—Muslims from France’s North African protectorates.

Right up until the decolonization of Morocco and Tunisia, ministerial authorities remained in constant communication with the metropolitan offices of both protectorates, discussing, among other issues, the best approaches to take when assisting the clients of their respective social welfare branches. Moreover, the metropolitan offices of both protectorates were regularly looped into broader state-led coordination efforts. By 1954, the heads of both offices even sat on another special committee that included representatives from several public and private sector welfare associations, as well as the SNCF. Known as the Comité Lyautey, this committee organized reception and orientation services “in favour of North African workers travelling from Marseille to Paris by train.”

To ensure the effectiveness of the coordination efforts outlined above, several administrative specialists, or experts, with experience in the colonial governments of French North Africa were employed to aid, monitor, and report on welfare services and programs in the departments with large Maghrebi populations. Principal among these experts were General

---

130 Letter from Léon Martinaud-Deplat, Interior Minister, to the Inspecteurs généraux de l’administration en mission extraordinaire (IGAMEs) and prefects of metropolitan France concerning an “Enquête sociale sur la situation des musulmans originaires d’Algérie résidant en métropole,” 24 August 1953. ADBR 138 W 49.
131 Due to the fact the overwhelming majority of Muslims of Moroccan and Tunisian origin living in late colonial France were single male workers, the national government ministry that worked closest with the metropolitan offices of both protectorates was the Labour and Social Security Ministry: Letter from Olivier Marin to the resident general of the Protectorate of Morocco on the “commission consultative Nord-Africain” between the Office of the Moroccan Protectorate in France and the Labour and Social Security Ministry, 4 March 1947. CADN 1MA200, article 480.
132 The committee was named after Louis Hubert Gonzalve Lyautey, a long-time colonial administrator best known as the first resident general of Morocco (1912-1925). For a detailed study of Lyautey’s career as a colonial administrator, see: William A. Hoisington, Lyautey and the French Conquest of Morocco (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1995).
133 The principal public sector welfare providers represented on the committee were the Interior and Labour and Social Security Ministries: Office of the Moroccan Protectorate in France, note on the “Comité Lyautey,” 27 October 1954. CADN 1MA200, article 480.
Administrative Inspectors on Special Assignment (Inspecteurs généraux de l’administration en mission extraordinaire, IGAMEs), who were originally deployed by the Interior Ministry to France’s ten military districts in 1948 to assist in the metropolitan operations of its Algerian and Overseas Departments Service.\(^{134}\) Into the 1950s, the IGAMEs became increasingly involved in the actions of the interministerial commissions, working closely with prefectural authorities “to define […] the principal lines of action to undertake” in order to integrate Muslim North Africans living “in the departments.”\(^{135}\)

In 1952, to assist the IGAMEs in their efforts, the Interior Ministry and governor-general of Algeria jointly deployed additional technical consultants “specializing in Muslim social questions,” or CTAMs (Conseillers techniques pour les affaires sociales musulmanes), to cities in the second (Lille—Mr. Laurent), sixth (Metz—Mr. de Nesmes-Desmartes), eighth (Lyon—Mr. Georges Martin), and ninth (Marseille—Mr. Alfred Martin) military districts.\(^{136}\) Former Algerian colonial civil service administrators, these experts worked directly under the supervision of their respective IGAMEs. Their primary responsibilities included “advising the managers of social aid organizations in the region […] and supervising the associations benefitting from the financial aid of the state.”\(^{137}\)

In Marseille, the participation of both the IGAME and CTAM of the ninth military district in the domain of North African-focused action sociale was essential to bringing administrative structure and oversight to the specialized welfare network (Fig. 3). The three men who successively served as the IGAME between 1948 and 1954—Jean Baylot, René Paira, and André Pelabon—

\(^{134}\) Ibid., 62.
performed double duty as the prefect of the Bouches-du-Rhône. As a result, efforts to monitor and organize the delivery of local North African-focused *action sociale* services were centralized at the prefecture’s Bureau of Muslim Affairs. The directors of Marseille’s North African-focused welfare associations reported directly to the Bureau of Muslim Affairs, submitting annual activity reports to the prefect-IGAME. In addition, they regularly attended the meetings of the regional Advisory Commission for North African Questions.  

Figure 3. The North African-focused welfare network of Marseille by 1954. Source: Created by the author.

After 1952, prefectoral coordination initiatives became even more streamlined with the appointment of CTAM Alfred Martin. Demonstrating his commitment to integrating Marseille’s Maghrebi population, Martin established his own liaison committee that brought together local North African-focused welfare associations not only to discuss the “essential needs” of Maghrebi workers and families, but also to determine the best approaches to take to facilitate their integration.  

---

138 No clear explanation was given to help us understand why the responsibilities of two important regional government positions were placed in the hands of one specialist. Internal government documents concerning North African social welfare in France simply referred to these specialists as prefect-IGAMEs. Examples of this can be found throughout ADBR series 138 W.

139 Principal members of the committee included Louis and Simone Belpeer and representatives from the BAS and the Departmental Directorate of Labour and Manpower: Meeting of the Comité officieux de liaison, 27 May 1952. ADBR 148 W 193.
frequently producing reports detailing their social aid initiatives while also offering them advice and guidance.  

**Integrating Maghrebi Families**

During the early years of its existence, *action sociale* for Maghrebi men formed the backbone of Marseille’s North African-focused welfare network. However, by 1954, the growing presence of Maghrebi families in the city had become an increasingly important point of focus for local welfare specialists and providers. Indeed, in the report she submitted to the prefect in 1952, Simone Belpeer asserted the migration of entire Muslim families from France’s North African colonies came with its own set of “problems.” According to Belpeer, the most concerning of these problems was the evolutionary gap that, in her opinion, existed between male workers who had already made achievements on the “train of evolution” and wives and children who remained stuck in a milieu “lagging behind the West.”  

Focusing on the personal consequences of this perceived gap, she argued that it contributed to the formation of serious “marital drama” between husbands and wives.

Subsequent reports produced by ATOM built on Belpeer’s idea of an evolutionary gap and explained what it revealed about Maghrebi women and their adjustment to French society. In its activity report for 1954, for example, ATOM argued that, when compared to their male counterparts, Maghrebi women were less familiar with the French language, less suited to the demands of metropolitan life, and more ignorant of “the basic requirements of home economics, child care, and civic life.” Specialized welfare services that targeted Maghrebi families sought

---

140 Some of these reports have already been cited in this chapter.
142 Ibid.
to address these issues by specifically encouraging Maghrebi women to enter what Belpeer called “a stream of Westernization.”

But the Westernization envisioned for Maghrebi women by service providers like Belpeer entailed more than simply bringing them in line with the path to integration envisioned for Maghrebi men. According to Belpeer, it involved changing pre-migratory patriarchal family structures under which women were “passive” and “traditionalist” and men controlled “everything” from family expenditures to the “upbringing and education of children.” In other words, although she praised Maghrebi men for being more evolved than their female counterparts, Belpeer still treated them with suspicion when it came to the overall evolution of their families. Belpeer was thus one of the growing number of welfare experts who during the late colonial era touted the advantages of the migration of Muslim women of North African origin to the metropole, particularly when it came to the establishment of “Westernized” Muslim households that were clean, well-managed, and “modern.” Insisting that Maghrebi women carried the potential to exhibit considerable influence on the behaviours and values of their husbands and children, these experts believed that the “harmonious integration” of entire Maghrebi families hinged on the transformation of their adult female members. More specifically, they asserted that, once properly shown the advantages of adopting “French” ways of living, Maghrebi women would take the lead in spreading French values to their families. Given experts’ views on the matter, it should come as no surprise that they praised Muslim North African women whose families adopted French customs and domestic practices and blamed Muslim North African women whose families continued to follow so-called backward cultural practices.

145 Ibid.
The attention that French officials and welfare experts in late colonial Marseille devoted to integrating Muslim North African women was not new. It instead built off an already existing colonial discourse that, as Frantz Fanon explained in the late 1950s, presented Muslim women as the “humiliated, sequestered, [and] cloistered” victims of an overtly masculine and unchanging Islam that was both “medieval and barbaric.” Early contributions to this discourse from the late nineteenth century centered on exploring the status of Muslim women as a means of judging—and identifying as inferior—the morals, customs, and beliefs of indigenous North African society. In Algeria in particular, colonial administrators and nonofficial observers paid special attention to Islamic legal and customary practices (i.e. polygamy, child marriage, the sale of brides) that they considered sexually deviant, morally perverse, and oppressive towards women. Some nonofficial observers, including suffragist Hubertine Auclert, drew from these observations to advocate for efforts to improve the educational and legal rights of Muslim Algerian women. For Auclert, the cultural “elevation” of Muslim Algerian women was key to freeing them from their presumed oppression. Until the interwar era, though, the supposedly deviant and perverse aspects of indigenous North African society were more readily used by opponents of the colonial doctrine of assimilation as evidence that Muslims were incapable of culturally and politically assimilating into French civilization.
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149 Auclert was one of a number of European women who advocated for better rights for colonized populations. In the process, these women also furthered European feminist causes: See Julia Clancy-Smith, “Islam, Gender, and Identities in the Making of French Algeria, 1830-1962,” in Domesticating the Empire: Race, Gender, and Family Life in French and Dutch Colonialism, eds. Julia Clancy-Smith and Frances Gouda (Charlottesville and London: The University of Virginia Press, 1998), 154-174; see also Antoinette Burton, Burdens of History: British Feminists, Indian Women, and Imperial Culture, 1865-1915 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1994).
150 Clancy-Smith, “Islam, Gender, and Identities in the Making of French Algeria, 1830-1962,” 167-172. As Clancy-Smith points out, Muslim women became a subject of inquiry for a growing number of official and nonofficial observers in Algeria beginning in the late nineteenth century. In their textual and visual accounts, these observers used Muslim women as a way to both “penetrate” colonized Algerian society and comment on and judge the cultural differences of indigenous Muslims. According to Clancy-Smith, many photographs and travel accounts, particularly by nonofficial observers, also explicitly functioned to sexually commodify Muslim women.
Indeed, in Algeria, it was not until the early 1930s that French colonial officials began to articulate a concrete political strategy regarding Muslim women. Under this strategy, colonial officials posited that, in order to obtain control of and transform Algerian society, France needed to “conquer” the Algerian woman. Fanon offers a succinct description of the attitudes that undergirded this program and the goals it sought to accomplish:

The Algerian, it was assured, would not stir, would resist the task of cultural destruction undertaken by the occupier, would oppose assimilation, so long as his woman had not reversed the stream. In the colonialist program, it was the woman who was given the historic mission of shaking up the Algerian man. Converting the woman, winning her over to the foreign values, wrenching her free from her status, was at the same time achieving a real power over the man and attaining a practical, effective means of destructuring Algerian culture.

According to Fanon, this strategy blatantly manifested itself in French efforts to “unveil” Algerian women, an act he argues simultaneously symbolized the desire of colonial officials to penetrate, degrade, and ultimately break the resistance of Algerian culture and society.151

To “conquer” Maghrebi women in Marseille in the early 1950s, welfare providers like the Belpers advocated offering them a range of socio-educative services, from instruction in the French language to introductory classes in French civic life. More importantly, they championed providing Maghrebi women a gender-based “enseignement ménager,” which they described as a “proper” education in home economics, childrearing, and domestic science (arts ménagers) skills and practices.152 Specialized services for Maghrebi women thus hinged on emphasizing that their natural place was in the domestic sphere as housewives and mothers. In many ways, these services mirrored social aid programs that since the late nineteenth century had targeted French lower-class women. However, that is where the similarities ended. Although they found it acceptable for poor French women to work outside the home, the providers of North African-focused social aid did

151 Fanon, A Dying Colonialism, 35-47.
not expect Muslim North African women to do the same.153 This integrationist approach, it should not be ignored, was itself a product of French patriarchal norms, a fact service providers clearly ignored as they sought to transform Maghrebi women into “French” homemakers capable of raising “French” families.154 Indeed, the emphasis service providers placed on arts ménagers, which after World War II became the centre of a movement to professionalize housekeeping through the use of scientific principles and new household technologies,155 fully underscored their desire to convince Maghrebi women to adopt a new way of life as modern homemakers. In their capacity as homemakers, service providers envisioned that Maghrebi women would serve as a modernizing and Westernizing force within their families.

The main provider of socio-educative services to Maghrebi women in late colonial Marseille was ATOM. As part of its service d’action familiale, the association employed social workers to conduct hundreds of home visits to assess the levels of integration of local Muslim North African families in a number of areas, including their housing conditions and domestic “atmospheres,” their spending and saving practices, their sanitary habits, and their relations with their neighbours. In 1953, ATOM social workers “regularly” visited 400 families in Marseille and Aix-en-Provence.156 The following year, they gathered information on between 600 and 800 families in the entire Bouches-du-Rhône and conducted approximately 700 home visits.157

154 If Simone Belpeer’s “Muslim origin” is to be believed, it is clear that, despite the fact she did not personally conform to such a view, she fully bought into dominant discourses that emphasized that Maghrebi women’s natural place was in the home: Lyons, The Civilizing Mission in the Metropole, 104-105.
156 ATOM, “Rapport d’Activités pour l’exercice du 1 Juillet 1952 au 30 Juin 1953,” 7. Insight into the ways in which ATOM social workers assessed Muslim North African families is provided in two assessments of Algerian families in Marseille and Aix-en-Provence that were conducted by the association in 1953 and 1954 and reprinted in ESNA, “Situation et aspirations de la famille nord-africain en Métropole,” 16-35.
By 1954, ATOM also ran four home economics classes—developed in conjunction with the local Home Economics School of Provence—for adult Muslim North African women in the city. Conducted by social workers either once or twice a week in clients’ homes for instructional periods lasting as long as three hours,158 these classes provided lessons in sewing and mending, general hygiene, childcare, and cooking.159 Through these classes, female Maghrebi clients were taught, among other things, how to prepare “food suitable to the metropolitan climate,” how to follow French “conceptions of hygiene” and cleaning practices, and how to use the utensils and technologies of European households.160 All customs and practices linked to their cultural traditions were thus considered inconsequential and devalued.

Reporting on ATOM’s home economics classes in May 1954, CTAM Martin explained that they formed as a result of “favourable” contacts that the association had made with local Maghrebi families.161 In total, they catered to roughly 100 clients, most of whom were married.162 However, as ATOM itself noted, a small number of the clients who attended these classes were “jeunes filles musulmanes” (young Muslim girls), suggesting that the association ultimately envisioned branching its service d’action familiale initiatives out to all women in a given Maghrebi household regardless of age.163

ATOM’s activity report for 1954 offers further insight into how welfare providers, through the services they offered to Maghrebi women, approached the integration of Maghrebi families. In
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161 Martin, note on the “Orientation nouvelle donnée par l’ATOM à son organisation d’éducation familiale.”
162 ATOM’s focus on married female clients in the early years of its existence was noted by Louis Belpeer in 1959: Note from Louis Belpeer to the CTAMs of Marseille on “Action sociale éducative en faveur des femmes musulmanes,” 1959. ADBR 138 W 27.
describing ATOM’s home economics classes, the report asserted that the integration of Muslim North African families “must be multifaceted, adapted to different psychological and social standings, varying according to whether it applies to the natives of the coast, the plains, the mountains or the oasis.” In addition, the report argued that any integrationist action “must also take into account the degree of evolution of the families” it targeted. In other words, service providers believed that, in order to be successful, socio-educative family assistance initiatives needed to have the ability to respond to the different backgrounds and perceived needs of their clients. No matter how it crafted these initiatives, however, the objective ATOM sought to accomplish remained consistent: to “penetrate” the homes of Maghrebi families and shape their behaviours and values in accordance with majority French cultural and social norms.

In working to accomplish this objective, ATOM had tireless advocates in Louis and Simone Belpeer. In her 1952 report to the prefect, for example, Simone Belpeer highlighted the “encouraging success” ATOM had already achieved in establishing a home economics class for a group of Muslim Algerian families living in Aix-en-Provence. According to Belpeer, when these families initially settled in the town, they lived “amongst themselves, without contact with the outside world.” However, after only five months of contact with ATOM social workers, she insisted that they had undergone a “surprising” evolution: “the women […] speak better and better in our language [and] dress à la Française; the children are neat and well behaved; the interiors of their homes have, despite their poverty, a pleasant and clean appearance.” Despite these results, Belpeer was adamant they were just a first step in ATOM’s integrationist action familiale. Indeed, in her report, she continued to warn the prefect that some Muslim North African migrants maintained an “enduring” attachment to their “ancestral customs.” To address this concern, Belpeer indicated that ATOM envisioned implanting its home economics classes in local schools,

an approach he believed would better foster the integration of the organization’s female clients by encouraging them “to dress, go out, do their shopping along the way, [and] meet Métropolitains.”

In addition to establishing services for women, welfare providers’ efforts to spur the integration of Maghrebi families living in Marseille extended into the domain of social housing. In 1952, Simone Belpeer identified the housing situation of Muslim North African families in late colonial France an issue of “paramount” importance. Writing in particular on the growth of slums and shantytowns in the Marseille region, she asserted that “since we have given our North African populations the right to come make a living on metropolitan soil, we must concern ourselves with how we […] keep them from the slums which are their only shelter.” Foreshadowing the type of attention shantytowns would receive during the Algerian War of Independence, she claimed their presence and ongoing growth presented “dangers” that could not be ignored, including the potential they could become family “ghettos” and barriers to all French influence. Belpeer thus identified shantytowns as sites that hindered the integration of their Maghrebi residents. Moreover, she underscored the need to develop housing initiatives that would not only address this shantytown “problem,” but would also contribute to the integrationist efforts of local welfare providers.

Belpeer was not alone in making this assessment. One year before her report, Études Sociales Nord-Africains identified housing as a fundamental “social duty” that French officials and welfare specialists needed to address to ensure the Maghrebi populations of France’s major
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cities adjusted to life in the metropole.\textsuperscript{168} Other studies of housing conditions in late colonial Marseille identified life in slums and shantytowns as a “brake on evolution.” As one study from 1961 asserted, Muslim North Africans who lived in local bidonvilles attempted “to recreate in some way the kind of traditional habitat to which they are accustomed,” and thereby demonstrated tendencies that supposedly “reinforced” their segregation from French society and made them “less permeable to Western customs.” According to the study, these tendencies included reconstituting “le douar” (Arab tent villages), maintaining “la cuisine sur le ‘Kanoun’” (outdoor preparation of meals by traditional barbeque), and preferring to sit on rugs and mats over chairs and other furniture.\textsuperscript{169}

Reading into the 1961 study, it is clear that the Maghrebi residents of Marseille’s shantytowns made efforts to organize their lives in accordance with pre-migratory spatial and domestic logics. As MacMaster argues, this approach can be considered a mechanism through which many shantytown residents sought to protect themselves from what they viewed as “a threatening outside world.”\textsuperscript{170} The 1961 study also makes it clear, though, that French officials and welfare experts, as part of their effort to solve Marseille’s shantytown “problem,” envisioned bringing Muslim North African shantytown-dwellers into greater contact with this outside world. For these officials and experts, the elimination of shantytowns was essential to ensuring their Muslim North African residents, particularly Muslim North African women, did not “stay strangers to the metropolitan setting,” but instead embraced it, together with French customs and habits.\textsuperscript{171}


\textsuperscript{169} Pitrou, “Le logement des Nord-Africains à Marseille,” 22.

\textsuperscript{170} MacMaster, “Shantytown Republics,” 75-77.

\textsuperscript{171} Pitrou, “Le logement des Nord-Africains à Marseille,” 22-23.
Unlike efforts to deliver housing assistance to travailleurs Nord-Africains in Marseille, however, the push to address the housing situation of local Muslim North African families did not immediately produce concrete solutions. Even though French officials and welfare experts acknowledged the “tragic” housing conditions many of these families faced, they did very little in the late 1940s and early 1950s to address this situation. The first welfare organization exclusively dedicated to providing housing assistance to local Muslim North African families, the private charity Immobilière Familiale Nord-Africain (IFNA, North African Family Real Estate), was only founded in September 1954. As a result, by the time the Algerian War was underway in November 1954, its mission to “integrate, as completely as possible, Algerian families within metropolitan communities” was barely off the ground.

In the early 1950s, municipal and prefectoral authorities gave a number of reasons to explain why solutions to assisting poorly housed Muslim North African families were slow to materialize. In general, they argued that because local “native” French families also required housing assistance, “it is not possible, nor desirable to […] construct] homes that will be reserved for Muslim households.” In the specific case of Maghrebi families living in Marseille shantytowns, they went even further. Characterizing these families as “asocial,” they asserted it was “impossible to house them in normal ways.” Even when it came to the development of government social housing, officials claimed that most projects underway in Marseille, including rent-controlled public housing estates (Habitations à Loyer Modéré or HLMs) operated by the
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municipal and prefectoral Offices d’Habitation à Loyer Modéré, were too expensive for these families. On the whole, high rents, the small size of available apartments, and discrimination on the part of housing administrators prevented all but a few Maghrebi families from residing in HLMs. In an effort to address this situation, some officials called upon both the prefecture and municipality to fund the construction of more simply designed dwellings that would provide “strict” minimums of comfort to “families whose resources are extremely limited.” In a similar vein, service providers like the Belpeers suggested renovating uninhabited and abandoned homes to accommodate the city’s poorest Maghrebi families.

By 1954, though, these various ideas remained largely unrealized, contributing to a situation in which French officials, welfare specialists, and social service providers had failed to address the poor housing conditions faced by many Maghrebi families living in Marseille. This situation did not go unnoticed by leading figures in the city’s welfare network. Commenting on the state of local North African-focused social welfare in 1954, for example, CTAM Martin argued that, in contrast to initiatives of “pure social action” like family education and job training, housing and accommodation services required greater attention and remained “largely open to future achievements.” Eventually, the push to expand social housing services for Maghrebis living in Marseille would make some progress, but only after officials and welfare experts turned to address concerns associated with Algeria’s struggle for independence.
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177 This problem would continue well into the late 1950s and early 1960s: MacMaster, Colonial Migrants and Racism, 194.
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Conclusion

The main purpose of this chapter was to trace the origins of a project initiated by French officials, welfare specialists, and social service providers in late colonial Marseille to integrate Maghrebis into French society. This project began with the creation of a welfare network dedicated to providing specialized services and programs to Muslims from France’s three North African colonies. Formed in the aftermath of World War II by several government-run welfare associations, the North African-focused welfare network initially assisted Muslim men from French North Africa adapt to their new lives in France. Public sector welfare providers in particular sought to transform these men into workers capable of contributing to France’s postwar economic development, offering them a variety of integrationist services to accomplish this task.

As the late colonial era progressed, the specialized welfare network for Maghrebis grew with the creation of private welfare associations and the deployment of specialists who were charged with monitoring and coordinating the actions of public and private sector service providers. This growth was accompanied by the expansion of the types of services available to the Maghrebi population of Marseille. In response to the growing presence of Maghrebi families in the city, the development of socio-educative services for Muslim North African women became an especially important point of focus within the welfare network. French officials and welfare experts alike believed that the integration of Muslim North African women was key to convincing their families to replace their so-called backward pre-migratory customs and habits with supposedly superior “French” customs and habits. The private welfare association ATOM took the lead in the effort to realize this goal, establishing a service d’action familiale that provided, among other services, home economic classes to adult Muslim North African women to train them to become modern homemakers.
Efforts to expand Marseille’s North African-focused welfare network continued into the late 1950s and early 1960s. As these efforts unfolded, France’s colonial empire collapsed in the face of emergent independence movements and the process of decolonization they helped foster. As a result, the welfare network became entangled in efforts to prevent the loss of French colonial rule in North Africa. In response to the Algerian war for independence especially, French officials, welfare specialists, and social service providers began to exclusively employ North African-focused *action sociale* as a tool to turn Muslim Algerian migrants away from anti-colonial nationalism and the idea of independence.
Chapter 2
Narrowing the Integrationist Gaze: Social Welfare for Maghrebis in Marseille during Decolonization

From the mid-1950s to early 1960s, the French project to integrate the Maghrebi population of Marseille into French society occurred against the backdrop of the decolonization of French North Africa. The circumstances that led to the end of France’s rule over Algeria above all represented the most traumatic and violent chapter in the entire French experience of decolonization. The nationalist insurrection that broke out in Algeria on 1 November 1954 quickly escalated into a war for independence on both sides of the Mediterranean Sea that lasted until 1962. A complex and brutal affair, it included everything from fighting between the FLN and French armed forces in Algeria, to infighting between different nationalist groups on metropolitan French soil, to a revolt by European settlers and the French Army that brought about the dissolution of the Fourth Republic and the establishment of the Fifth Republic.¹ In comparison to the Algerian dilemma, the paths that Morocco and Tunisia took to gaining their independence from France were far less complex and brutal. However, this does not mean that France’s North African protectorates ended without conflict. Instead, both protectorates ended in March 1956 in the wake of years of contentious political wrangling between nationalists, French officials, and European settlers, which occasionally spilled over into violence.²

Most of the scholarly literature on Marseille and decolonization focuses on exploring the consequences of the end of French colonialism in North Africa and questioning how they affected

the city politically, socially, and culturally. As Jean Jacques-Jordi and others have pointed out, as France’s main Mediterranean port city, Marseille became the main point of reception for the mass exodus of pieds-noirs (European “repatriates” from North African) that accompanied the collapse of French North Africa. According to Jordi, it was the massive influx of pieds-noirs in Marseille during the months leading up to and immediately following Algeria’s independence—an arrival that was met with an insufficient government response and produced tense relations between repatriates and local “metropolitan” residents—that particularly brought the realities of decolonization home to the city.

But the process of decolonization was present in Marseille well before the beginning of this mass repatriation movement. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, it was not uncommon to find nationalist groups from Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia active in the city, typically engaged in disseminating anti-colonial propaganda. In the mid-1950s, as the decolonization conflicts in French North Africa intensified, so too did the local activities of these groups. With regard to Algerian nationalism, members of the French Federation of the FLN (FF-FLN) organized themselves into smaller “commando” units that, among other activities, carried out acts of sabotage in Marseille’s port district. Rival nationalist group Mouvement National Algérien (MNA, Algerian National Movement), meanwhile, attempted to cripple the city economically by
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4 According to Jordi, it was the repatriates’ experience of these final months that also led to the formation of a distinct pieds-noirs identity: Jordi, “The Creation of the Pieds-Noirs: Arrival and Settlement in Marseilles, 1962,” 61-74.

5 Outside of spreading propaganda, nationalist groups like the Algerian Mouvement pour le Triomphe des Libertés Démocratiques (MTLD, Movement for the Triumph of Democratic Liberties) often protested the demolition of local “Arab” quarters that French authorities deemed insalubrious: Service Départemental des Renseignements Généraux, note on the “Union Française Nord Africains: La démolition des quartiers arabes,” 16 June 1952. ADBR 148 W 193.

organizing several strikes by North African labourers. Until the late 1950s, Marseille was also one of the main sites of the struggle both groups waged against each other for control of the Algerian nationalist movement in France, which the FF-FLN eventually won.

During decolonization, Marseille was also a central site of French efforts to counter the actions and influence of North African nationalist activists and groups. After the beginning of the Algerian War in particular, government authorities established a network of surveillance and repression in the city that actively gathered information on Muslim Algerian residents, monitored the arrival and departure of Algerian migrants, distributed anti-nationalist propaganda, and arrested suspected nationalists. At the same time, Marseille’s North African-focused welfare network expanded as part of a concerted effort by the French government to employ action sociale as another tool to combat Algerian nationalism, which came to be viewed as the greatest barrier to Muslim Algerians’ successful integration. In the face of the collapse of Algérie Françasie, social welfare services and programs were increasingly relied upon to establish positive contacts with Muslims of Algerian origin in Marseille, which French officials and welfare experts hoped would convince them of France’s goodwill and “free” them from the idea of independence.

Thus, in the context of decolonization, the project to integrate Maghrebis into French society became closely tied to the goal of preventing Muslim Algerians from embracing anti-colonial nationalism and joining the fight for Algerian independence. This chapter explores how decolonization shaped the actions of the officials, specialists, and service providers within Marseille’s North African-focused welfare network from the mid-1950s to early 1960s. It shows
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7 These strikes normally failed due to the lack of participation of the FF-FLN: Letter from Raymond Haas-Picard to Interior Minister Jean Gilbert-Jules on the “Mot d’ordre de grève lance par le MNA pour le 29 mars,” 30 March 1956. ADBR 137 W 383.

8 The importance of establishing positive contacts with Muslim Algerians in Marseille was stressed in meetings organized by the prefect-IGAME: Procès-Verbal de la réunion qui s’est tenue le 26 septembre 1959 à la Préfecture des Bouches-du-Rhône en vue de présenter les officiers des affaires algériennes aux chefs des services administratifs et sociaux intéressés par leur action. ADBR 138 W 28.
how, as a consequence of the longer and more complicated process of decolonization in Algeria, they ended up narrowing their focus from assisting and integrating Muslims from all three of France’s North African colonies to exclusively targeting *français musulmans d’Algérie*. It also highlights how, as the Algerian War intensified, local Algerian-focused *action sociale* initiatives became increasingly intertwined with the operations of the city’s new surveillance and repression network, culminating in the development of a social housing program for poorly housed Muslim Algerian families in 1959. Finally, this chapter addresses how French officials, welfare specialists, and social service providers responded to the mass repatriation movement from Algeria in 1962, paying specific attention to what this development entailed for the operations of the North African-focused welfare network once the fight to keep Algeria “French” ended.

**Prioritizing Integrationist Action Sociale for “French Muslims from Algeria”**

To understand how decolonization affected integrationist *action sociale* initiatives that targeted Maghrebis living in Marseille, the French state’s reaction to the circumstances that eventually led to the end of French colonialism in North Africa must first be explored. It was the outbreak of the Algerian War in 1954 that especially caught the attention of leading government authorities, who doubled down on the assertion that “Algeria is France” and became increasingly concerned with winning and maintaining the loyalty of Muslim Algerians living in the metropole.9 At the centre of the state’s effort to win this population over were two major government welfare agencies that French authorities created to exclusively deliver Algerian-focused social aid.

The first of these agencies was the Société Nationale de Construction de Logements pour les Travailleurs originaires d’Algérie (SONACOTRAL, National Society for the Construction of Housing for Algerian Workers), a social housing organization created by the Fourth Republic in
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9 The national dynamics of the French government’s efforts in this regard are explored in detail in Lyons, *The Civilizing Mission in the Metropole.*
August 1956. Its creation responded to what “les pouvoirs publics” (government officials) identified as the “urgent” housing needs “of the population of Algerian origin living in France.” Under the leadership of Eugène Claudius-Petit, its founder and president, the SONACOTRAL’s primary objective was to facilitate “the construction and development of residential buildings […] destined to house French Muslims from Algeria working in the metropole as well as their families.” According to Claudius-Petit, it also had a secondary, but no less important, objective of creating the “conditions” necessary to encouraging Muslim Algerians’ “real human and social advancement.” To accomplish these objectives, the SONACOTRAL funded regional and municipal housing initiatives that targeted Muslim Algerian migrants. It also received subsidies from several government ministries and agencies, as well as the colonial government in Algeria, to undertake its own Algerian-focused social housing projects. Together, these powers and responsibilities made the SONACOTRAL the main national agency dedicated to providing social housing assistance to North Africans in the metropole during decolonization.

The second national welfare agency created in the context of the Algerian War was the Fonds d’Action Sociale pour les Travailleurs Algériens en Métropole et leur Familles (FAS, Social Action Fund for Algerian Workers and their Families in the Metropole). Founded on 29 October 1958 by President Charles de Gaulle’s new Fifth Republic government, it took the lead in overseeing the delivery of the entire range of specialized services and programs available to
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10 For a detailed analysis of the history of the SONACOTRAL, see Marc Bernadot, Loger les immigrés: la SONACOTRA, 1956-2006 (Broissieux: Du Croquant, 2008).
14 The SONACOTRAL received most of its funds from the Interior and Labour and Social Security Ministries and the colonial government in Algeria: Claudius-Petit, “Note sur le problème du logement des travailleurs originaires d’Algérie et l’action de la société d’économie mixte,” 4-9.
Muslim Algerians living in the metropole. In this capacity, it more or less functioned as the metropolitan component of the Constantine Plan, a massive development and modernization program—the quintessential example of France’s postwar overseas “modernization mission”—that de Gaulle had launched in Algeria in early October following the establishment of the Fifth Republic. Ambitious in its mission, the Constantine Plan sought to lessen the political, social, and economic differences between metropolitan France and Algeria, which Fifth Republic officials believed would turn Algerians away from supporting the FLN and its fight for Algerian independence.

In practice, the officials who oversaw the implementation of the Constantine Plan in Algeria sought to prevent Algerian independence by bringing “modern civilization” to the colony through the development of Algerian industry and agriculture, as well as the expansion of education and housing services. Under the auspices of the Constantine Plan in metropolitan France, the FAS’s principal goal was to eradicate “terrorism” by improving the social, cultural, and material conditions of Muslim Algerian migrants and convincing them to “embrace France.” To accomplish this goal, the civil servants who ran the FAS, notably Michel Massenet, the Fifth Republic’s official delegate in charge of social action for “French Muslims from Algeria,” funded, supervised, and coordinated the operations of public and private sector welfare services and
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16 For more detailed analyses of the Constantine Plan, see Phillip C. Naylor, “A Reconsideration of the Fourth Republic’s Legacy and Algerian Decolonization,” French Colonial History 2 (2002): 159-180; Muriam Haleh Davis, “Restaging Mise en Valeur: ‘Postwar Imperialism’ and The Plan Constantine,” Review of Middle East Studies 44, no. 2 (2010): 176-186; Lyons, The Civilizing Mission in the Metropole, 151-159. As Lyons notes, while it was the largest program of its kind, the Constantine Plan was far from the first public or private integrationist initiative undertaken in colonial Algeria. Indeed, after the outbreak of the Algerian War but before the implementation of the Constantine Plan, the colonial Algerian government of civilian governor-general and anthropologist Jacques Soustelle had already launched an integrationist education program, the Social Centre Service. Under the leadership of anthropologist Germain Tillion, this program’s goal was to use social welfare to “pacify the ‘Algerian rebels’” as well as to bring “French and Algerian men and women together to solve [Algeria’s] most dire problems.” For a thorough exploration of the actions of Soustelle and other intellectuals during the decolonization of Algeria, see James Le Sueur, Uncivil War: Intellectuals and Identity Politics during the Decolonization of Algeria (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001).
programs that specialized in the integration of Muslim North African clients.\textsuperscript{18} The creation of the FAS therefore represented the culmination of over a decade of state-led efforts to coordinate social welfare for Maghrebis throughout France. Moreover, given the FAS’s overall purpose, its involvement in these efforts ensured that metropolitan-based \textit{action sociale} initiatives focused exclusively on assisting and integrating \textit{français musulmans d’Algérie}.

Almost immediately after they were founded, the SONACOTRAL and the FAS both became actively involved in the delivery of specialized \textit{action sociale} services and programs to Muslim Algerians living in Marseille. The SONACOTRAL’s earliest actions in the city consisted of launching a program in 1957 to improve the housing conditions of single male Algerian workers. As part of this program, it provided over 300,000 francs in financial support to the AFNA. The AFNA, in turn, used these funds to help pay for the construction of its fourth dormitory, the 243-bed Foyer-Hôtel Commanderie, in the northern neighbourhood of Saint-Louis.\textsuperscript{19} This dormitory officially opened its doors in 1961.\textsuperscript{20}

By that year, as we will explore in more detail below, the SONACOTRAL had already bolstered its presence in Marseille by participating in the development of another social housing program launched in 1959 to exclusively assist and integrate poorly housed Muslim Algerian families. To support the realization of this family housing program, it opened a subsidiary HLM organization, Logements et Gestion Immobilière de la Région Méditerranéenne (LOGIREM, Housing and Real Estate Management Company of the Mediterranean Region), in Marseille in

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{18} Lyons, “Social Welfare, French Muslims and Decolonization in France,” 69-73. Michel Massenet was named Délégué à l’action sociale pour les français musulmans de l’Algérie en métropole in January 1959 and worked directly under Prime Minister Michel Debré.
\textsuperscript{19} Letter from Raymond Haas-Picard to the general secretary of the mayor of Marseille Jean Poggioli on the SONACOTRAL’s “Programme d’amélioration des conditions de logement des travailleurs d’origine musulmane algérienne,” 3 July 1958. AMM 483 W 244.
\textsuperscript{20} AFNA, “Foyers-Hôtels à Marseille et dans la Région,” 1962. ADBR 138 W 58.
\end{flushright}
To ensure an “expert” in North African-focused social welfare had a hand in guiding this new company’s operations, Claudius-Petit named long-serving CTAM Alfred Martin its director in 1961. After assuming this new position, Martin used the connections he had established in Marseille since the early 1950s to form a commission of welfare experts, including ATOM director Louis Belpeer and several public housing administrators, who collaborated to support LOGIREM in implementing its various Algerian-focused housing projects.

The FAS’s involvement in North African-focused action sociale initiatives in Marseille predominantly entailed the dispersal of monetary aid to local welfare associations. In particular, it provided large subsidies directly to private welfare associations like ATOM and CANA to finance their already active operations and to help fund the development of new services and programs for Muslim Algerian clients. As Nasiali has observed, the FAS also became a resource the city of Marseille relied on to fund its own modernization initiatives, particularly in the domains of shantytown clearance and social housing development. In reflection of the agency’s exclusive focus on Muslim Algerians, municipal officials looking for support in eliminating bidonvilles couched their requests for state funding in the language of North African-focused social welfare, specifically identifying “North Africans” or “Algerians” as the source of Marseille’s shantytown “problem.” Moreover, they concentrated their attention on clearing slums and shantytowns with large Maghrebi—predominantly Algerian—populations. In effect, this meant that, during the

---


23 The creation of this commission was also discussed in 1959: “Proces-Verbal d’une réunion tenue à Marseille en vue de préparer le creation par le SONACOTRAL d’une Société HLM,” 21 November 1959.

24 The subsidies provided by the FAS were largely drawn from money that had been paid into the French family allowance system by Algerian workers: Lyons, The Civilizing Mission in the Metropole, 94, 149.

25 See the Department of the Bouches-du-Rhône’s folder on the “Programme d’extension du reseau social” in 1959 in ADBR 138 W 49.
Algerian War, some municipal modernization initiatives were incorporated into the French state’s efforts to counter the activities and influence of the FLN.²⁶

Along with creating major agencies like the SONACOTRAL and the FAS, the French state became involved in local North African-focused social welfare through efforts to increase the number of specialists in Algerian affairs in the metropole. As it did before 1954, the Interior Ministry served as the main supplier of these specialists. During the first half of the Algerian War, it deployed two additional CTAMs, Yves Bourdonneau and Henry Merlet, to Marseille. They joined Alfred Martin in supporting and monitoring the activities of Marseille’s North African-focused welfare associations until he assumed the directorship of LOGIREM in 1961. The Interior Ministry also placed Marseille’s CTAMs in charge of monitoring the activities of the Service d’Assistance Technique (SAT, Technical Assistance Service), a new social intervention bureau in “affaires algériennes” it implanted in the city in 1959.²⁷ Run by three technical assistance officers who had previously worked in the colonial administrations of French North Africa,²⁸ the SAT functioned as the metropolitan equivalent of the Special Administrative Sections that had been established in Algeria in 1955 to help “pacify” the FLN.²⁹ Through two offices located in inner city Marseille (Marseille centre) and northern Marseille (Marseille nord),³⁰ SAT officers provided their clients direct assistance in matters of health care, education, housing, and employment. At

²⁶ Nasiali, *Native to the Republic*, 78-82.
²⁸ The three SAT officers deployed to Marseille were Captains Seigneur and Sessa and Commander Chaumaz: Raymond Haas-Picard, note on “Action sociale spécialisés dans les Bouches-du-Rhône en faveur des populations musulmanes algériennes,” 4 November 1960, 8. ADBR 138 W 49.
²⁹ One year before the creation of Marseille’s new social intervention bureau, SAT officers were already active in the Paris region due to the actions of the city’s Prefect of Police, Maurice Papon: MacMaster, *Shantytown Republics,* 80-81; see also Naylor, “Un âne dans l’ascenseur,” 427. For a good examination of the SAS in Algeria, see Grégor Mathias, *Les sections administratives spécialisées en Algérie: Entre idéal et réalité, 1955-1962* (Paris: L’Harmattan, 1998).
³⁰ The SAT also opened offices in the Marseille suburbs of Berre l’Étang, Martigues, and Port-de-Bouc: Letter from Raymond Haas-Picard to Interior Minister Jean Berthoin on the “Création dans les Bouches-du-Rhône de bureaux spécialisés dirigés par des officiers des affaires algériennes,” 4 March 1959. ADBR 138 W 49.
the same time, they also gathered intelligence on the individuals and families who visited their offices in order to “combat the influence of Algerian separatist elements.”

Thus, in the context of the decolonization of French North Africa, specialized *action sociale* initiatives for Maghrebis living in Marseille was shaped by state-led efforts to place a barrier between Muslim Algerian migrants and Algerian nationalism and, ultimately, to keep Algeria “French.” The city’s North African-focused welfare network expanded with the creation of new Algerian-focused organizations like LOGIREM and the SAT, as well as the deployment of a growing number of Algerian affairs specialists. Local North African-focused welfare associations, meanwhile, came to rely on national agencies like the SONACOTRAL and the FAS to fund their operations and to support the implementation of new welfare initiatives exclusively for Muslim Algerian clients. The result was an intensification of local efforts to integrate *français musulmans d’Algérie*, underscoring an important shift in focus within the welfare network. Indeed, whereas the welfare network before decolonization responded to a broader “North African problem,” during decolonization it specifically responded to the “Algerian problem.”

Within Marseille’s North African-focused welfare network during decolonization, further evidence of this shift in focus comes from efforts that were undertaken by the prefecture to coordinate local services and programs for Maghrebi clients. An examination of prefectoral coordination efforts also reveals that, alongside the outbreak of the Algerian War, another factor that contributed to this shift was the elimination of France’s protectorates over Morocco and Tunisia in 1956. Indeed, before 1956, the Moroccan Social Service and the Bureau of Social Questions, the respective welfare branches of the offices of the Moroccan and Tunisian protectorates in France, participated in prefectoral coordination efforts. As late as 1955,

---

administrators at the SSM and the BST were approached by prefect-IGAME Haas-Picard to help develop “solutions” to the “problems raised in the metropole” by the migration of “les populations nord-africaines.” But after Morocco and Tunisia gained their independence, the operations of the SSM and the BST, along with the attention they brought to assisting and integrating Muslims from Morocco and Tunisia, ended. In addition, although they continued to acknowledge the presence of Muslim Moroccans and Tunisians in Marseille, officials and experts who participated in prefectoral coordination efforts no longer concentrated on delivering specialized assistance to clients from France’s now former North African protectorates. Instead, by the late 1950s especially, they exclusively identified Algerian workers and families as the intended targets of integrationist action sociale, which they asserted was essential to solving the “metropolitan side of the problem of Algerian migration.”

Thus, it is clear that after France’s protectorates over Morocco and Tunisia ended, the officials and experts who participated in prefectoral coordination efforts in Marseille were free to prioritize the delivery of Algerian-focused services and programs. The “problems” they sought to address through integrationist action sociale, moreover, reflected the broader concerns generated in metropolitan France by the Algerian struggle for independence. As prefect-IGAME Haas-Picard insisted at a coordination meeting held at the prefecture on 6 November 1958:

The worsening of terrorism in the metropole that was recorded in August and September had the effect of forcing Muslim Algerians to retreat further into isolation. In this circumstance specialized associations remained one of the few points of contact that persisted between Algerians and metropolitans […] It is therefore important to multiply and strengthen the links between [these] associations and [the] Algerian population.

---

33 For example, see: Meeting organized by Raymond Haas-Picard on “la coordination régionale des affaires sociales musulmanes,” 6 November 1958. ADBR 138 W 50.
34 Meeting on “la coordination régionale des affaires sociales musulmanes,” 6 November 1958.
At another coordination meeting held on 26 September 1959, Haas-Picard further discussed why he felt it was necessary to multiply and strengthen these links, arguing that such efforts were essential to restoring Muslim Algerians’ “trust” in the French while also “liberat[ing] them from the guardianship of the FLN.” Simply put, with the Algerian dilemma still unresolved, it alone became the crucial point of focus within Marseille’s North African-focused welfare network.

As if to bring the full extent of the shift undertaken within Marseille’s specialized welfare network for Maghrebi clients home, CTAM Martin asserted in a 1960 report that Muslims of Moroccan and Tunisian origin “do not benefit in principle from the specialized social welfare network.” However, despite Martin’s claim, even after their respective countries had gained independence, Muslims from Morocco and Tunisia continued to receive assistance from associations that operated within the specialized welfare network. Even government-run organizations that joined Marseille’s this network at the height of the conflict to exclusively target Muslim Algerians counted Muslim Moroccans and Tunisans as clients. Records kept by local SAT officers, for example, reveal that dozens of Muslims from Morocco and Tunisia visited their offices yearly in search of help “finding employment” and “obtaining housing allowances,” among other matters. In this regard, Muslims of Moroccan and Tunisian origin were never fully ignored by North African-focused welfare specialists and social service providers. Still, it is clear that during decolonization efforts to facilitate their integration took a back seat to concerns over the integration of français musulmans d’Algérie. As a result, they became a more or less invisible clientele within the North African-focused welfare network, a position they would remain in until after 1962.

35 Meeting organized by Raymond Haas-Picard “en vue de présenter les officiers des affaires algériennes aux chefs des services administratifs et sociaux intéressés par leur action,” 26 September 1959. ADBR 138 W 50.
37 Monthly paper records of the SAT’s office at Marseille centre. ADBR 138 W 19, 21, 23, and 24.
Français musulmans d’Algérie and the Bureau of Muslim Affairs

In detailing all that was done to prioritize the delivery of integrationist action sociale to Muslim Algerians in Marseille during decolonization, it is important to question how the recipients of these services reacted to the special attention they received. Available evidence of Muslim Algerians’ interactions with local welfare specialists and providers reveals that most were not averse to this attention. On the contrary, they actively sought it out. During the second half of the Algerian War especially, the Bouches-du-Rhône’s Bureau of Muslim Affairs alone received hundreds of letters from Muslim Algerian men and women requesting assistance in a whole range of matters or lodging complaints about the benefits they were, or were not, receiving. Typically, these men and women sought help gaining access to specific services, unpaid benefits such as allocations familiales, employment, or emergency financial relief. Dozens of individuals and families also contacted the Bureau looking for help to either migrate to France or to return to Algeria.38

In her analysis of how Muslim Algerians in France interacted with French officials, welfare specialists, and social service providers during the Algerian War, Lyons argues they made themselves visible by using “the language of rights to demand what the state owed them as citizens.”39 The men and women who sent requests or complaints to the Bureau of Muslim Affairs were consistent in referencing their status and rights as French citizens. In addition, many of these individuals used their interaction with the Bureau as an opportunity to highlight their contributions

---

38 Records of the letters received by the Bureau of Muslim Affairs between 1958 and 1961 are contained in ADBR 138 W 72, 138 W 73, 138 W 74, and 138 W 75.
to French society—contributions that more often than not spoke to the gender-based ideals and objectives of North African-focused *action sociale*.\(^\text{40}\)

When requesting assistance, Muslim Algerian men highlighted their contributions as workers. If they were married, they also underscored their roles as household breadwinners. In one case, after losing his job as a docker at Marseille’s port, Mr. Baakia, a married forty-year-old military veteran and father of two, sought help from both the Bureau and the War Ministry. In the letter he wrote to the latter on 13 September 1958 he explained that

> I used to work every day for the shipping company Transports Maritimes, and now I find myself without work. I lost the pinky finger on my left hand for this company, and my left wrist is ruined. I would be grateful if the Minister could kindly examine my situation with compassion, especially for my children, so that I may be allowed to work at the port again, or that any other work can be found for me, so that I do not lose my livelihood.

In another case, writing to the Bureau in November 1958 for assistance in helping his wife migrate to join him in the town of Aubagne, Mr. Boussaïd noted that he “worked regularly” and that his conduct and behavior “never gives rise to any unfavourable remarks.”\(^\text{41}\)

In other cases, individuals who requested the Bureau’s assistance explicitly attempted to use the gender-based ideals and objectives of North African-focused *action sociale* to their advantage. For example, on 30 July 1959, sixteen-year-old Mohamed Bouchakour wrote to the Bureau expressing his interest in leaving Algeria to live with his brother in the town of La Ciotat, where he planned to enroll in an adult professional job training centre to train as a tile-layer. In his letter, Bouchakour noted bluntly that he was “fully aware of the effort that the government wants to make to enable French Muslim men to access a professional qualification,” which led him “to

---

\(^{40}\) Although Lyons does note a few rare cases in which Muslim Algerian women rebuffed the gender-based ideals of North African *action sociale*, for the most part their requests for aid played into these notions: Lyons, *The Civilizing Mission in the Metropole*, 162-163.

think that you will take my request into consideration.”

Within a week, demonstrating a clear willingness to accommodate this request, the Bureau began to liaise with the mayor of La Ciotat to ensure that, upon his arrival to France, Bouchakour could enter a job training program. It even offered to move Bouchakour to Marseille so he could enter the CANA’s vocational pre-training program for young Maghrebi men and boys.

Though the examples above demonstrate that Muslim Algerians engaged with the Bureau and other potential sources of specialized assistance on integrationist terms, I agree with Lyons when she argues that their search for assistance in no way signified their unreserved acceptance of French integrationist efforts. Nor did it indicate they had been won over to supporting the maintenance of a “French” Algeria. On the whole, Muslim Algerians living in France wished not only to engage with French society on their own terms, but also for French colonialism to end. In this regard, it is more likely the requests or complaints they sent to the Bureau reflected a desire to bring stability to their lives above all else.

Even though most Muslim Algerians supported Algerian independence, French officials and welfare experts did not stop trying to use specialized assistance and benefits to win over their hearts and minds. In no doubt a strategic move, officials at the Bureau devoted considerable attention to assisting families whose members had been injured or killed by the FLN. In one case, the Bureau received a letter written by Mrs. Achour on 25 December 1958 detailing the hardships her family had encountered since her husband, a garde champêtre (rural police officer) “for France” in the Algerian town of Dra-el-Mizan, was killed by the FLN in June 1958. Following her husband’s death, Mrs. Achour, who lived in Dra-el-Mizan with her four youngest children, relied

---

43 Letter from J. Vaudeville to the mayor of La Ciotat, Jean Graille, 5 August 1959. ADBR 138 W 72.
44 Lyons, The Civilizing Mission in the Metropole, 159-162.
solely on the financial assistance of her twenty-one and fifteen-year-old sons, who lived in the town of Rousset with their seventy-five-year-old grandmother. Unfortunately, as she explained in her letter, her eldest son had recently lost his job at a coal factory, leaving the entire family in “complete misery.”

After receiving Mrs. Achour’s letter, officials at the Bureau mobilized quickly to help a family they identified as “victims of terrorism.” In January 1959, CTAM Merlet contacted the state-owned electric utility company Électricité de France on behalf of Mrs. Achour’s oldest son in an effort to find him employment in Aix-en-Provence. Although Merlet did not guarantee his efforts would lead to a job, he did promise Mrs. Achour’s son that he would keep himself “informed” on the matter going forward. In the meantime, Merlet and his colleagues worked in conjunction with officials in Algeria to ensure Mrs. Achour and her children in Dra-el-Mizan received some form of financial aid. In February 1959, this aid was delivered in the form of two “attributions”—one related to the death of Mrs. Achour’s husband, the other related to childcare expenses—totalling over 4,500 francs.

Records kept by the Bureau of Muslim Affairs reveal that French officials and welfare experts continued until the last years of the Algerian War to use action sociale as a tool to thwart FLN efforts to control Muslim Algerians in Marseille. In particular, convinced that the majority of Algerians did not support the FLN, officials and experts actively worked to move individuals and families out of areas of FLN activity and influence by securing them re-housing assistance and other forms of specialized aid. Occasionally, they even responded to Algerian requests for

---

47 Note from the Bureau of Muslim Affairs to the director of the General Fund for Retirees in Algeria, 4 February 1959. ADBR 138 W 72.
protection from the FLN. For instance, on 1 August 1960, such a request was filed by Mr. Khelifaoui, a twenty-nine-year-old manual labourer living in Marseille, who claimed that he was “threatened with death” after he “refused to pay monthly contributions to the FLN.” As part of his request, Mr. Khelifaoui also declared that he had been recognized as “fit for war” at age eighteen and now wished to “enlist with the army.” The next day, even though the Marseille police could not verify his claims regarding the FLN, they placed Mr. Khelifaoui in protective custody.\footnote{Superintendent of the Major Crimes Unit of the Marseille police, note on the “demande de protection du nommé Rezki Khelifaoui,” 2 August 1960. ADBR 138 W 74.} Within the same week, CTAM Bourdonneau wrote to the head of Marseille’s office of military recruitment, requesting support in helping Mr. Khelifaoui fulfill his “desire to join the armée française.”\footnote{Letter from Yves Bourdonneau to the Commander of the Office of Military Recruitment of Marseille, 5 August 1960. ADBR 138 W 74.}

As Lyons notes, during the Algerian War, French authorities also called on welfare associations specializing in the delivery of services to Muslim North African clients to provide services to the families of interned Algerian men in order to place a buffer between them and the FLN.\footnote{Lyons, The Civilizing Mission in the Metropole, 162.} Underscoring that relations between these families and French officials and welfare experts were nothing but complex, the former often came to the latter on their own in hopes of receiving social assistance. For example, following the arrest of her husband during an anti-nationalist police raid in Aix-en-Provence in June 1959, a Mrs. Bendela wrote directly to prefect-IGAME Haas-Picard explaining:

I respectfully wish to draw your attention to the fact that my husband is the father of six young children [….] In addition, he is seriously ill, which I can prove by sending the necessary medical certificates to you. Furthermore, my husband has been living in France for about fifteen years, has always worked as a manual labourer for companies that have done nothing but praise him, and has never been political. For these reasons, I do not understand what motivated his arrest. He has never been convicted and has always been the subject of excellent inquiries [renseignements]. Following his arrest, I find myself with six young children to care
for and I wonder how I will properly take care of them […] I beg you in these conditions to take into consideration these observations and I hope that you will not fail to release him immediately.\textsuperscript{52}

Taking a similar approach to others who requested assistance from the Bureau, Mrs. Bendela pointed to her husband’s status as a worker and father to declare his innocence and to request assistance. Not surprisingly, shortly after receiving her letter, officials at the Bureau of Muslim Affairs ordered the Departmental Directorate of Population and Social Aid to launch a social inquiry to determine if it was “possible to eventually assist this family.”\textsuperscript{53}

It is important to note that the employment of social welfare as an anti-FLN measure did not go unnoticed by FLN operatives in Marseille. As CTAMs Martin and Bourdonneau reported in 1961, the FF-FLN frequently attempted to hinder the operations of local North African-focused welfare associations. In one instance, it spent three months blocking Muslim Algerian women and young girls in the neighbourhood of Sainte-Marthe from attending ATOM classes, all the while attempting “to make them renounce the clothing and habits of modern life.” In order to respond to such instances of FF-FLN action against the integrationist mission undertaken in the city by government officials, welfare specialists, and social service providers, Martin and Bourdonneau argued that a “joint police and social service action” was required.\textsuperscript{54}

**Welfare and Repression**

In Marseille, the push to deliver integrationist action sociale exclusively to Muslim Algerians was just one consequence of the decolonization of French North Africa. Another consequence, as indicated by Martin and Bourdonneau’s 1961 report, was that the North African-focused welfare network became increasingly intertwined with local efforts to monitor and repress

\textsuperscript{52} Letter from Mrs. Bendela to prefect-IGAME Haas-Picard, 17 June 1959. ADBR W 72.

\textsuperscript{53} Note from J. Vaudeville to the Departmental Directorate of Population and Social Aid on the “Enquête sociale concernant la famille Miloud Bendela,” 27 June 1959. ADBR 138 W 72.

\textsuperscript{54} CTAM report, first trimester 1961. ADBR 138 W 22.
anti-colonial nationalism. The development of linkages between social welfare for Maghrebi clients and repression, it should be remembered, was not an entirely new phenomenon in metropolitan France. As noted at the beginning of this dissertation, North African-specific services created in the metropole during the interwar era, most notably the Paris police prefecture’s North African Brigade, employed social assistance predominantly as a means of controlling and monitoring the political and social activities of Maghrebi migrants. Despite this precedent, though, the linking of welfare and repression in the context of decolonization was still highly significant, namely because it came on the heels of roughly a decade of official attempts to prevent specialized services and programs for Muslim North Africans from again becoming involved in policing and surveillance operations.

Indeed, in the immediate aftermath of World War II, and especially in the wake of the German occupation and the Holocaust, the French government oversaw the elimination of North African-specific services that had previously engaged in policing and surveillance operations, denouncing them as racist institutions. Above all, French authorities publicly singled out the North African Brigade, which had participated in wartime collaboration, as a particularly repressive and unwanted service. The elimination of these services, of course, did not bring a complete end to French efforts to monitor the activities and movements of Maghrebi migrants. Government

55 The re-establishment of closer ties between social welfare and repression during decolonization, particularly the Algerian War, has been noted by Lyons, *The Civilizing Mission in the Metropole*, 141-173; see also Naylor, “Un âne dans l’ascenseur,” 426-427.
condemnation of repressive and racist welfare services did, however, have the effect of ensuring that public and private sector welfare associations created between 1945 and the mid-1950s that catered to Maghrebi clients lacked connections to metropolitan policing and surveillance structures. As late as October 1954, just prior to the outbreak of the Algerian War, officials at the Interior Ministry who oversaw efforts to coordinate metropolitan action sociale services and programs for Maghrebis did not raise policing or surveillance as a “problem” welfare specialists and social service providers needed to solve. Instead, they devoted their attention to highlighting the so-called demographic, economic, and social “problems” these experts needed to address to effectively “integrate” and “improve the living conditions” of Maghrebis living in France.58

Against the backdrop of the decolonization of French North Africa, however, the separation between “assistance” and “repression” within metropolitan welfare circles became harder to maintain. Almost immediately following the outbreak of the Algerian War, experts who specialized in Algerian affairs, notably IGAMEs and CTAMs, became involved in advising and, in some cases, leading efforts to counter the metropolitan actions and influence of Algerian nationalists. On 12 November 1954, eleven days after the Algerian conflict commenced, Interior Minister François Mitterrand instructed the IGAMEs and prefects of France to respond to the “events” in Algeria by monitoring “the attitudes of citizens originally from North Africa in your departments.” It also encouraged them to work with the French national police’s general intelligence directorate (or Renseignements Généraux, RG) to gather intelligence on suspected

nationalist “militants” and, if necessary, arrest them.\textsuperscript{59} During the Algerian War, the RG created an entire intelligence database (the \textit{fichier Z}) to combat Algerian nationalism.\textsuperscript{60}

Since he fulfilled the roles of prefect and IGAME from 1955 to 1963, Raymond Haas-Picard was the specialist largely responsible for following the Interior Minister’s instructions in the Bouches-du-Rhône during the Algerian War. Once in office, Haas-Picard placed considerable focus on Marseille, where he spearheaded the creation of a local network of surveillance and repression that specifically targeted Muslim Algerian residents. Responding in particular to Interior Ministry concerns that the violence in Algeria could spread to the metropole, Haas-Picard ordered the Departmental Service of General Intelligence—the regional intelligence-gathering branch of the RG—and the Bouches-du-Rhône Police Service to keep track of the local activities of Algerian nationalist groups, particularly the FLN and the MNA.\textsuperscript{61} To accomplish this task, these agencies worked together to carry out surveillance operations at Marseille’s ferry terminals and airport, keeping statistics on the number of \textit{français musulmans d’Algérie} who entered and exited the city, and tracking the movements of suspected nationalists.\textsuperscript{62} In addition, both agencies

\textsuperscript{59} Memo sent by Interior Minister François Mitterrand to the IGAMEs and prefects of France, 12 November 1954. ADBR 137 W 382.


\textsuperscript{61} A number of letters exchanged between Haas-Picard and Interior Ministry and Renseignements Généraux officials document these concerns. For example, see: Letter from Raymond Haas-Picard to the Chief Commissioner of the Departmental Service of General Intelligence on the “Movement National Algérien et du Front de Libération Nationale,” 8 August 1955. ADBR 137 W 382; Letter from Raymond Haas-Picard to Interior Minister Maurice Bourgès-Maunoury on the “Movement National Algérien et du Front de Libération Nationale,” 17 August 1955. ADBR 137 W 382.

\textsuperscript{62} A number of letters and notes exchanged between officials at the prefecture, the Departmental Service of General Intelligence, and the Bouches-du-Rhône Police Service detail these surveillance operations: For example, see: Note from the chief of the Port Division of Marseille’s Police Service to the Chief Commissioner of the Departmental Service of General Intelligence on the “Départ pour l’Algérie d’un Français Musulman suspect,” 12 November 1955. ADBR 137 W 382; Note from the head of the Bouches-du-Rhône Police Service’s division at Marseille-Marignane Airport to prefect-IGAME Haas-Picard, the sub-prefect of the Bouches-du-Rhône, and head of Marseille’s Police Service on the “Mouvement des passagers Nord-Africains entre le Métropole et l’Algérie du 18 au 19 Décembre 1955 de 8 heures à 8 heures,” 19 December 1955. ADBR 137 W 382.
monitored neighbourhoods that were “frequented” by Algerian migrants residentially and socially.63

Letters exchanged between officials who were involved in Marseille’s surveillance and repression network in the early part of the Algerian War suggest that, at least initially, the city was hardly touched by the conflict. In a letter to Haas-Picard in August 1955, the Chief Commissioner of the Departmental Service of General Intelligence noted that the actions of FLN and MNA “militants” in Marseille was limited to the spread of anti-colonial propaganda tracts and pamphlets.64 In a separate letter to the director of the Bouches-du-Rhône Police Service, the Chief Commissioner explained that between November 1954 and August 1955, “no act of violence attributable to North African nationalists was committed in the entire department of the Bouches-du-Rhône.”65 When it came to the “morale” of the city’s Maghrebi residents, meanwhile, a municipal police official reported to the Chief Commissioner that, as late as June 1955, the majority assumed “a passive attitude towards the events unfolding in Algeria.”66

In the late summer and fall of 1955, however, this relatively calm situation began to change. After the arrest of several nationalist leaders in Marseille in July 1955, the same police official argued that many Muslim Algerians chose to “refrain” from engaging in “any relations” with the local European population. At the same time, he asserted “certain” Muslim Algerians became openly defiant towards French society.67 By October 1955, Haas-Picard wrote to Interior Minister

63 Note on “des renseignements recueillis au cours de la surveillance effectués dans les quartiers fréquentés par les Nord-Africains” received by prefect-IGAME Haas-Picard, the Director of the Bouches-du-Rhône Police Service, and the Chief Commissioner of the Departmental Service of General Intelligence, 15 August 1955. ADBR 137 W 382.
67 The ways in which they expressed their defiance were not specified: Ibid.
Maurice Bourgès-Maunoury expressing concern about the arrival of “dangerous and fanatical elements” from Algeria, a development that he feared would further alter the “climate within Marseille’s colonie Nord-Africaine.”

In response to these developments and others, efforts to police the activities of Algerian nationalist groups in Marseille broadened and intensified. In early September 1955, Haas-Picard, following Interior Ministry orders, oversaw the deployment of a “control and security” initiative “against French-Muslim agitators” that targeted Marseille’s entire Algerian population. Under this initiative, the Marseille police conducted house-to-house visits in neighbourhoods with high concentrations of “français musulmans,” coming into contact with 3,500 people. Out of this number, police officials put together intelligence files on 352 individuals and arrested nine “suspects.”

In the same month, the Interior Ministry also placed the prefect-IGAME in charge of running the Marseille office of its Service de Coordination des Informations Nord-Africaines (SCINA, Service for the Coordination of North African Information). Operating out of each of France’s ten military districts, the SCINA was responsible for directing the actions of the various civilian and military agencies that participated in the fight against North African “separatism.”

Under the SCINA, the agencies comprising Marseille’s surveillance and repression network assumed a number of new responsibilities. The Bouches-du-Rhône Police Service, for example, began inspecting ferries and airplanes destined for Algeria to hinder efforts to smuggle weapons there. As part of an initiative launched in 1956 to prevent acts of sabotage from being carried out against Algeria-bound troops and military equipment, it also partnered with the
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68 Note from Raymond Haas-Picard to Interior Minister Maurice Bourgès-Maunoury on “Activités des nationalistes algériens à Marseille,” 19 October 1955. ADBR 137 W 382.
70 Letter from Maurice Bourgès-Maunoury to the prefects and IGAMEs of France on the “Création du Service de Coordination des Informations Nord-Africaines,” 21 September 1955. ADBR 137 W 382.
71 Note from the chief of the Ninth Division of Marseille’s Police Service to Raymond Haas-Picard on the “Trafic d’armes à destination de l’Algérie,” 30 May 1956. ADBR 137 W 384.
Departmental Service of General Intelligence to monitor the activities of Muslims working in and around Marseille’s port district.\textsuperscript{72}

It was in the context of the intensification of anti-nationalist policing in Marseille that efforts were also made to incorporate North African-focused \textit{action sociale} into the local surveillance and repression network. In 1956, representatives from the Bouches-du-Rhône Police Service and the Departmental Service of General Intelligence began attending prefectoral coordination meetings. At these meetings, service providers like Louis Belpeer informed them of the “general mood” of their Muslim Algerian clients.\textsuperscript{73} In the same year, Marseille’s CTAMs received new directives from the Interior Ministry to support the mission of the SCINA’s Marseille office.\textsuperscript{74} At first, their new duties entailed sending the Interior Ministry reports on the state of nationalist sentiments in France’s ninth military region. As the Algerian War dragged on, however, their reports expanded to detail the “evolution” of the attitudes and morale (\textit{état d’esprit}) of Muslim Algerians.\textsuperscript{75}

In 1958, as part of the SCINA’s push to better “penetrate” the “milieux nord-africains” of Marseille, the Interior Ministry gave the city’s CTAMs additional orders to help develop an \textit{action psychologique} to counter the pro-independence message of Algerian nationalist propaganda.\textsuperscript{76} This effort included creating and distributing anti-nationalist propaganda tracts designed to deter Muslim Algerians from supporting groups like the FLN (Fig. 4). Some of these propaganda tracts focused specifically on breaking up the FF-FLN’s attempt, through a tax collection system it


\textsuperscript{73} For example, see: Meeting of the Advisory Commission for North African Questions organized by prefect-IGAME Raymond Haas-Picard, 27 January 1956.

\textsuperscript{74} Raymond Haas-Picard, “Bilan pour 1957 de l’action sociale spécialisée dans la IXème Région en faveur des populations d’origine musulmane algérienne,” 1956, 2. ADBR 138 W 49.

\textsuperscript{75} For example, see: CTAM report, second trimester 1959. ADBR 138 W 27.

\textsuperscript{76} Raymond Haas-Picard, note on the April 1958 meeting of the SCINA of the ninth military district, 23 April 1958. ADBR 138 W 52.
instituted in metropolitan France during the Algerian War,\textsuperscript{77} to raise funds—voluntarily and forcibly—from Algerian migrants to support the nationalist rebellion. As one tract exclaimed:

\begin{quote}
Muslim workers: the FLN continues to take your money while life is expensive and you find it difficult to support your family. You pay for fear of reprisals. If you want it to stop, if you want to live in peace, help the police arrest those who take your money, those who threaten you, those who kill your brothers. Indicate their names, their addresses, the factories and sites where they work, the places where they meet. Just send a letter where you say everything you know to the following address: the Marseille police station.\textsuperscript{78}
\end{quote}

Other propaganda tracts, clearly aimed at attracting Muslim Algerian support for the maintenance of \textit{Algérie française}, extolled everything that France had done, and could still accomplish, for Algeria and its people:

\begin{quote}
There are 400,000 Algerians in the metropole who work, that is to say one fifth of the active population of Algeria and by what they gain, they support their families on the other side of the sea who total more than two million people. In the case of a rupture, where would they go? To Cairo, to Tunis, to Rabat, to Beijing, to Moscow, or to New York? And then, finally, should Algeria be transformed into a modern and prosperous country? If so, who is the power that can lend itself to this and contribute to this in proportion and under the right conditions? Only one: France.\textsuperscript{79}
\end{quote}

The \textit{action psychologique} undertaken in Marseille during the Algerian War was not limited to the spread of anti-nationalist propaganda. As Martin explained in a note to Haas-Picard in late 1958, the CTAMs also believed that local \textit{action psychologique} and \textit{action sociale} efforts could be combined to simultaneously repress the “separatist activities” of Algerian nationalists and “facilitate the social promotion of Algerians to enable them to adapt to \textit{la vie métropolitain}.” In their opinion, “direct” social assistance was the only way to reinforce French propaganda efforts, since it encouraged “broader contact with the Algerian population.”\textsuperscript{80} Underscoring his agreement

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{77} Stora, \textit{Ils venaient d’Algérie}, 163-169. According to Stora, the contributions levied by both the FLN and MNA totaled approximately 400 million new francs by the end of the war.
\textsuperscript{78} Counter-propaganda tract addressed to “Travailleurs Musulmans.” ADBR 138 W 52.
\textsuperscript{79} Counter-propaganda tract addressed to all Algerians developed from an excerpt from a press conference delivered by President de Gaulle on 5 September 1960. ADBR 138 W 52.
\textsuperscript{80} Note from Alfred Martin to Raymond Haas-Picard regarding the “Observations sur le procès-verbal de la réunion tenue en Octobre des Conseillers techniques,” 6 December 1958, 2-3. ADBR 138 W 52.
\end{footnotes}
with this sentiment, Haas-Picard would later argue that efforts to “facilitate as much as possible the access of *français musulmans d’Algérie* to government employment” represented a “measure of benevolence […] particularly appropriate to the *plan psychologique.*”\(^{81}\)

![Image](image-url)

**Figure 4.** Counter-propaganda distributed by Marseille’s CTAMs. Source: ADBR 138 W 52. Reprinted with the permission of the Archives départementales des Bouches-du-Rhône.

Thus, by the halfway point of the Algerian War, it seemed that it was once again acceptable in France to employ social welfare as a mechanism of repression.\(^{82}\) In Marseille, additional proof of this development was evident in the objectives and actions of the Interior Ministry-implanted SAT. More than simply a welfare association created to simultaneously assist and integrate

---

\(^{81}\) Note from Raymond Haas-Picard to the Departmental Directorate of Postal Services and Telecommunications, 27 January 1959. ADBR 138 W 72. Haas-Picard made these comments when reflecting on a government decree that was issued on 26 October 1958 that called for measures to be taken to make more government jobs available to *français musulmans d’Algérie*.

\(^{82}\) That North African social welfare again became a repressive tool during the Algerian War does not mean that individuals involved in administering and delivering services to Muslim Algerians fully supported the more violent forms of police repression employed against nationalist groups and activists. As Lyons argues, a number of key administrators and providers on both sides of the Mediterranean Sea, including Michel Massenet and Eugène Claudius-Petit, became open critics of anti-FLN police violence: Lyons, *The Civilizing Mission in the Metropole*, 169-170.
Muslim Algerians, the SAT’s mission, according to Alfred Martin, was to “humanize the repressive side of police action.” Along with providing a number of different social aid services, the SAT gathered intelligence on its clients and relayed that intelligence to Marseille’s CTAMs, the Interior Ministry, and the RG’s _fichier Z_. According to Haas-Picard, the goal behind combining welfare and repression in this way was to “establish or re-establish contacts between the state and ‘French Muslims’” that had been damaged by “police repression.” Underscoring that the SAT was not alone in this effort, Haas-Picard argued at the time of its creation that, “given the circumstances,” it was necessary to employ the services and programs offered by ATOM and other local North African-focused welfare associations in a similar fashion.

Further evidence of the interconnectivity between Marseille’s respective North African-focused welfare and surveillance and repression networks can be found in the domains of shantytown clearance and social housing. In general, many officials, welfare experts, and nonofficial observers continued during decolonization to characterize shantytowns as barriers to Maghrebis’ adjustment to life in France. As an investigative report on the shantytowns of Marseille published in 1955 by the Paris-based newspaper _Le Figaro_ exclaimed, the isolated nature of _bidonvilles_ enabled their Maghrebi residents to retain their different “mores and mentalities,” hindering “their integration into the French community.” Increasingly, though, French authorities also classified shantytowns as threats to public safety, particularly for the role they played in facilitating the spread of Algerian nationalist influence and support. Targets for the distribution of

---

83 Note from Alfred Martin to Raymond Haas-Picard, 9 February 1959. ADBR 138 W 47.
84 CTAM Martin actively encouraged Marseille’s SAT officers to be on the lookout for nationalist sympathizers by sending them questionnaires that requested information on the attitudes of the Muslim Algerians they came into contact with: Note from Alfred Martin to the SAT officers of the Bouches-du-Rhône, 21 September 1960. ADBR 138 W 20.
85 Meeting organized by Raymond Haas-Picard “en vue de présenter les officiers des affaires algériennes aux chefs des services administratifs et sociaux intéressés par leur action,” 26 September 1959.
86 Letter from Raymond Haas-Picard to Interior Minister Pierre Chatenet, 8 October 1959. ADBR 138 W 28.
pro-Algerian independence propaganda at the beginning of the Algerian War, shantytowns over time became strongholds in which Algeria nationalist operatives concealed arms and documents and hid from police. By the early 1960s, according to Neil MacMaster, “the FLN established an almost absolute control over all aspects of daily life, particularly through local *commissions de justice*, which imposed Islamic law (*sharia*), regulated disputes, marriage and divorce, banned alcohol, and imposed fines.” In addition, Algerians living in shantytowns became important sources of revenue for the FF-FLN’s tax collection system.

In 1959, French authorities identified nine shantytowns in Marseille that contained large percentages of Muslim Algerian residents. In total, they estimated that 2,000 single Muslim Algerian men and 429 Muslim Algerian families consisting of 2,500 people lived in local *bidonvilles*. Despite the fact they represented a minority of Marseille’s total Algerian population, which numbered approximately 18,000 by 1960, Marseille authorities fixated on these shantytown dwellers due to their concerns about the relationship between *bidonvilles* and Algerian nationalism. Following calls made by the state in 1958 and 1959 to solve the shantytown “problem,” the Marseille police directed considerable resources and personnel to carrying out

---

89 Ibid., 77.
91 Reports on “les bidonvilles nord-africains de Marseille” and “la liquidation des bidonvilles dans la région de Marseille” that were prepared in advance of the visit of Michel Massenet and M. Blanchard, the Head of the Interior Ministry’s Muslim Affairs Service, on 25-26 June 1959. CAC 19770391, article 7. It is important to point out that even though these numbers were contained in official reports, official estimates of the number of Muslim Algerians living in the shantytowns of Marseille varied greatly in the last years of the Algerian War: See Lyons, *The Civilizing Mission in the Metropole*, 179. Another official estimate made in 1959, for example, claimed that as many as 600 “North African” families lived in Marseille *bidonvilles* and slums: Henri Bouchet, “Financement du programme des 2,000 logements,” 23 November 1959. AMM 455 W 44.
92 Martin, “Note sur l’action sociale spécialisée dans les Bouches-du-Rhône en faveur des populations musulmanes algériennes,” 2. In general, shantytown dwellers represented a small percentage of the entire Algerian population of France. In 1959, for example, the FAS estimated that only 25,000 of the approximately 350,000 Algerians living in France resided in shantytowns: see Lyons, *The Civilizing Mission in the Metropole*, 179.
increasingly repressive anti-FLN raids targeting Algerian shantytown dwellings. In 1960, these raids, as well as other anti-FLN operations carried out in Marseille’s shantytowns, received added support when the Fifth Republic enacted a new law giving government officials throughout France and Algeria the power to seize shantytown lands and properties.

Alongside these repressive measures, North African-focused welfare associations in Marseille, notably ATOM, turned their attention to delivering services that were designed to eliminate shantytowns and re-house and integrate their Muslim Algerian residents. In the opinion of French officials and welfare experts, these services were essential not only to speeding up the slow progress that had defined local efforts to improve the housing conditions of Muslim North Africans since the late 1940s, but also to undermining Algerian nationalism and ensuring the city’s “security.” On the surface, as Lyons notes, they demonstrated France’s ongoing dedication to helping Muslim Algerians adopt French manners and customs. In practice, they moved Muslim Algerians from sites of FLN influence into “normal” habitations where they could be better supervised.

Efforts to eliminate the shantytowns of Marseille in the final years of the Algerian War were supported by both the FAS and the SONACOTRAL. The former allocated the majority of the subsidies it distributed locally to welfare associations that provided social housing assistance

---

94 While MacMaster, “Shantytown Republics,” 81-82, has underscored the repressive nature of anti-FLN policing in the shantytowns of Paris in the second half of the Algerian War, similar actions were taken by the Marseille police during the same period: Note from J. Vaudeville to Claude Delorme, President of the Administrative Council of the HLM Office of the city of Marseille, 28 January 1958. ADBR 137 W 390.


96 Municipal officials were especially quick to point out the public safety advantages associated with the effort to re-house “Muslim” families: Letter from the general secretary of the mayor of Marseille, Jean Poggioli, to Raymond Haas-Picard, 21 December 1960. AMM 483 W 245.

97 The social housing programs developed over the course of the Algerian War have garnered considerable attention for their simultaneous, and often synchronistic, use of repression and welfare: Lyons, The Civilizing Mission in the Metropole, 175-205; see also Émile Elongbil Ewane, “Hébergement et répression: le centre de la Part-Dieu,” in La France en guerre, 1954-1962, 419-425; MacMaster, “Shantytown Republics,” 82-83.
to Muslim Algerians. It also committed special funding to ATOM so that the association could establish socio-educative outposts in shantytowns with “strong concentrations of North Africans.” The latter, meanwhile, took the lead in clearing local shantytowns and re-housing their Muslim Algerian residents. Above all, between 1959 and 1962, administrators from both agencies worked closely with local social service providers, the prefecture, and the municipality to implement a social housing program that sought to re-house shantytown-dwelling Muslim Algerian families to facilitate their social and cultural integration.

Social Housing in the Last Years of the Algerian War

As sociologist Agnès Pitrou observed in 1961, the central goal of the social housing program carried out in Marseille between 1959 and 1962 was to “foster Muslims’ access to normal living conditions in Western civilization […] and to help the North African population merge with the indigenous French population in order to eliminate de facto segregation.” To accomplish this goal, the architects of the program specifically targeted Muslim Algerian families living in shantytowns who, in their opinion, required specialized housing assistance to remove them from “inferior” living conditions that inspired “pathological personal and social disorders.” The social housing program thus responded to French fears that shantytowns not only allowed these families to isolate themselves from French society and potentially join the Algerian nationalist cause, but also enabled them to “transport” presumably backward customs and traditions across the

---

98 The same was true for other major cities like Paris and Lyon. Indeed, underscoring the considerable emphasis the FAS placed on shantytown clearance and re-housing operations, the organization directed nearly six million francs to housing projects for Algerian workers and families in its 1959 budget. A year later, out of a total annual budget of just over 19.5 million francs, it increased its support to these projects to just over 15.1 million francs: FAS activity report, 1961. CAC 19770391, article 2.
99 Procès-Verbal de la réunion qui s’est tenue le 26 juin 1959 à la Préfecture des Bouches-du-Rhône en vue d’examiner le problème du logement des travailleurs musulmans algériens à Marseille. ADBR 138 W 49.
100 While the SONACOTRAL was established in 1956, it only began operating in Marseille in 1959: Ibid.
101 Pitrou succinctly articulated the program’s goal in the “abstract” of Centre de Recherches et de Documentation sur la Consommation, “Rapport d’étude du plan d’équipement collectif de l’agglomération de Marseille.”
Mediterranean. The architects of the program considered social housing to be a “necessary” means of rapidly spurring the “adaptation of Algerian immigrants” into “la civilisation urbaine et française.” Ideally, they envisioned using the program to “disperse” Muslim Algerian families throughout Marseille, where they would live amongst, and establish good relations with, “les métropolitains,” and adopt the customs and habits of “the European way of life.”

On paper, the social housing program consisted of three interconnected stages. First, the architects of the program planned to evaluate shantytown-dwelling Muslim Algerian families to determine their levels of integration, their material and financial resources, and their readiness to move into “normal” public housing estates such as HLMs. Under the program, most of these evaluations were conducted by ATOM social workers in conjunction with Marseille’s SAT officers. However, municipal techniciens (public health officials or urban planners) and police officers also participated in assessing local shantytowns and their Algerian residents, often under the guise of ensuring Marseille’s “safety.” Second, after these evaluations were completed, SONACOTRAL and its subsidiary LOGIREM planned to evict Muslim Algerian families from shantytowns, re-locate them to nearby temporary accommodations, and demolish their shantytown dwellings. Finally, both organizations, through what ultimately amounted to a tiered integrationist re-housing scheme, envisioned moving evicted families into two different types of social housing complexes reflective of their supposed levels of integration.

103 Ibid., 31.
105 Nasiali, “Ordering the Disorderly Slum,” 1030. For an example of the evaluations carried out by municipal techniciens or police officers, see “État Civil et Renseignments des nord-africains demeurant dans les baraouements de la Rue Jean Dussert, Marseille,” 8 November 1960. AMM 483 W 245.
Under the social housing program’s tiered integrationist re-housing scheme, families that welfare experts classified as “sufficiently integrated” (or bien évolué) were given access to apartments in HLMs constructed or acquired by SONACOTRAL-LOGIREM. Categorized as either HLM Logécos (logements économiques) or LoPoFa (logements popularies et familiaux), these complexes featured modern housing amenities that were “commonly accepted in France,” including central heating, electricity, indoor plumbing, and access to hot water. For the social workers at ATOM, conditions that signalled Muslim Algerian families were adequately integrated and ready to inhabit an HLM apartment included: the acceptance of the economic standards of European living, including the regular payment of rent, the maintenance of a clean household, the ability to use modern furniture (tables and chairs) and appliances (washing machines and gas stoves), and the adoption of European clothing. As illustrated by ATOM in a March 1960 assessment of a “sufficiently integrated” family of five living in a shantytown in the neighbourhood of Saint-Julien:

Mr. Medjadi and his family live in a small room measuring four metres by two-and-a-half-metres, without windows. Only the front door lets in sunlight […] The house is well maintained, water and electricity have been installed, according to Mr. Medjadi at his expense. Mr. Medjadi has since 1948 lived in this neighbourhood, where he is well regarded. Despite the good will of the mother, the narrowness of the premises causes some disorder. However, Mrs. Medjadi seems to be sufficiently integrated, speaks French half decently, and tries to arrange her small home in the European manner. In conclusion, this is a family who at first sight seems apt to be in an HLM.

Though it is not noted in this specific assessment, the architects of the social housing program also expected “sufficiently integrated” families to express a “desire to evolve,” a desire symbolized by

---

regular attendance in home economics, childcare, and French language courses in the case of women, and regular employment in the case of men.\textsuperscript{109}

Experts classified as “insufficiently integrated” (or \textit{peu évolué}) families who, in their opinion, did not adequately meet the conditions necessary to occupy an HLM apartment. Under the social housing program’s tiered integrationist re-housing scheme, this group of families was given access to apartments in transitional housing complexes (\textit{cités de relogement} or \textit{cités de transit}), where experts argued they would learn how to adopt the customs and habits required to move into an HLM. Transitional housing complexes were designed by public housing administrators to help familiarize their residents with the modern and collective “norms” of French urban and domestic life. In comparison to HLMs, they offered more simplistic amenities, including shared washroom facilities. On the whole, the apartments within these complexes featured standardized internal layouts and lacked indoor plumbing and access to hot water.\textsuperscript{110} Further reflecting their transitional purpose, these complexes contained ATOM social centres that ran home economics and literacy classes for Muslim Algerian women as part of its ongoing effort to transform them into modern housewives and mothers and, by extension, integrate their families. Families living within these complexes were also regularly visited and evaluated by ATOM household monitors.\textsuperscript{111} Residents’ comings and goings, moreover, were monitored by live-in guardians whose roles included providing “useful advice and guidance” and, if necessary, punishing “misdeeds or offences.”\textsuperscript{112}


\textsuperscript{110} Nasiali, \textit{Native to the Republic}, 76-78.


Thus, under the social housing program, transitional housing featured a combination of social assistance and surveillance. Writing in the aftermath of the Algerian War, LOGIREM director Martin justified this approach along paternalistic and integrationist lines, arguing that “the benefits of greater comfort—elevators, central heating, garbage chutes, and hot water from the tap—are for a more distant future, only when the people concerned have truly […] demonstrated their sociability.” For Martin, residency in transitional housing was a step “insufficiently integrated” Muslim Algerian families needed to take to become more familiar with the “requirements of modern life,” including “respect for their neighbours, the regular payment of rent, and the use of electricity and running water.”113 Once these families reached what Martin and other experts identified as an acceptable level of integration—a process the architects of the social housing program envisioned would take several months to complete—they were then promoted into an HLM apartment. Following a relocation process known as an opération-tiroir, apartments in transitional housing complexes that were vacated by newly “promoted” families were then occupied by other families recently removed from Marseille’s shantytowns.114

To supplement the integrationist mission of the social housing program, administrators from the SONACOTRAL and LOGIREM negotiated to exchange apartments in the HLM and transitional housing complexes constructed by their organizations with apartments in housing projects managed by the public housing offices of the city (Société d’HLM de Marseille) and the prefecture (Office Public d’HLM des Bouches-du-Rhône). Local public housing administrators who participated in this housing exchange system agreed to keep the capacity of français musulmans d’Algérie living in any given public housing complex at between 10 and 15 percent. According to the architects of the social housing program, the ideal behind this effort was to settle

Muslim Algerian families amongst “metropolitan” French families, which they argued would produce “neighbourly relations” that would help influence the former to “rapidly evolve.”

In practice, the social housing program was difficult to realize. When it came to moving shantytown-dwelling families into HLMs, efforts proceeded at an extremely slow pace. Despite announcing in 1958 that it intended to construct or acquire 750 HLM apartment units for Muslim Algerian families between 1959 and 1962, the SONACOTRAL managed to procure only 400 units during that period. Due to construction delays, just 100 of these units were built in 1960. Another 100 units were either built or in the process of being built by the end of 1961. By that year, official records indicate that between only 60 and 80 families comprising a population of between 400 and 500 people—a very small percentage of the Algerian population of Marseille—occupied local HLMs. By the end of the Algerian War, Martin argued that only 20 Muslim Algerian families in total lived in complexes run by the Société d’HLM de Marseille or the Office Public d’HLM des Bouches-du-Rhône.

In addition to construction delays, contemporaries underscored several other reasons to explain the social housing program’s failure to move more Muslim Algerian families into local HLMs. According to Pitrou, for example, even Muslim Algerian families who welfare experts classified as bien évolué remained into the early 1960s “handicapped by their low seniority in the city, their limited financial resources, and their size, which necessitates residency in large housing

---

115 Ibid, 24, 38; see also Procès-Verbal de la réunion qui s’est tenue le 26 juin 1959 à la Préfecture des Bouches-du-Rhône en vue d’examiner le problème du logement des travailleurs musulmans algériens à Marseille.


117 Letter from Gaston Defferre to director-general of SONACOTRAL Jean Vaujour, 11 February 1961. AMM 455 W 44. These 400 units were part of a larger 4,000-unit social housing development project that had been initiated by the city of Marseille in 1957: Convention Particulière no. 9 avec la Société Marseillaise Mixte de Construction et d’Aménagements Communaux annexée à la Délibération du Conseil Municipal, 7 October 1957. AMM 483 W 167.


units [...] already in short supply.” But the program’s failure also stemmed from ongoing discrimination on the part of municipal and prefectural HLM administrators. Citing concerns about Algerians’ lack of adaptability, some administrators outright refused to make apartments in the HLMs they managed available to Muslim Algerian families. Moreover, they refused to participate in the housing exchange system that had been initiated by SONACOTRAL-LOGIREM, resulting in the system’s virtual stagnation by 1962.120

Compared to the slow pace that defined their efforts to move Muslim Algerian families into HLMs, the architects of the social housing program experienced more success moving families into transitional housing. In 1961, official records indicate that close to 300 Muslim Algerian families totaling around 2,000 people lived in transitional housing complexes in Marseille.121 Many of these families occupied units that had been acquired by the SONACOTRAL in the cités de relogement of Grand Arénas and La Paternelle, two complexes that were respectively managed by the Reconstruction and Urbanism Ministry and the city of Marseille.122 Other families took up residency in the cités de transit of Saint-Barthélémy and Cap Janet, two additional complexes built and managed by LOGIREM. The organization constructed the former as part of a large 700-unit transitional housing plan initiated by the SONACOTRAL to clear a shantytown in the neighbourhood of Saint-Barthélémy.123 It constructed the latter to clear a shantytown in the neighbourhood of La Calade.124

122 Ibid., 20, 39-40.
123 Under this plan, the SONACOTRAL also intended to open a cité de transit in the nearby neighbourhood of Les Arnavaux: Letter from Jean Vaujour to Gaston Defferre on the “Réalisation de programmes de construction par la SONACOTRAL et la Société ‘LOGIREM’ à Marseille,” 5 January 1961. AMM 455 W 44.
124 Letter from Jean Vaujour to the Chief Engineer of Maritime Roads and Bridges, 28 April 1961. ADBR 1937 W 542.
Although Muslim Algerian families had better access to transitional housing, this aspect of the social housing program also suffered from serious shortcomings. Since transitional housing was meant to be an intermediate and, ideally, short-term step on the path to Muslim Algerians’ full integration into French society, *cités de transit* and *relogement* were both built from simple and cheap construction materials. In addition, the equally simplistic amenities they featured, such as shared washrooms and exterior drainage, constantly required repairs. As a result, these *cités* deteriorated rapidly, sparking fears among official and nonofficial observers that they would become new slums. Some nonofficial observers blamed this situation on the rapid construction of these *cités*. Pitrou, for example, linked the “inconvenient” hygienic conditions that came to be associated with the *cités de relogement* of Grand Arénas and La Paternelle to the fact that they were quickly erected on vacant lots with poor access to surrounding infrastructure such as roads, water and sewage systems, and electrical power networks. Moreover, in general, she claimed that the overall appearance of transitional housing complexes as “wastelands” incited “carelessness and sloppiness” on the part of their residents.

Government officials were more prone to blame the deterioration of transitional housing complexes solely on the attitudes and practices of their residents. As Nasiali highlights in the case of the *cité de relogement* of La Paternelle, municipal *techniciens* cited “resident misuse” as the main reason for clogged or leaking sewer and water lines. According to MacMaster, some Muslim Algerian families living in transitional housing also drew the ire of officials and welfare experts for the efforts they made to reconfigure “modern internal spaces to their customary practices.” For example, to place an emphasis on family privacy, a key feature of the design of

---

125 Nasiali, *Native to the Republic*, 78.
127 Nasiali, *Native to the Republic*, 78.
traditional North African homes, families often erected new internal walls and partitions. In an effort to recreate pre-migratory domestic spaces that served multiple functions, they also transformed bedrooms into kitchens or storage rooms. Overall, for these families, such efforts represented acts of resistance against the “constraints” of the standardized layouts of transitional housing units. For French officials and welfare experts, however, they were considered additional examples of an inadequate integration into French society.129

Although more Muslim Algerian families lived in cités de transit or relogement by the end of the Algerian War, the overall slowness of social housing development in Marseille also affected this aspect of the social housing program. Delays in the construction of HLM complexes led to a backlog in efforts to filter Muslim Algerian families through transitional housing. As a result, even families living in transitional housing complexes who, in the opinion of officials and experts, were ready to inhabit HLMs ended up staying in their apartments for several years, not the several months originally envisioned by the architects of the social housing program.130 In other words, local transitional housing complexes almost never fulfilled their short-term purpose. Moreover, the stagnation that underscored efforts to move families out of transitional housing meant that apartments in cités de transit and relogement were almost never vacated quickly, leading to a parallel stagnation in efforts to re-house families still living in shantytowns.

Records kept by the Bureau of Muslim Affairs underscore the troubles many Muslim Algerian families faced as a result of the slow pace of the social housing program’s shantytown clearance and re-housing efforts. The case of the Allik family is illustrative. In the late 1950s, the family moved in with Mrs. Allik’s uncle, who lived in a small wooden shack with his wife and

129 Similar customary spatial logics also informed how Muslim North Africans living in shantytowns designed their external and internal living spaces: Ibid., 75-80, 86-87.
two children in the shantytown of Fonscolombes in the neighbourhood of La Villette. Under the social housing program, clearance efforts at Fonscolombes commenced in 1959. However, by 1961, despite the fact officials at the Bureau considered them “sufficiently integrated to qualify for HLM housing,” the Allik’s had not been re-housed. Making matters worse, in a letter she wrote to Nafissa Sid-Cara, the Secretary of State in Charge of Social Affairs in Algeria, on 22 January 1961, Mrs. Allik explained that her uncle, to accommodate the birth of his third child, had recently kicked her family out of his home. As a result, the family became “homeless.” In an effort to rectify this situation and secure some form of social housing assistance, Mrs. Allik personally visited the offices of the prefecture, the Bureau Muslim Affairs, and the city of Marseille. Unfortunately, as she noted in her letter, “no one wants to house us.”

After receiving Mrs. Allik’s letter, Sid-Cara wrote to prefect-IGAME Haas-Picard and Marseille’s CTAMs on 1 February 1961 asking them to look into the situation. However, even though a Bureau official explained to Sid-Cara ten days later that “the situation is being carefully followed by a social worker,” the Bureau’s records offer no evidence to suggest the Allik family received re-housing assistance before the end of the Algerian War.

The stagnation of the social housing program, combined with the ongoing arrival of new migrants from North Africa and a continuing lack of available housing, contributed to a situation in which shantytowns remained after decolonization an ongoing “problem” for French officials,
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131 File on the Allik family compiled by the Bureau of Algerian Affairs. ADBR 138 W 72.
132 Procès-Verbal de la réunion qui s’est tenue le 26 juin 1959 à la Préfecture des Bouches-du-Rhône en vue d’examiner le problème du logement des travailleurs musulmans algériens à Marseille. ADBR 138 W 49.
133 Letter from M. Denieul to Nafissa Sid-Cara, 11 February 1961. ADBR 138 W 72.
134 As the Secretary of State in Charge of Social Affairs in Algeria from 1959 to 1962 under Prime Minister Michel Debré, Nafissa Sid-Cara was the first “Muslim” Algerian woman to serve in a French government: Shepard, The Invention of Decolonization, 192.
135 Letter from Mrs. Allik to Nafissa Sid-Cara, 22 January 1962. ADBR 138 W 72.
136 Letter from Nafissa Sid-Cara to prefect-IGAME Raymond Haas-Picard and the CTAMs of Marseille, 1 February 1961. ADBR 138 W 72.
137 Letter from M. Denieul to Nafissa Sid-Cara, 11 February 1961.
welfare specialists, and social service providers in Marseille. Even though French authorities claimed in 1960 that three shantytowns in the neighbourhoods of Saint-Barthélémy, La Timone, and Saint-Victor had been completely demolished,\textsuperscript{138} internal government documents clearly demonstrate that, well after the Algerian War ended, Saint-Barthélémy remained the target of local clearance operations.\textsuperscript{139} Moreover, contemporary studies of Marseille’s housing situation estimated that, by 1962, the number of Muslims of Algerian origin living in local shantytowns had actually grown to as much as 6,000.\textsuperscript{140}

Thus, despite the focus French officials and welfare experts in Marseille had placed on eliminating shantytowns and re-housing their Muslim Algerian residents, the housing crisis that many Muslim Algerians living in the city faced was not resolved by the end of the Algerian War. As a result, many officials and experts continued to express concerns about the presence of Muslim ghettos in local shantytowns. In expressing their concerns, some of these individuals repeated older arguments that singled out Muslim North Africans’ inability or refusal to adapt to life in France and propensity for self-isolation as “difficulties” or “problems” that needed solving. Others, however, identified other reasons to explain the continuation of this crisis, including inadequacies in French efforts to assist Muslim North African shantytown dwellers. For example, Michel Massenet, who oversaw the operations of the FAS, criticized public housing administrators and managers who refused to make units available to eligible Muslim Algerian families, referring to their actions as “severe racial discrimination.”\textsuperscript{141}

\textsuperscript{138} Lyons, \textit{The Civilizing Mission in the Metropole}, 179.
\textsuperscript{139} Note from Alfred Martin to the director of the FAS on the “Programme de construction pour la résorption de bidonvilles à Marseille,” 24 February 1964. CAC 19850021, article 18.
\textsuperscript{140} In her 1961 study, for example, Pitrou estimated that around 500 Algerian families and 3,000 single Algerian male workers comprising a population of between 5,500 and 6,000 people still lived in Marseille’s shantytowns: Pitrou, “Le logement des Nord-Africains à Marseille,” 18.
\textsuperscript{141} Michel Massenet, quoted in Lyons, “Social Welfare, French Muslims and Decolonization in France,” 77-78.
Similar criticisms were made by ATOM director Belpeer, whose association had raised the issue of the potential ghettoization of Muslim North Africans since the early 1950s. Writing in the 31 October 1961 issue of ESNA’s journal *Documents Nord-Africains*, Belpeer argued that “it is not true to say that Algerians love to live among themselves, that they deliberately keep away from *la vie métropolitaine*.” Instead, in his opinion, most *français musulmans d’Algérie* desired “to be a worker like the others [French citizens], to have a room and a house like the others, to be dressed like the others, and to flourish in the midst of the others.”  

According to this view, the tendency for some Muslim Algerians to turn away from French society had as much to do with a combination of high expectations, an inadequate reception, and a lack of opportunity “to choose another solution” than it did with an inability or refusal to adapt. As Belpeer explained:

> The Algerian will find the success or failure of his attempt [to integrate] depends for a very large part on the reception he receives. From the métropolitains that he meets in his very first steps, he expects everything: indication of possible housing, orientation for the unraveling of many administrative questions that he may have, referral to profitable work, and, above all, understanding and friendship. If he does not find himself alone in handling the different aspects of this research, he will find his place fairly easily in *la cité métropolitaine*. If, on the other hand, he encounters indifference, if not hostility, soon enough he finds no other recourse than to take refuge in a kind of psychological ghetto, and probably also to go and live in these geographical ghettos embodied in the shantytowns surrounding large urban areas.

Ultimately, staying consistent with the opinions his wife had expressed before the outbreak of the Algerian War, Belpeer believed that French institutions and people were responsible for solving the housing crisis many Muslim Algerians faced, particularly through an approach to co-habitation that benefited “everyone.” Moreover, even as he commended the “serious” efforts that had been made up until that point to provide social housing assistance to Muslim Algerians throughout
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143 Ibid., 2.
France, he acknowledged that these efforts had not done enough to eliminate the presence of “geographical” and “psychological” Algerian ghettos.\textsuperscript{144}

Although Belpeer did not address the subject directly, his comments encourage us to question if the social housing program he helped introduce in Marseille in 1959 had itself contributed to this process of ghettoization. An analysis of the program’s shantytown clearance efforts, as well as the spatial formula of its re-housing operations, offers some insights in this regard. The table below provides a list of the shantytown clearance operations conducted under the program before the end of the Algerian War (Table 1).\textsuperscript{145} An important observation that can be drawn from this list is that inner city shantytowns constituted the program’s primary targets. Indeed, five of the first six shantytowns that it targeted for removal—Boulevard de la Corderie, Enclos Peyssonnel, Fonscolombes, La Timone, and Rue Jean Dussert—were located in neighbourhoods in “Marseille centre.”\textsuperscript{146} French authorities gave two reasons to explain the attention these shantytowns received. First, they argued that because inner city shantytowns were located on “relatively important” lands near large centres of labour, including the port district, they presented obstacles to the proper planning and development of Marseille’s downtown core.\textsuperscript{147}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid., 2-3.
\item On its own, the city of Marseille had already commenced shantytown clearance operations in the neighbourhoods of Saint-Victor and Saint-Barthélémy, as well as the Parc du Capitaine Gèze in 1956. Defferre, “La résorption des bidonvilles à Marseille.”
\item The information contained in Figure 5 comes from multiple archival sources: Procès-Verbal de la réunion qui s’est tenue le 26 juin 1959 à la Préfecture des Bouches-du-Rhône en vue d’examiner le problème du logement des travailleurs musulmans algériens à Marseille; “Bidonvilles, baraquements, cités d’urgence encore existants à Marseille le 1 Septembre 1973.” ADBR 275 J 59; “Bidonvilles: Sur la quarantaine qui existait à Marseille 25 ont disparu – Encore 7,000 personnes à realoger,” Le Provençal, 10 September 1973.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Second, they argued that, as a result of the presence of Algerian nationalism in Marseille, inner city shantytowns and their residents posed serious threats to the heart of the city.148

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted Shantytown</th>
<th>Neighbourhood/Arrondissement</th>
<th>Start of Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard de la Corderie</td>
<td>Saint-Victor / 7th</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclos Peyssonnel</td>
<td>La Villette and Saint-Lazare / 3rd</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fonscolombes</td>
<td>La Villette / 3rd</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campagne Julien</td>
<td>Saint-Barthélémy / 14th</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Timone</td>
<td>La Timone / 10th</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rue Jean Dussert</td>
<td>Chutes Lavie / 4th</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campagne Picon</td>
<td>Sainte-Marthe / 14th</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap Janet</td>
<td>La Calade / 15th</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Shantytown clearance operations carried out in Marseille under the “programme de résorption” of 1959. Source: Documents contained in ADBR 138 W 49, 275 J 47, and 275 J 59.

Unfortunately, the effort to re-house Muslim Algerian families living in inner city shantytowns—or any shantytown for that matter—failed to live up to the original goals of the social housing program. Far from widely dispersing shantytown-dwelling families throughout Marseille to facilitate their integration, the program’s architects employed a spatial formula that predominantly re-grouped them in neighbourhoods in the city’s northernmost arrondissements. Indeed, all of the 400 HLM apartment units the SONACOTRAL procured in 1959 were located in one HLM project in the neighbourhood of Saint-Barthélémy in the fourteenth arrondissement.149

The same neighbourhood was also home to LOGIREM’s *cité de transit* of Saint-Barthélémy, while neighbouring Sainte-Marthe in the same arrondissement contained the city-run *cité de relogement* of La Paternelle. LOGIREM’s other transitional housing complex, the *cité* Cap Janet, was located

148 The lone peripheral shantytown targeted before 1962, the Campagne Julien in the neighbourhood of Saint-Barthélémy, appeared to require attention commensurate with inner city shantytowns due its reputation for harbouring the most “aggressive *foyer FLN* in Marseille”: “Projet de destruction de la partie du bidonville de Saint-Barthélémy utilisée par des célibataires musulmans,” note to the Director of the Cabinet of the prefect of the Bouches-du-Rhône, 23 January 1962. ADBR 137 W 426.

in the neighbourhood of La Calade in the fifteenth arrondissement. As a result, by the end of the Algerian War, the social housing program had actually functioned in practice to move poorly housed Muslim Algerians to northern Marseille and keep them there.

**Social Welfare for Maghrebis and the End of “French” Algeria**

In 1962, with the integrationist social housing program far from complete, officials, specialists, and social service providers who specialized in delivering *action sociale* to Maghrebi clients were confronted with another issue that had serious ramifications for Marseille. On 18 March of that year, the Fifth Republic and the FLN finalized the Evian Accords that ended the Algerian War and set the conditions for Algeria’s separation from France. Three and a half months later, on 3 July, Algeria formally declared its independence. During this short period, but also in the months immediately following Algerian independence, over one million people travelled between France and Algeria, the vast majority by way of Marseille. Most of the people who left Algeria for France during this period were European “repatriates” who fled to escape an increasingly violent atmosphere created by the FLN and the Secret Army Organization (OAS, Organisation Armée Secrète), an anti-Algerian independence French terrorist group that had formed in 1961.

Also included among these European arrivals were tens of thousands of Muslim refugees, or “French Muslim repatriates,” who had either fought as French army auxiliaries
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152 The term “French Muslim repatriate” was used to differentiate Muslim Algerian refugees from the regular Muslim Algerian migrants who continued to travel between France and Algeria in the months leading up to and immediately following Algerian independence. In general, from March to August 1962, the ports of the Bouches-du-Rhône registered the arrival of over 28,000 Muslims of Algerian origin: Study on the “Exode des populations d’Algérie en 1962” submitted to the prefecture of the Bouches-du-Rhône, 25 January 1963. ADBR 137 W 456. In total, between 87,000 and 92,000 Muslim Algerian auxiliaries entered France after 1962: Sung-Eun Choi, *Decolonization and the French of Algeria: Bringing the Settler Colony Home* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 62.
during the Algerian War (harkis) or served in some capacity in the colonial government in Algeria.\textsuperscript{153} Largely as a result of this mass repatriation movement, Marseille found itself in a situation that proved too difficult to handle in any organized way. As one 1963 report on the “problems posed by the repatriation of Algerian refugees” explained, the arrival of “rapatriés d’Algérie” the previous year had thrown into disorder “all reception, reclassification, and housing estimates” and posed “serious social, economic, and financial problems.”\textsuperscript{154}

As wave upon wave of people reached Marseille by boat or plane in the spring and summer of 1962, welfare associations that offered reception and orientation services to Muslim North African clients remained busy. From March to August, the city-run Bureau d’Aide Sociale provided emergency monetary relief to 2,790 newly arrived Muslim Algerians and distributed housing vouchers to another 520 clients.\textsuperscript{155} Both of these totals remained consistent with the number of clients it had handled in previous years.\textsuperscript{156} Behind this quantitative consistency, though, lay a slight alteration in the kinds of clients the BAS targeted. As CTAM Bourdonneau noted in the fall of 1962, the mass repatriation movement from Algeria contributed to a situation in which the providers of specialized reception and orientation services began “animating and coordinating […] action sociale in favour of Muslim refugees” alongside, but also sometimes in place of, their regular Muslim Algerian clientele. However, according to Bourdonneau, since many “French Muslim repatriates” were considered “peu évolués,” the effort to procure them “employment, clothing, and food” and assist them through other means came with its own set of concerns. In particular, he explained that a large number of male Muslim refugees came from rural areas and

\textsuperscript{156} During the same months in 1961, for example, the BAS provided emergency monetary relief to 2,849 clients and housing vouchers to around 575 clients: BAS, “Aide aux Nord-Africains,” 1961. CAC 19850021, article 12.
lacked the professional qualifications needed to integrate into French society economically, leaving them vulnerable to becoming unemployed and destitute.  

In their reports to the Interior Ministry in the final years of the Algerian War, Marseille’s CTAMs drew attention to the dilemma of Muslim auxiliaries, officials, and civil servants in Algeria, labelling them targets of FLN “terrorism” and encouraging the development of initiatives to facilitate their “repatriation” to France. Despite this effort, however, the French government’s response to the arrival of “French Muslim repatriates” in 1962 was largely one of indifference.  

As Sung-Eun Choi reveals in the case of the harkis, in April 1962, the Interior Ministry limited entries to those who could prove they had been threatened by the FLN. The following month, the Algerian Affairs Ministry went even further, issuing a decree on 12 May that denied entry to those who did not come to France via an officially organized repatriation plan. For those who were admitted into France, assistance from the government was not only wholly inadequate, but also segregationist. Many who entered under the auspices of the official repatriation plan, for
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158 For example, see: CTAM report, first trimester 1961; CTAM report, first trimester 1962. ADBR 138 W 17.  
159 Much of this indifference stemmed from conflicting assessments of this group’s safety in the last years of the war. In the case of the harkis, the state’s indifference also had a lot to do with the belief held by some high ranking officials, including president de Gaulle, that they were undesirable: William B. Cohen, “The Harkis: History and Memory,” in Algeria and France, 1800-2000, 165-168. For additional scholarship on the experience of the harkis both during and after decolonization, see: Maurice Faivre, Les combattants musulmans de la guerre d’Algérie: des soldats sacrifiés (Paris: Harmattan, 1995); Jean-Jacques Jordi and Mohand Hamoumou, Les Harkis: une mémoire enfouie (Paris: Autrement, 1999); Charles-Robert Ageron, “Le ‘Drame des Harkis’: mémoire ou histoire?” Vingtième Siècle, no. 68 (2000): 3-16; Géraldine Enjelvin, “Les Harkis en France: carte d’identité française, identité harkie à la carte?” Modern & Contemporary France 11, no. 2 (2003): 161-173; Claire Eldridge, From Empire to Exile: History and Memory within the “pied-noir” and “harki” communities, 1962-2012 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016).  
160 Choi, Decolonization and the French of Algeria, 67-68.  
161 Due to the restrictive nature of the official plan, it accepted the repatriation of very few harkis. While a significant number of harkis still entered France through unofficial means, those who were caught doing so in the spring and summer of 1962 were sent back to Algeria. There, they faced violent reprisals from the FLN and its loyalists: Cohen, “The Harkis,” 167; see also Stora, La Gangrène et l’oubli, 175-176, 200-202; Sung-Eun Choi, “The Muslim Veteran in Postcolonial France: The Politics of the Integration of Harkis After 1962,” French Politics, Culture & Society 29, no. 1 (2011): 27.
example, were housed in former internment camps, abandoned villages, or public housing sites near industrial towns where they ended up becoming isolated from the rest of French society. The harkis and other “French Muslim repatriates” who managed to avoid this outcome and settle in Marseille, meanwhile, still relied heavily on the aid of local welfare associations.

Outside of providing welcome and orientation services to “French Muslim repatriates,” Marseille welfare associations also engaged in delivering them social housing assistance. In the summer of 1962, for example, the AFNA repurposed the entirety of its 70-bed Viala-Annexe dormitory, transforming it into temporary housing for “rapatriés musulmans.” During the same period, the Centre de Préformation de Marseille (CPM, Pre-Training Centre of Marseille), a private vocational pre-training service for young Muslim Algerian men that opened in the city in 1961, erected a tented camp for “French Muslim repatriates” in the neighbourhood of La Croix-Rouge with enough space to temporarily accommodate 300 people.

By the fall of 1962, more permanent housing solutions were offered by the SONACOTRAL when it launched an initiative to construct 2,000 social housing units for Muslim refugees in France’s major cities. The main feature of this initiative in Marseille was the cité Les Tilleuls, a cité de transit for harkis that opened in early 1963 in the neighbourhood of Les Aygalades in the fifteenth arrondissement. Reflecting the preoccupation officials and experts who
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162 One of these camps, the Rivesaltes Camp in rural Catalonia, was a former interment camp for “undesirable foreigners” opened by the Third Republic in 1939. During World War II, it was also by the Germans: Jeannette E. Miller, “A Camp for Foreigners and ‘Aliens’: The Harks’ Exile at the Rivesaltes Camp (1962-1964),” *French Politics, Culture & Society* 31, no. 3 (2013): 21-44.
164 Note received by Raymond Haas-Picard on the “Hébergement temporaire des rapatriés musulmans à Marseille,” 1962. ADBR 137 W 460.
165 This initiative was launched following orders issued by the Minister of Repatriates in the spring of 1962: Letter from the Minister of Repatriates Y. Perony to the prefects and IGAMEs of France and the regional delegates of the Repatriate Ministry on the “Reclassement et logement des ex-supplétiens musulmans réfugiés en France,” 5 February 1964. ADBR 12 O 1559.
operated in Marseille welfare circles had with integrating Maghrebin even after decolonization, this complex contained an ATOM social centre.\textsuperscript{166}

Another source of social aid for “French Muslim repatriates” in Marseille was the SAT. Muslims who fled Algeria as part of the mass repatriation movement began visiting the association’s offices in the spring of 1962.\textsuperscript{167} These visits continued well into 1963, prompting the SAT to produce monthly reports detailing the number of “rapatriés musulmans” who solicited its “intervention” as well as the types of assistance they sought. From 25 January to 25 February 1963, for example, the association reported that it came into contact with 779 single male Muslim repatriates and 227 repatriate Muslim families totalling 1,761 people.\textsuperscript{168} The following month, its offices registered visits by 1,968 “French Muslim repatriates.”\textsuperscript{169} These numbers leave little doubt about the central role the SAT played in handling the arrival and presence of “French Muslim repatriates” locally. This point was further underscored in June 1963 when the association, no longer able to fulfill its original purpose of combatting Algerian nationalism to prevent Algeria’s independence, was reorganized and transformed into a new support service for “French Muslim repatriates,” the Service des Rapatriés Musulmans-Français de Marseille. In this new capacity, it continued to operate under the supervision of the Interior Ministry into the 1970s.\textsuperscript{170}

Thus, the arrival and presence of “French Muslim repatriates” introduced a new dimension to the operations of Marseille’s North African-focused welfare network. However, it was not the only development associated with the end of the Algerian War that affected the activities of local welfare specialists and service providers. In the months prior to and immediately following the

\textsuperscript{166} ATOM, “Compte-Rendu d’activités pour l’année 1971: Les Tilleuls.” CAC 20120054, article 98.

\textsuperscript{167} See, for example, the activity reports of the SAT’s office in Marseille-centre in ADBR 138 W 23 and 138 W 24.


\textsuperscript{170} Note received by the Repatriate Ministry on the “Activité du bureau d’assistance aux Français musulmans d’Algérie de Marseille,” 31 August 1963. ADBR 138 W 25. Information on the activities of the Service des Rapatriés Musulmans-Français de Marseille in the late 1960s and early 1970s can be found in CAC 20120054, article 98.
formal declaration of Algeria’s independence, the network was also incorporated into French government efforts to address the mass arrival of European settlers. At the administrative level, for example, Haas-Picard, in his capacity as prefect-IGAME, was instructed in May 1962 by the Secretary of State of Repatriates, Robert Boulin, to help facilitate the creation of multiple welcome and transit centres in Marseille for European repatriates from Algeria. Chief among these centres was the Centre Rouguière, a nearly-complete HLM the Repatriate Ministry acquired from the Office d’Habitation à Loyer Modéré de Marseille. As Yann Scioldo-Zürcher argues in his examination of the effort that was made to implement similar centres in Paris, their creation was meant to help les Français d’Algerie “avoid any installation, even temporary, in the innumerable shantytowns that encircled most French cities.”

At the associational level, LOGIREM became involved in the response to European repatriation as well when it agreed to join another social housing program initiated by the Repatriate Ministry in August 1962. Under this program, the association agreed to allocate between 10 and 30 percent of the units in some of its housing estates to European repatriates. Given the nature of LOGIREM’s founding mission, this decision left little doubt that European
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171 Overall, the state’s efforts in this regard were largely inadequate and contributed to serious hardship for many European repatriates: Jordi, “The Creation of the Pieds-Noirs,” 67-71.
172 Letter from Robert Boulin to Raymond Haas-Picard, 15 May 1962. ADBR 137 W 459. It is important to note that Haas-Picard’s involvement in such efforts was not without precedent. The Secretary of State of Foreign Affairs had previously tasked the prefect-IGAME in 1956 with establishing an orientation service, the Bureau d’Orientation pour les Français rentrant du Maroc et de Tunisie, to handle the arrival of European repatriates from Morocco and Tunisia in Marseille: Bureau d’Orientation pour les Français rentrant du Maroc et de Tunisie, “Rapport sur les difficultés rencontrées par les diverses catégories de rapatriés de Tunisie et du Maroc,” 29 October 1957. ADBR 148 W 195.
173 Opened in June 1962, the Centre Rouguière had the capacity to house and assist 2,000 repatriates every forty-eight hours. Unfortunately, due to the state’s ultimate failure to adequately prepare for and react to the mass repatriation movement of 1962, the centre quickly became overcrowded: Jordi, “The Creation of the Pieds-Noirs,” 68.
175 Letter from François Missoffe, the Minister of Repatriates, to the prefects and IGAMEs of France and the regional delegates of the Repatriate Ministry, 24 January 1964. ADBR 12 O 1559.
repatriates and Muslim Algerians would end up living in the same social housing estates after decolonization. It is less certain, however, if this decision contributed to a situation in which the spaces reserved for the latter were re-allocated to the former.\footnote{In general, recent scholarship on the mass repatriation movement that accompanied the end of the Algerian war shows that a large number of European repatriates also dealt with a shortage of available housing. Moreover, officials in a number of French cities often expressed frustration over the presence of repatriates and the need to provide them services: Scioldo-Zürcher, \textit{Devenir métropolitain}, 231-247; Choi, \textit{Decolonization and the French of Algeria}, 59-60.} Available documentation suggests that LOGIREM’s social housing estates did not begin accommodating European repatriates until 1964.\footnote{Letter from M. Rudeau, the Departmental Director of the Bouches-du-Rhône, to the Minister of Construction on the “Programme spécial d’HLM réservées aux rapatriés: etat d’avancement des operations au 31 décembre 1963,” 13 January 1964. ADBR 12 O 1559.} By that year, the association had already shifted away from its exclusive focus on re-housing poorly housed Muslim Algerian families.

\textbf{Conclusion}

The process of decolonization affected the French effort to integrate Maghrebis living in Marseille in a number of significant ways. In particular, the threat of losing France’s three North African colonies led officials and experts who worked within the city’s North African-focused welfare network to direct considerable attention to countering the activities and influence of anti-colonial nationalists, whom they identified as a roadblock to their integrationist mission. After the termination of the protectorates over Morocco and Tunisia in 1956, the collective focus of the welfare network shifted to exclusively addressing the “problem” of Algerian nationalism. Helping spur this local shift in focus were the SONACOTRAL and the FAS, two Algerian-focused welfare agencies created by the French state to prioritize the delivery of integrationist action sociale to français musulmans d’Algérie. Also during decolonization, the welfare network was incorporated into a parallel surveillance and repression network that specifically monitored and policed the activities of Algerian nationalists. Together, these developments culminated in the introduction of a social housing program in 1959 that sought to eliminate Marseille’s shantytowns, at that time
hotbeds of Algerian nationalist influence, by re-housing and integrating their Muslim Algerian residents.

Although decolonization brought an end to French North Africa, it did not spell the end of the French project to integrate the Maghrebi population of Marseille. As the response to the mass repatriation movement of 1962 within the city’s North African-focused welfare network demonstrates, Algerian independence prompted the creation of new services and programs for “French Muslim repatriates” that remained in place after July 1962. But this response is far from the only example of the persistence of local integrationist action sociale initiatives targeting Maghrebis after decolonization. As the remaining chapters of this dissertation emphasize, in Marseille, French officials and welfare experts continued into the 1970s to devote considerable attention to delivering specialized assistance to Maghrebi clients, even after local welfare associations ceased offering North African-focused services and programs.

In this regard, integrationist action sociale for Maghrebi clients was an important legacy of colonialism that carried over into the postcolonial era. In exploring the complex dynamics of this legacy below, this dissertation is guided by several questions: What became of the services and programs that were specifically developed before 1962 to accommodate Maghrebis in Marseille? In what ways did efforts to integrate Maghrebis living in Marseille remain uniform after decolonization? In what ways did these efforts change? And, finally, what factors led French officials and welfare experts in postcolonial Marseille to continue to fixate on Maghrebis as a special group of focus?
Chapter 3
A “Capital of Hope and Disappointments”: Re-Housing *les familles musulmanes mal-logées* after Decolonization

We turn now to explore the ways in which the French project to integrate Maghrebis living in late colonial Marseille continued after decolonization. As the previous chapter indicates, the city’s North African-focused welfare network, which in the context of decolonization became more Algerian-focused, did not disappear once the process of decolonization in the Maghreb ended. In response to the mass repatriation movement that accompanied Algerian independence in 1962, associations like the BAS and the SAT pivoted to address the arrival and presence of “French Muslim repatriates.” Others, namely ATOM and LOGIREM, remained in the months leading up to and immediately following Algerian independence steadfast in maintaining specialized services and programs that exclusively targeted all Muslim Algerian clients. Indeed, as CTAM Yves Bourdonneau reported in the fall of 1962, in response to the arrival in Marseille of a growing number of “frustrated migrants” from Algeria who “do not speak French,” both associations continued to focus on taking “all the steps necessary” to specifically accommodate Muslim Algerian clients.¹

As the postcolonial era progressed, however, the maintenance of Algerian-focused social welfare in Marseille, and all of France for that matter, became increasingly difficult. No longer able to hold something like the threat of losing *Algérie française* and all it entailed up as a reason to justify the exclusive targeting of Muslim Algerian clients, French officials and North African-focused welfare specialists and providers were eventually forced to abandon their priorities in this regard. In 1965, the Interior Ministry folded its Muslim Affairs Service into a new broadly-focused Migrant Liaison and Promotion Service (Service de Liaison et de Promotion des Migrants,

¹ CTAM report, third trimester 1962. ADBR 138 W 17.
It also closed the offices of the IGAMEs and CTAMs of France, which by extension led to the closure of regional services that specifically responded to North African immigration, including the Bouches-du-Rhône’s Bureau of Muslim Affairs. By the mid-1960s as well, the national government renamed Algerian-focused welfare agencies like the FAS and the SONACOTRAL. Originally the Fonds d’Action Sociale pour les travailleurs algériens en métropole et leurs familles, the former became the Fonds d’Action Sociale pour les travailleurs étrangers (FAS, Social Action Fund for Foreign Workers). The latter’s designation, meanwhile, changed from the Société Nationale de Construction de Logements pour les Travaillleurs Originaires d’Algérie et leurs familles to the Société Nationale de Construction de Logements pour les Travaillleurs (SONACOTRA, National Society for the Construction of Housing for Workers). Along with these descriptive changes, government authorities restructured both agencies so that they would assist immigrants of all origins living in France. As Naylor notes, similar structural changes were also made by North African-focused welfare associations in Marseille, ultimately contributing to the formation of a local postcolonial immigrant welfare network.

In recent years, scholars have begun to question what these changes signified. According to Lyons, the renaming and restructuring of public sector North African-focused welfare agencies represented, for all intents and purposes, a concerted effort to erase and, ultimately, forget their colonial origins and goals. Despite this effort, however, scholars also highlight the continuities that remained after decolonization. In particular, they emphasize the consistencies evident in the

---

4 Files associated with the Bouches-du-Rhône’s Bureau of Muslim Affairs end in 1964; see the paper inventory of the prefecture’s documentation on “Affaires musulmanes” in ADBR’s series 138 W.
6 Naylor, “‘Un âne dans l’ascenseur’,” 434-439.
personnel and practices of welfare agencies and associations that delivered services to Maghrebi clients, through which colonial perspectives and strategies continued to be brought to bear on services for an undifferentiated mass of immigrants—and in some cases “metropolitan” French citizens—in postcolonial France.  

My goal in this chapter and those that follow it is to add new layers to our understanding of the legacies of late colonial North African-focused action sociale. Here, in particular, I look to further unpack two observations related to the issue of continuity and change that guide current scholarship on this subject: that strategies employed during the late colonial era to integrate Maghrebi clients, in addition to remaining unchanged, continued into the postcolonial era to dominate the French approach to immigrant welfare; and that in moving away from the Algerian-focused exclusivity that structured their actions in the context of decolonization, French officials and welfare experts no longer viewed and treated Muslim Algerians as a separate and special case from the rest of France’s immigrant population. In making these observations, scholars tend to ignore the development of new approaches to immigrant welfare in the postcolonial era that arose from different views on how to integrate immigrants into French society. Moreover, they fail to take into account the significant attention North African immigration continued to receive in France after decolonization. In postcolonial Marseille in particular, “Muslims”, “North Africans,” or “Maghrebis” from Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia collectively remained a key group of focus in a number of domains, including the domain of social welfare.  

To fill these gaps in the case of Marseille, this chapter pays special attention to analyzing the ongoing involvement of formerly North African-focused welfare associations in efforts to

---


9 French officials and welfare experts in postcolonial Marseille used these three labels interchangeably when describing Muslims from Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia.
address an issue that remained unresolved after 1962—the shantytown “problem.” Well into the 1970s, the regional press reported on the ongoing presence of bidonvilles in Marseille, labelling them unsightly physical and sanitary blights that required immediate removal. At the same time, French officials, welfare specialists, and social service providers in the city continued to raise concerns about the various challenges associated with the presence and growth of shantytowns locally, particularly when it came to the question of how to re-house and integrate their residents. Because of the pivotal role they had played in shantytown clearance and social housing initiatives before and during decolonization, welfare associations like LOGIREM and ATOM remained at the forefront of addressing these concerns. Nevertheless, in order to continue operating in the new post-colonial landscape, these associations made a number of changes, the most important being their decision to extend the reach of their services to accommodate a new base of clients of diverse ethnic and national origins.

Despite this postcolonial shift, however, Marseille’s shantytown “problem” remained intimately tied to North African immigration. In official and media discourse especially, the latter was regularly blamed for causing the former. A major consequence of this view was the continuation of specialized efforts to integrate Maghrebis living in Marseille, which after decolonization became a self-perpetuating process. In addressing the postcolonial shantytown “problem,” local welfare associations, from those with late colonial origins to those without, constantly kept one eye squarely focused on addressing the supposed difficulties and handicaps of Maghrebi shantytown dwellers. For these associations, the removal of Maghrebi families from shantytowns, their placement in social housing, and their integration into French society remained a high priority into the 1970s.

With this observation in mind, this chapter takes interest in the special focus French officials and welfare experts continued to place on les familles musulmanes mal-logées (poorly
housed Muslim families) after decolonization. In doing so, it explores the factors that contributed to the continuation of *action sociale* initiatives aimed at integrating the Maghrebi residents of Marseille, including the obligation specialists and service providers felt to finish the integrationist project that had originally been introduced in the city during the late colonial era. It also addresses the ongoing centrality of Marseille to North African immigration and the complex ways in which French officials and welfare experts viewed and categorized North African immigrants along ethno-cultural and socio-economic lines.

In placing critical focus on shantytown clearance and re-housing operations in postcolonial Marseille, particularly as they related to efforts to integrate *les familles musulmanes mal-logées*, this chapter also examines the strategies French officials and welfare experts employed to realize their integrationist objectives. In the process, it traces how the social housing program forged in Marseille at the height of the Algerian War, which in the postcolonial era came to be referred to as *la méthode marseillaise*, continued after decolonization to play an important role in shaping local approaches to shantytown clearance and social housing development. But it also addresses the introduction of alternative approaches to shantytown clearance and social housing development that were not directly associated with colonial precedents. These alternative approaches were instead promoted by a new group of experts who worked out of a new welfare association, the Comité de Liaison pour l’Aide et la Résorption des Bidonvilles (CLARB, Liaison Committee for the Aid and Resorption of Shantytowns), that began operating in Marseille in 1964. Ultimately, these colonial and alternative postcolonial approaches had contrasting implications for the settlement patterns of the city’s North African immigrant population. The most significant implication in this regard was spatial, the former functioning to situate poorly housed Muslim families in northern Marseille, the latter working to re-house them in Marseille’s inner city.
The Shantytown “Problem” in Postcolonial Marseille

Between the summer of 1964 and the fall of 1965, the right-wing regional newspaper *Le Méridional* published several reports on the shantytowns of Marseille. Referring to shantytowns negatively as “islands of misery” and “the leprosy that is the shame of large agglomerations,” the newspaper made it clear that these settlements of wooden planks, plywood, metal sheets, and mud remained a significant fixture in the city after decolonization.\(^{10}\) According to the newspaper, not only was Marseille prone to the formation of new shantytowns, particularly “along the rail tracks” extending from the Saint-Charles train station,\(^ {11}\) but local clearance operations also struggled to eliminate already existing shantytowns. Reporting on efforts to clear the inner city shantytown of Enclos Peyssonnel on 28 July 1964, *Le Méridional* noted that after their dwellings were torn down, some of the shantytown’s residents simply relocated to a vacant lot on a nearby street. Keeping in mind that Marseille’s inner city neighbourhoods had been the main target of local clearance operations during the last years of the Algerian War, the report was presented in a somewhat cynical manner. The headline read: “Is Saint-Lazare a cursed neighbourhood?” In addition, the report questioned: “Will we let the shantytown of Enclos Peyssonnel move itself to Junot Street? And who granted the ‘construction permit’?”\(^ {12}\) Marseille’s ongoing shantytown “problem,” however, was not limited to inner city neighbourhoods. In the northern neighbourhood of Saint-Barthélémy as well, the newspaper crassly reported in November 1965 that despite months of intense clearance efforts, “close to four thousand people” still lived “like animals” in the shantytown of Campagne Julien.\(^ {13}\)

---

\(^ {10}\) See, for example, Yves Pellen, “Bidonvilles: Cette lèpre qui est la hante des grandes agglomerations,” *Le Méridional*, 25 November-1 December, 1965.


In 1965, municipal authorities estimated that around 1,500 families and 2,000 single men comprising a total population of over 10,000 people still lived in 24 shantytowns spread throughout Marseille.\textsuperscript{14} These numbers underscored the slow progress that up until that point had been made in eliminating the city’s shantytowns, a fact not lost on these authorities. Writing to the general secretary of the municipal council of Marseille in August 1965, the city’s general director of technical services, G. Lacroix, admitted that the task of curtailing the size of the local shantytown population remained “difficult.” Although he noted the city of Marseille had helped move around 2,500 people out of eight different shantytowns since 1959, Lacroix also complained that Marseille seemed to contain a “permanent resupply of shantytown dwellers” that had “no limit.”\textsuperscript{15}

Beyond the number of shantytown dwellers, municipal and prefectoral officials fixated on other challenges the city’s shantytowns continued to pose. Some, including Lacroix, pointed out that certain shantytowns still technically and financially “paralyzed” local town planning operations, and thus constituted a threat to Marseille’s overall urban development.\textsuperscript{16} Others reiterated long-held fears about the “deplorable” sanitary conditions associated with shantytowns, writing about the state of bidonvilles in postcolonial Marseille in terms of malodorous settlements in various states of decay.\textsuperscript{17} Municipal officials also consistently expressed concerns over the place of shantytowns within the city’s “social order.” One does not have to look far to find correspondence in local official circles that referred to shantytown dwellers as “asocial” and questioned their capacity to evolve or integrate.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{14} Letter from G. Lacroix to the general secretary of the municipal council of Marseille, 17 August 1965. AMM 483 W 33.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{17} Letter from Dr. de Mouzon, medical director of Marseille’s Municipal Bureau of Hygiene, to Jean Poggioli, general secretary of the mayor of Marseille, 27 July 1964. AMM 483 W 33.
\textsuperscript{18} Letter from G. Lacroix to the general secretary of the municipal council of Marseille, 17 August 1965.
Local welfare associations likewise remained fixated on Marseille’s shantytowns after decolonization. At LOGIREM in particular, shantytowns continued to be labelled a “social cancer,”\(^\text{19}\) and shantytown clearance continued to be identified as a “principal objective.”\(^\text{20}\) The organization thus spent the years following the end of the Algerian War developing new social housing projects to accommodate more shantytown dwellers. In November 1962, for example, building on its late colonial efforts to re-house Muslim Algerian families living in shantytowns in the neighbourhood of Saint-Barthélémy, LOGIREM broke ground on La Busserine, a social housing complex in the adjacent neighbourhood of Sainte-Marthe (Fig. 5).\(^\text{21}\)

![Figure 5. The HLM-PSR complex of La Busserine under construction. Source: CAC 19850021, article 18. Reprinted with the permission of the Centre d’Archives Contemporaines.](image)

Completed in 1965, La Busserine contained a mixture of 238 HLM apartments and 50 transitional or PSR (programme social de relogement) apartments,\(^\text{22}\) the latter described as units

---


\(^\text{20}\) Letter from Alfred Martin to the director of the FAS, 3 November 1967. CAC 19850021, article 56.

\(^\text{21}\) “Opération ‘La Busserine’ quartier de Saint-Barthélémy-Marseille,” excerpt from the minutes of the meeting of the board of directors of the FAS, 27 February 1964. CAC 19850021, article 18.

\(^\text{22}\) Agreement between LOGIREM and the FAS regarding the funding of the construction of La Busserine, 20 May 1965. CAC 19850021, article 18.
of “simplified norms costing less than HLM housing.” To further accommodate shantytown-dwelling families from Saint-Barthélemy and the nearby neighbourhood of La Calade, the organization commenced construction on two additional HLMs—the 276-unit HLM Le Cap Janet and the 214-unit HLM La Visitation—between the fall of 1963 and the spring of 1964.

The shantytown “problem” also continued to be an important point of focus for the administrators at LOGIREM’s frequent collaborator ATOM. In 1966, the private charity formed a working group of social workers to examine, and propose solutions to, “the social problems posed by the clearance of shantytowns” in Marseille. According to the working group, socio-educative services such as those developed and provided by ATOM remained imperative to facilitating “the insertion of a population conditioned by life in shantytowns into […] ‘normal’ society.” That the delivery of these services remained one of the association’s main priorities is reflected in its effort to expand the number of social housing-based social centres it operated in Marseille. As noted in the previous chapter, before the end of the Algerian War in 1962, ATOM had opened social centres in four transitional housing complexes. In the five years after the Algerian War, it opened social centres in three more cités de transit or reglement. By 1975, it ran eleven social centres locally. By that year, the association had also expanded its bidonville-related outreach through the

---

23 Meeting of the FAS board of directors, 28 September 1967. CAC 19850021, article 56.
24 LOGIREM received permission to construct the HLM Le Cap Janet from the city of Marseille in August 1963: Municipal decree 3660-63-1610-P of 12 August 1963 regarding LOGIREM, Chemin Vicinal du Cap Janet à La Calade. AMM 572 W 1168. The organization announced plans to begin constructing the HLM La Visitation in late February 1964: Letter from Alfred Martin to the director of the FAS on the “Programme de construction pour la résorption de bidonvilles à Marseille,” 24 February 1964. CAC 19850021, article 18.
26 Ibid., 1-5.
27 This included the social centre at the SONACOTRAL-built cité Les Tilleuls mentioned in the previous chapter: ATOM, “Logement et promotion sociale des travailleurs migrants dans la région marseillaise,” October 1967, 2. CAC 19850021, article 55.
development of youth clubs which organized sports and leisure activities, as well as educational services, for adolescent boys and girls from poorly housed families.\textsuperscript{29}

The continuing presence of bidonvilles in postcolonial Marseille also inspired the creation of the Comité de Liaison pour l’Aide et la Résorption des Bidonvilles (CLARB), a new private welfare association exclusively devoted to addressing the shantytown “problem.” Founded in 1964 under the leadership of sociologist Denise Jarry, the association’s president, the CLARB’s stated mission was to “raise public awareness and to […] draw the attention of public authorities to the problem of the poorly housed.”\textsuperscript{30} To this end, it put together a team of experts in the fields of sociology, ethnography, and geography to conduct studies of Marseille’s shantytowns and their residents. In general, the experts who worked for the CLARB also conducted studies of the city’s immigrant populations. Often working in tandem with municipal officials at the Agence d’Urbanisme de l’Agglomération Marseillaise (AGAM, Planning Agency for the Marseille Conurbation), the CLARB used the results of these studies to propose solutions to re-housing local shantytown dwellers.\textsuperscript{31} Finally, the association devoted itself to bringing “sensible improvements to the lives of shantytown dwellers” before they were re-housed.\textsuperscript{32} For example, in the fall of 1965, it installed potable water tanks and other sanitary infrastructure near shantytowns in southern Marseille.\textsuperscript{33} Underscoring the important contributions they believed the CLARB’s efforts in this regard would make, Alfred Martin and Louis Belpre, the respective directors of LOGIREM and ATOM, joined the association’s board of directors in January 1965.\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{29} ATOM, “Logement et promotion sociale des travailleurs migrants dans la région marseillaise,” 3-4.
\textsuperscript{30} Document on the “Motivation de la naissance du CLARB et justification de son étude,” no date. ADBR 275 J 1.
\textsuperscript{31} Notes from the meeting of the board of directors of the CLARB, 18 January 1965. CAC 19850021, article 25.
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{33} To construct these installations, the CLARB received financial support from the FAS: Letter from Denise Jarry to the president of the FAS on the CLARB’s “demande de subvention pour l’assainissement du bidonville de la campagne Colgate à Marseille,” 15 February 1965. ADBR 275 J 3; Letter from Denise Jarry, the president of CLARB, to the director of the FAS on the “Assainissement bidonville ‘Colgate’,” 25 September 1965. CAC 19850021, article 25.
\textsuperscript{34} Notes from the meeting of the board of directors of CLARB, 18 January 1965.
Reaffirming the “Marseille Method”

Even as a new provider of bidonville-focused social aid emerged in Marseille after decolonization, the primary responsibility for solving the shantytown “problem” remained in familiar hands. On 30 October 1964, prefect Robert Cousin called a meeting of top prefectoral and municipal officials, as well as representatives from several public and private sector welfare associations, to discuss the implementation of a new social housing program that sought to realize once and for all “la résorption des bidonvilles de Marseille.” In determining who would carry out this new “programme de résorption,” they looked specifically to LOGIREM and ATOM directors Martin and Belpheer. As the prefect explained, Martin’s role at LOGIREM placed him in the perfect position to execute the shantytown clearance and re-housing operations required under the new program. Belpheer, for his part, was tasked by the meetings attendees with instituting a “plan social” that involved creating more social centres to spread the “formule d’encadrement” practiced by ATOM to Marseille’s shantytown population. As the meeting made clear, the years of experience both men and their associations had amassed in providing social aid to Maghrebis, particularly in the domain of social housing, were too important to ignore.

Given who was charged with carrying it out, the new “programme de résorption” that grew out of the 30 October 1964 meeting was not very new at all. Instead, it more or less continued the social housing program that had previously been deployed in Marseille during the final years of the Algerian War to re-house Muslim Algerian families. In the postcolonial era, French officials, welfare specialists, and social service providers commonly referred to this program as la méthode marseillaise. The 1964 program kept in place its predecessor’s tiered integrationist re-housing scheme under which officials and experts evaluated the “degree of evolution” of shantytown

35 Meeting of the cabinet of the prefect of the Bouches-du-Rhône regarding the elimination of the shantytowns of Marseille, 30 October 1964.
residents to determine whether or not they were prepared to move into HLM, transitional, or other forms of public housing.\textsuperscript{37} Just as before 1962, families who, in the opinion of officials and experts, required a greater “impregnation” of “Western civilization” continued to be placed in transitional housing before they could inhabit an HLM.\textsuperscript{38}

Under the “Marseille method,” a number of other late colonial approaches to shantytown clearance remained in place after decolonization. Similar to the effort, albeit flawed, made by French officials and welfare experts before 1962 to disperse Muslim Algerian families throughout local public housing estates, the individuals who attended the October meeting agreed to keep the quota of former shantytown residents living in any given HLM at between 10 and 15 percent. When it came to accommodating single men living in shantytowns, they promoted the development of additional low-rent dormitories. Signalling his confidence in the continuation of these late colonial tactics, one of the attendees at the October meeting, Jean Poggioli, general secretary for mayor Gaston Defferre, argued in favour of expanding the 1964 program’s reach to include individuals and families living in slum-like conditions outside of Marseille’s shantytowns.\textsuperscript{39}

Overall, the 30 October 1964 meeting underscored a desire to stay the course when it came to solving Marseille’s shantytown “problem.” But it also revealed that, much like before 1962, the “Marseille method” would not be implemented in a vacuum. Included among the meeting’s local and regional attendees were several “participants parisiens” from the SONACOTRA and the FAS—the same national government agencies that had supported anti-

\textsuperscript{37} Of the approximately 1,500 shantytown-dwelling families, the new program determined that 300 were sufficiently evolved to inhabit HLMs, while 750 were still insufficiently evolved and required time in transitional housing. The remaining 450 were considered fully “asocial” and only capable of inhabiting simplistic temporary accommodations: Cabinet of the prefect of the Bouches-du-Rhône, “Procès-verbal de la réunion tenue le 30 October 1964 à la Préfecture des Bouches-du-Rhône pour la résorption des bidonvilles de Marseille.”


\textsuperscript{39} Ibid.
Marseille during the Algerian War. In the postcolonial era, shantytown clearance and re-housing operations conducted in the city, including those under the 1964 program, continued to rely on the technical advice and financial assistance of both agencies.\textsuperscript{40} By the end of 1964, these operations received additional support from deputies in Paris when the National Assembly of the Fifth Republic passed the \textit{loi Debré}.\textsuperscript{41} The brainchild of former prime minister Michel Debré,\textsuperscript{42} the \textit{loi Debré} granted France’s cities the power to expropriate “any lands containing housing that is insalubrious and beyond repair commonly called shantytowns,” for the purposes of realizing urban planning and construction projects.\textsuperscript{43} Even before the \textit{loi Debré} was passed, the potential benefits it held for renovating certain areas of Marseille were recognized by the Bouche-du-Rhône’s director of construction, a Mr. Rudeau, who suggested the law could be “extended to the ‘cemeteries’ of vehicles” located in the city’s northern neighbourhoods.\textsuperscript{44}

The Fifth Republic’s ongoing involvement in anti-\textit{bidonville} efforts in postcolonial Marseille, however, did not necessarily mean that national government interests aligned perfectly with either local or regional interests, as they had during decolonization. In the mid-1960s, Lyons argues that the FAS, responding to the Labour Ministry’s push to prioritize the recruitment of single white European immigrant workers over all other foreign workers, changed its funding priorities to place greater emphasis on supporting housing programs for single men over those for families. For example, in 1964, it reduced the amount of funding it directed towards family housing

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid. \\
\textsuperscript{41} Loi N° 64-1229 du 14 Décembre 1964 tendant à faciliter, aux fins de reconstruction ou d’aménagement, l’expropriation des terrains sur lesquels sont édifiés des locaux d’habitation insalubres et irrécupérables communément appelés bidonvilles. ADBR 275 J 41. \\
\textsuperscript{42} At the time the \textit{loi Debré} was passed, Michel Debré occupied the position of deputy of Saint-Denis from the French overseas department of Réunion. \\
\textsuperscript{43} Loi N° 64-1229 du 14 Décembre 1964. \\
\textsuperscript{44} Cabinet of the prefect of the Bouches-du-Rhône, “Procès-verbal de la réunion tenue le 30 October 1964 à la Préfecture des Bouches-du-Rhône pour la résorption des bidonvilles de Marseille.”
\end{flushright}
to 1.5 million francs—the previous year’s amount had been 8.5 million francs. In the same year, it offered 4.5 million francs to support the development of social housing for men.45

The effects of this shift in funding priorities were reflected in the FAS’s involvement in shantytown clearance efforts in Marseille. Speaking at the October 1964 meeting about the allocation of government funds to support the elimination of the city’s remaining shantytowns, Michel Massenet explained that the agency’s “means of intervention […] are limited by its very definition: on the one hand, it is only responsible for foreign workers, while on the other it must never finance an entire operation.” “In the case of HLMs,” Massenet continued, “the FAS will only participate if […] local organizations contribute their fair share to this effort.”46 Put simply, the FAS was now more likely to throw the weight of its financial resources behind efforts to rehouse single men. The agency’s tendency in this regard was underscored early in the life of the 1964 program, under which three of the first four LOGIREM housing projects it guaranteed to subsidize were dormitories for single male shantytown dwellers. When built, these three dormitories contained a total of 900 beds.47

Although the FAS shifted its attention to prioritizing social housing for single men, the fact remains that, in postcolonial Marseille, families continued not only to comprise the largest percentage of shantytown inhabitants, but also to receive greater attention from those tasked with carrying out the “Marseille method.” Commenting in 1972 on the shantytown “problem” in postcolonial France, for example, Belpeer argued that Marseille’s situation was unique when compared to France’s other major cities, especially Paris. According to Belpeer, whereas Paris

46 Cabinet of the prefect of the Bouches-du-Rhône, “Procès-verbal de la réunion tenue le 30 October 1964 à la Préfecture des Bouches-du-Rhône pour la résorption des bidonvilles de Marseille.”
47 Ibid; see also “Bidonville du Cap Janet,” note received by the director of the Port of Marseille, 5 November 1964. ADBR 1937 W 542. Outside of the program, the FAS also continued to eagerly fund the AFNA’s ongoing efforts to construct dormitories for immigrant workers: See the folder on the postcolonial operations of the AFNA in CAC 19850021, article 12.
contained shantytowns that were mainly inhabited by “célibataires” (single people), Marseille had a prevalence of “bidonvilles familiaux.”

Thus, for Belpeer, and by extension his association, the integration of shantytown-dwelling families into “normal”—French—society remained integral to solving Marseille’s shantytown “problem.”

Not surprisingly, when it came to determining the number of social housing spaces needed to clear Marseille’s remaining shantytowns, families continued to take precedence under the “Marseille method.” At another meeting organized by prefect Cousin in November 1964 to discuss the new “programme de résorption,” attendees agreed that close to 10,000 new social housing units would need to be constructed to fully re-house local shantytown-dwelling families. In contrast, they argued that the development of the three FAS-funded LOGIREM dormitories and their 900 total beds would be enough to sufficiently accommodate single male shantytown dwellers.

LOGIREM’s construction of these three single male dormitories was completed in 1968. By that year, the SONACOTRA subsidiary had only begun to expand its family housing operations. In 1964, it had assumed control of its third transitional housing facility when it obtained the cité de relogement of Grand Arénas from the city of Marseille. One year later, under the auspices of the loi Debré, it had acquired land in order to construct a 360-unit HLM, the Baou de Sormiou, and in 1966 it had built its fourth local cité de transit, the 151-unit cité La Cayolle.

---

48 Belpeer made these remarks at a 27 April 1972 meeting of the city of Marseille’s Sous-Commission Extra-Municipales du Logement. AMM 1221 W 21.
50 This number followed the effort to keep the number of shantytown-dwelling families living in social housing sites in Marseille at no more than 15 percent: Notes from a meeting organized by prefect Robert Cousin on the “Bidonville du Cap Janet,” 5 November 1964. ADBR 1937 W 542.
51 Ibid.
52 Letter from Eugène Claudius-Petit to mayor Gaston Defferre, 23 May 1969. AMM 483 W 244.
53 The city had previously acquired the site from the Reconstruction and Urbanism Ministry: Note from the Minister of Construction to the Departmental Director of Equipment of the Bouches-du-Rhône on the “Acquisition par la Société d’HLM ‘LOGIREM’ de la cité du Grand Arénas à Marseille,” 1 July 1968. CAC 19940714, article 39.
55 Agreement between ATOM and LOGIREM regarding the establishment of a centre culturel et social to provide educational and socio-medical services at the cité of La Cayolle, 1 September 1966. CAC 19850021, article 26.
All three projects were located in the southern neighbourhood of Sormiou in Marseille’s ninth arrondissement. At the same time, LOGIREM expanded its family housing operations in northern Marseille. Building on the housing projects it had begun constructing in the neighbourhoods of Sainte-Marthe, Saint-Barthélemy, and La Calade between July 1962 and October 1964, the organization opened five additional residential complexes—Font-Vert, Les Micocouliers, Val Marie, Foresta-La Castellane, and Valmont—between 1966 and 1969 that in total contained over 1,300 HLM apartments and 200 PSR apartments (Fig. 6). Overall, one decade after the end of the Algerian War, LOGIREM had acquired, constructed, or was in the process of constructing eighteen different social housing complexes that contained spaces for shantytown-dwelling families in Marseille.

Figure 6. Aerial photograph of the HLM-PSR of Font-Vert, 1968. Source: ADBR 97 J 3. Reprinted with the permission of the Archives départementales des Bouches-du-Rhône.

56 Of the five complexes, Font-Vert, Les Micocouliers, and Valmont contained both HLM and PSR units, while Val Marie and Foresta-La Castellane contained only HLM units: see files on the development of all five complexes in CAC 19850021, article 56.

Speaking at the November 1964 meeting, the president of the SONACOTRA, Eugène Claudius-Petit, estimated that the 1964 program would take nine years to completely re-house the families living in Marseille’s shantytowns. His estimation, however, was based on the optimistic assumption that LOGIREM alone could construct 800 new HLM apartments a year and make 20 percent—an above-average amount—of those apartments available to shantytown-dwelling families. Labelled “enormous” by Claudius-Petit, this task was problematic, if not completely unrealistic, from the outset given the number of new housing units he expected would be built by an association with a track record for slow progress in the area of social housing development. In only accounting for the development of HLMs, Claudius-Petit’s estimation also underlined an assumption that all shantytown-dwelling families in Marseille would be successfully moved into that form of accommodation within nine years. This equally optimistic assumption also seemed highly problematic and unrealistic given Claudius-Petit’s own observation that Marseille contained a “large proportion of inassimilables,” who, in the opinion of many officials and experts, presented a major obstacle to LOGIREM’s shantytown clearance and re-housing operations.\(^{58}\)

Indeed, underscoring that he did not share Claudius-Petit’s optimism, Marseille’s general director of technical services argued in 1965 that even if LOGIREM’s efforts to realize the new program “could be continued for several years, the shantytown problem would only be partially resolved for the more socially evolved residents.”\(^{59}\)

Despite Claudius-Petit’s optimism, it is clear that LOGIREM alone was incapable of re-housing all of the families living in the shantytowns of postcolonial Marseille. Other sources of social housing assistance were necessary to accomplishing the objective of the 1964 program.

---

\(^{58}\) Notes from a meeting organized by prefect Robert Cousin on the “Bidonville du Cap Janet,” 5 November 1964.

\(^{59}\) Letter from G. Lacroix to the general secretary of the municipal council of Marseille, 17 August 1965.
Principal among these sources of assistance was the city of Marseille, which after October 1964 offered to contribute to the implementation of the “Marseille method” by filling any gaps that opened up in “l’action SONACOTRA-LOGIREM.” In particular, the city directed its attention to what municipal officials referred to as the “most difficult,” but “socially important” problem of accommodating families living in shantytowns who were deemed not only asocial, but also nomadic or sedentary. In other words, it targeted families living in shantytowns who were least likely to be considered capable of occupying HLMs.

The city’s solution to assisting “nomadic” or “sedentary” families involved the creation of more transitional housing complexes—either cités de reglement or cités d’urgence—featuring standardized, “reduced norm” units and amenities similar to its earlier housing project of La Paternelle. Work in this regard was already underway before the fall of 1964. In February 1963, for example, the city had commenced the construction of cité Bassens, a seven building complex containing a total of 111 apartments “destined to allow the evacuation of the shantytown situated at the industrial park of Capitaine Gèze.” In May 1964, the municipal council had also contracted the Société Anonyme Marseillaise pour la Construction de Logements Économiques (SAMCLE, Public Limited Company for the Construction of Low-Cost Housing in Marseille) to construct another 2,000 transitional housing units in the northern Marseille neighbourhoods of La Viste, Saint-Barthélemy, and Sainte-Marthe.

---

60 The city of Marseille, through mayor Defferre’s general secretary, Jean Poggiolo, expressed its interest in contributing to the new “programme de résportion” in November 1964: Notes from a meeting organized by prefect Robert Cousin on the “Bidonville du Cap Janet,” 5 November 1964.

61 Letter from G. Lacroix to the general secretary of the municipal council of Marseille, 17 August 1965.

62 Ibid.


64 Agreement between the city of Marseille and SAMCLE regarding the construction of housing in the neighbourhoods of La Viste, Saint-Barthélemy, and Sainte-Marthe, 30 May 1964. AMM 1093 W 23.
The Special Case of Poorly Housed Muslim Families

So far in this chapter we have underscored elements of continuity that defined shantytown clearance and re-housing operations in postcolonial Marseille. From the specialists and service providers tasked with carrying it out to the strategies they employed, the “Marseille method” that was first implemented during the Algerian War remained intact after decolonization under the new “programme de résorption” of 1964. Continuity in personnel and strategy does not mean, however, that change did not occur. One change that needs to be explored in more detail was the transition North African-focused welfare associations like ATOM and LOGIREM made after the end of the Algerian War away from exclusively targeting Muslim Algerian clients. An exploration of this transition underscores that, after decolonization, the anti-bidonville initiatives of the “Marseille method” reached a larger, and more diverse, clientele. It also reveals, though, that French officials and welfare experts in Marseille found it difficult to fully dissociate the shantytown “problem” from long-held concerns over the presence of Maghrebi in the city.

Of the many consequences stemming from the end of the Algerian War, the changes associated with the juridical status of Muslim Algerians living in France arguably played the greatest role in influencing officials and experts to abandon welfare initiatives that exclusively targeted Muslim Algerian clients. Against the backdrop of decolonization, public and private sector North African-focused welfare organizations throughout France made the delivery of integrationist action sociale to Muslim Algerians a priority. At the time, this decision made sense given France’s colonial history as it pertained to Algeria, including the unique status Muslims of Algerian origin held as French citizens. However, once Algeria separated from France, Muslim Algerians lost their unique status. Even though the Evian Accords guaranteed the Muslim Algerian

---

As demonstrated in Chapter 2, the Algerian War sparked the development of extensive welfare initiatives in Algeria as well.
population of France the same rights as French citizens, minus political suffrage, and a large number of Muslim Algerians continued to carry French identity papers, legally most of them did not maintain their French citizenship. Forced by 1 January 1963 to decide between adopting French or Algerian citizenship, the majority chose to claim the latter. As a result, they became foreign nationals and joined the ranks of France’s postcolonial immigrant population, making the maintenance of services exclusively devoted to assisting and integrating them less viable.66

When it came to addressing the shantytown “problem,” this development was significant. As a report produced on behalf of the Secretary of State of Housing in the mid-1960s underscored, Maghrebis made up only 42 percent of the total population living in shantytowns throughout France.67 Given these statistics, the officials who wrote the report argued that the complete elimination of shantytowns required “accurate knowledge of the populations living in them, their demographic and socio-cultural characteristics, their aspirations, and their possibilities of integrating into global society.”68 In other words, the maintenance of social aid services that prioritized assistance for Muslim Algerian shantytown dwellers while ignoring all other shantytown dwellers had the potential to hinder rather than further the success of shantytown clearance and re-housing operations. Despite this recognition, however, the transition North African-focused welfare associations made in opening their anti-bidonville operations up to a more

---

66 Lyons, “Social Welfare, French Muslims and Decolonization in France,” 79-83; see also Richard Alba and Roxane Silberman, “Decolonization Immigrations and the Social Origins of the Second Generation: The Case of North Africans in France,” International Migration Review 36, no. 4 (2002): 1177. As Alba and Silberman note, only 85,000 French citizens of Muslim Algerian descent, or “français musulmans,” were recorded in the French census of 1968. Without a doubt, a significant number of these individuals were harkis.

67 This number comes from statistics compiled in 1966, which indicate that 75,346 people lived in shantytowns throughout France. The remaining 58 percent consisted of immigrants from Italy, Portugal, Spain, and “other” countries, as well as French nationals: Secretariat d’État au Logement, Sous-Groupe de Travail constitué pour l’examen des problèmes sociaux posés par la résorption des bidonvilles, “Première Commission: Description de la population des bidonvilles de ses aspirations et de ses besoins,” 6 December 1966, 3. ADBR 275 J 41.

68 Ibid., 1.
diverse clientele did not occur overnight. Among government welfare agencies like the FAS, this transition took place over a couple of years.\(^{69}\)

A similar process occurred in Marseille. For nearly two years after the end of the Algerian War, LOGIREM and ATOM continued to conduct the business of the “Marseille method” in the language of Algerian-focused *action sociale*. In various memos and reports, both associations remained consistent in identifying the “integration,” “adaptation,” or “social promotion” of Muslim Algerians as their main objective.\(^{70}\) As late as April 1964, letters exchanged between Alfred Martin and FAS representatives discussed LOGIREM’s role solely in terms of re-housing “familles algériennes.”\(^{71}\) By 1965, though, the language used by both associations changed. In annual activity reports and external correspondence, LOGIREM began to define its involvement in addressing Marseille’s shantytown “problem” in terms of assisting “foreign” or “immigrant” workers and families regardless of national origin or ethnicity.\(^{72}\) As Ed Naylor points out, ATOM also altered its language, describing its own objective in terms of delivering social welfare to clients of all nationalities. Reflecting this revised objective, the doors of ATOM’s social centres were even opened to women of metropolitan French descent.\(^{73}\)

Even before the language employed by LOGIREM and ATOM changed, the integrationist social housing program they oversaw had already begun accommodating non-Algerian shantytown dwellers. In February 1964, for example, LOGIREM announced plans to re-locate 20 “familles musulmanes-algériennes,” 15 “familles européennes rapatriés d’Algérie,” and 15 “familles européennes” living in the shantytown of Campagne Julien to the recently completed PSR units in

---

\(^{69}\) See, for example, Lyons, “Social Welfare, French Muslims, and decolonization in France,” 79-85.

\(^{70}\) One example of this is Alfred Martin, “Note sur l’opération de construction de 288 logements au lieu dit La Busserine—Marseille—Saint Barthélémy,” 31 July 1963. CAC 19850021, article 18.

\(^{71}\) Letter from Guy de Serres de Justignac on behalf of the FAS to Alfred Martin, 17 April 1964. CAC 19850021, article 18.

\(^{72}\) Letter from Alfred Martin to Michel Massenet on the “Relogement de familles de travailleurs étrangers,” 12 August 1965. CAC 19850021, article 3.

its housing estate of La Busserine.\textsuperscript{74} By the end of the same year, ATOM’s social centres were offering socio-educative classes to female immigrants from North Africa and Europe, as well as to “metropolitan” French women.\textsuperscript{75} Soon after that, even social housing complexes that had specifically been built for \textit{harkis} in the aftermath of the mass repatriation movement of 1962 started accepting residents of European origin. In 1968, SONACOTRA’s \textit{harki}-specific transitional housing complex, the \textit{cité} Les Tilleuls, welcomed a contingent of 13 European families that had been removed from Marseille shantytowns.\textsuperscript{76} By 1970, European families occupied 21 of the complex’s 87 units.\textsuperscript{77}

As part of this postcolonial transition, representatives from ATOM and LOGIREM acknowledged the importance of extending the reach of \textit{la méthode marseillaise} to non-Algerians. For example, the working group of social workers formed at ATOM in 1966 argued that, when it came to the issue of shantytown clearance, “the action to be taken is […] an action of a global nature, addressing all the evolutionary aspects of the concerned population.”\textsuperscript{78} According to the members of the working group, the reasons for taking this approach were clear: “it seems difficult to make a typology of the shantytowns; the ethnic groups living in them are different, and in the interior of the same shantytown, one can find a population that is there by error or accident living next to a population tending towards asociality.”\textsuperscript{79} Alfred Martin concurred with this assessment. As he explained one year later in a letter to the director of the FAS, it was only through assisting
the entirety of Marseille’s shantytown population that LOGIREM could realize their complete “administrative and socio-educational encadrement.” In more direct terms, he explained in 1972 that, in clearing shantytowns, LOGIREM’s goal was to first and foremost accommodate “all of the families” living in them “without discrimination.” In Martin’s view, this so-called non-discriminatory approach was essential to ensuring the “best mixture” of the “different ethnic elements” of Marseille’s shantytown population found its way into social housing.

In how they described the postcolonial purpose and goals of the “Marseille method,” ATOM and LOGIREM promoted the idea that they no longer prioritized the delivery of action sociale to one ethnicity or nationality over another. However, on closer inspection, this approach was difficult to maintain in practice, particularly given the fact that postcolonial Marseille maintained its reputation as a “door to the Orient and North Africa.” Even efforts to restrict immigration from Algeria in the aftermath of the Algerian War, including the implementation of a so-called sanitary control system in the spring of 1963 that screened incoming male Muslim Algerian migrants and prevented some from entering France, did little to dent this reputation. Contemporaries such as Jeanne Mazel, the general secretary of the CLARB, continued into the 1970s to label the city the “European capital” of North African immigration. By that time, the number of Muslims from the Maghreb who entered or exited France through Marseille had reached

80 Letter from Alfred Martin to the director of the FAS, 3 November 1967. CAC 19850021, article 56.
82 Letter from Alfred Martin to the director of the FAS, 3 November 1967. While I believe ATOM and LOGIREM representatives were genuine in their respective assessments, it would be remiss to ignore the financial implications of both associations’ decision to expand their client base. Especially given the FAS’s own transition in this regard, ATOM and LOGIREM had no other choice but to justify their need for continuous national government funding on the basis that they provided aid to either “foreign” or “immigrant” clients, rather than exclusively Muslim Algerian clients.
83 See, for example, LOGIREM, “Memorandum sur le problème des bidonvilles à Marseille,” 18 November 1971, 1. ADBR 237 J 100.
84 Naylor, “‘Un âne dans l’ascenseur’,” 430.
over 400,000 annually,\textsuperscript{86} while the total number of Maghrebs living there had grown to over 40,000.\textsuperscript{87} Given these numbers, it remained imperative that Marseille, as the administrators of the CLARB put it, kept “structures” in place that were capable of both welcoming and facilitating the integration of Maghrebi immigrants.\textsuperscript{88}

In this context, even after Algeria’s independence had ushered in a transition away from Algerian-focused action sociale in metropolitan France, the integration of Muslims from the Maghreb remained a central point of concern for the officials, specialists, and social service providers who worked within Marseille’s postcolonial immigrant welfare network. In an ironic twist, the transition actually enabled these authorities and experts to once again place significant focus on delivering integrationist services to all Muslims from France’s now former North African colonies collectively.

This return to a broader focus on Marseille’s entire Maghrebi population was all but confirmed by the Interior Ministry’s Migrant Liaison and Promotion Service. In 1970, the SLPM dedicated an entire section of its report on “Action sociale spécialisée en faveur des travailleurs étrangers dans les Bouches-du-Rhône” to describing the specialized services that had been implemented in the department “in favour” of “Musulmans Nord-Africains” from Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia—it gave no other group of “foreign” recipients of French social welfare the same attention. In Marseille, more importantly, the SLPM’s report noted that the “imprégnation

\textsuperscript{86} Much like during the late colonial era, Muslim Algerians continued to make up the majority of this migratory flow: SLPM, “Action sociale spécialisée en faveur des travailleurs étrangers dans les Bouches-du-Rhône,” February 1970, 2. AMM 1221 W 31; see also André Meury, “A Marseille la situation des immigrés nécessite des mesures urgentes,” Croissance des Jeunes Nations 159 (May 1975): 18.

\textsuperscript{87} Statistics compiled by the AGAM indicate that the number of Muslims of Maghrebi origin living in Marseille increased from 31,904 in 1968 to 41,220 in 1975: AGAM, “Les étrangères par sexe et nationalité dans la commune de Marseille en 1968 et 1975,” 1.

\textsuperscript{88} Into the mid-1970s, experts who worked for the CLARB argued that Marseille’s geographic “situation” vis-à-vis North Africa meant that the city needed to play three central roles: a “role d’accueil,” a “role de refuge,” and a “role de transit”: Mazel, “Les Bidonvilles à Marseille,” 2; see also Daniel Gaillard and Pierre Jarry, Monographies et études sociologiques des bidonvilles de l’agglomération marseillaise: Tome 2 (Marseille: AGAM, 1971).
occidentale” of North African immigrants, especially *les familles musulmanes mal-logées*, remained a key goal of welfare associations like ATOM and LOGIREM. Indeed, at the same time the report explained that the goal of LOGIREM’s postcolonial shantytown clearance operations was to re-house “all poorly housed families,” it observed that the organization continued to single out the “evolution” of shantytown-dwelling “North African” families as a central concern requiring resolution. 89 In other words, for welfare specialists and providers in postcolonial Marseille, Maghrebis in general, and poorly housed Maghrebi families in particular, remained a special group in need of special attention. Three reasons can be given to explain why this was the case.

The first reason relates to how French officials and welfare experts defined and described Marseille’s postcolonial shantytown “problem.” Even after they had acknowledged the need to extend the reach of the “Marseille method” to the city’s entire shantytown population, officials and experts alike still blamed the very emergence of shantytowns on North African immigration. At the meeting that determined the “programme de résorption” of 1964, prefect Cousin did not mince words when describing the “givens of the problem.” According to Cousin, “the Muslim population of the city has doubled over the course of the last ten years, passing from 15,000 inhabitants in 1954 to 30,000 in 1964.” 90 Ultimately, he proclaimed, it was “the density of this migratory current […] that led to the proliferation of shantytowns.” 91 Well after decolonization, similar claims were made by Alfred Martin. In a report on “l’expérience marseillaise sur la résorption des bidonvilles” produced in 1970 on behalf of LOGIREM, he echoed Cousin’s

89 SLPM, “Action sociale spécialisée en faveur des travailleurs étrangers dans les Bouches-du-Rhône,” 6-11. Similar observations were made about ATOM by Minister of Social Affairs Edgar Faure. While commenting in 1972 on the clients of the Service Social d’Aide aux Emigrants (SSAE), a new social aid service that was created one year earlier for immigrants in France, Faure noted that “migrants from North Africa” in the Bouches-du-Rhône “constitute only a very small part of this clientele because they are supported by a specialized association, l’Aide aux Travaillers d’Outre-Mer (ATOM)”: Edgar Faure, “Panorama général de l’action exercée en faveur des travailleurs étrangers dans le département des Bouches-du-Rhône,” 1972. CAC 19860269, article 11.

90 Meeting of the cabinet of the prefect of the Bouches-du-Rhône regarding the elimination of the shantytowns of Marseille, 30 October 1964.

91 Ibid.
assessment of the shantytown “problem” when he linked the “bidonvillisation” of Marseille to the “arrival of North African families.”

Put simply, in postcolonial Marseille, the shantytown “problem” remained a “North African problem.”

Second, in addition to blaming them for the presence of shantytowns in Marseille, French officials and welfare experts blamed North African immigrants for hindering the very progress of postcolonial shantytown clearance efforts. In 1964, the prefecture specifically singled out Algerian immigrants for “not permitting the achievement of the task at hand.” On other occasions, the blame was applied generally to all Maghrebis. In the same year, for instance, municipal officials blamed the tendency for cleared sections of the Enclos Peyssonnel shantytown to re-emerge in nearby locations on the shantytown’s “anciens occupants,” which they identified as “North Africans.” Their claim ran counter to the fact that the Enclos Peyssonnel had historically been home to a more ethnically diverse population. In 1973, further underscoring how widespread local concerns about the Maghrebi presence in shantytowns were, Christiane Chombeau, a correspondent from the news magazine Croissance des Jeunes Nations, noted that some “French” residents feared shantytown clearance operations would cause “les Nord-Africains” to re-group in nearby neighbourhoods and eventually cause their deterioration.

Finally, the ongoing status of poorly housed Muslim families as a special group in need of special attention was apparent in the ways in which Maghrebi shantytown-dwellers in general were characterized by welfare specialists and providers. Even though they pointed out the difficulty in establishing a “typology” of the shantytowns of postcolonial Marseille, these experts did not stop

93 Cabinet of the prefect of the Bouches-du-Rhône, “Procès-verbal de la réunion tenue le 30 October 1964 à la Préfecture des Bouches-du-Rhône pour la résorption des bidonvilles de Marseille.”
95 Nasiali, Native to the Republic, 73-74.
comparing, and ultimately drawing distinctions between, the different groups living in these settlements. In his recent analysis of welfare services in postcolonial Marseille, Naylor argues the spotlight that was placed on the city’s entire shantytown population after decolonization contributed to the development of a more nuanced perspective of “foreign” shantytown dwellers—a group that after decolonization included Maghrebis. According to Naylor, in coming face to face with “asocial” metropolitan French families in shantytowns, whose presence they deemed “pathological,” service providers like ATOM’s Louis Belpeer began to deviate from a classic colonial perspective that associated foreign marginality with ethno-cultural backwardness. Instead, Naylor asserts that service providers tended to judge “foreign” shantytown dwellers less harshly than their French counterparts, attributing their presence in shantytowns more readily to their place on the social class hierarchy, a lack of opportunity, and discrimination.97

However, as the previous chapter underscores, service providers like the Belpeers had before 1962 already acknowledged a lack of opportunity and discrimination as factors contributing to the Maghrebi presence in Marseille’s shantytowns. Moreover, in the postcolonial era, even when specialists and service providers identified social class as a factor shaping the situation some Muslim North African shantytown dwellers found themselves in, they still seemed to consider it a less consequential factor than ethnic or cultural difference. This view was apparent in Martin’s 1970 report on “l’expérience marseillaise sur la résorption des bidonvilles.” In the report, even though Martin linked the marginality of “familles maghrébins” living in Marseille’s bidonvilles to poor economic circumstances, he also argued that some of these families remained “tellement ‘arabisés’.” Moreover, perpetuating colonial views of Maghrebs as “backward” and “inferior” and in need of French tutelage and guidance, he insisted that the entrance of these “arabicized” families

into the “modern city” remained “paralyzed by […] their total ignorance of the rules of behaviour they should follow.”98

Looking more closely at how welfare experts compared the “European” and “North African,” “Muslim,” or “Maghrebi” sub-groups of “foreign” shantytown dwellers further underscores that ethno-cultural considerations remained central to their views of the latter, while the more nuanced perspective identified by Naylor was more readily taken in relation to the former. Evidence of this view, for example, can be found in “Les Bidonvilles de Marseille,” a study published by the CLARB in June 1964. Characterizing the inhabitants of Marseille’s shantytowns by “origin,” the study indicated that two distinct groups made up the city’s shantytown population: “les européens” and “nord-africains et gitans.” According to the study, it was “les européens”—mostly immigrants from Italy and Spain—who ended up living in shantytowns “accidentally” as a result of a “lack of housing but also insufficient resources, sickness, unemployment, [or] alcoholism.” In contrast, the study asserted that the presence of “nord-africains et gitans” in local shantytowns was less a result of circumstance and more a result of a supposed “pathological” propensity to live “in communities that often retain ancestral modes of living.” To further suggest that the latter’s presence in shantytowns was “pathological,” the study argued that, in the bidonvilles of Marseille, newly settled “nord-africains et gitans” easily found “lodging near relatives already living [there] before them.”99 In 1970, as if summarizing the CLARB study, Martin argued that, when it came to the different groups of shantytown-dwelling families in Marseille, “one must distinguish between Maghrebis on the one hand and Europeans on the other. The latter, who […] are mainly of Italian and Spanish origin, do not pose, for the most part, any more problems than French families of the same social status.”100

---

It is important to note that the linking of *gitan* and Maghrebi shantytown dwellers in the CLARB’s 1964 study was not an anomaly. Instead, it further reveals the central role ethnic and cultural considerations continued to play in welfare experts’ assessments of Maghrebis in general. Although the word *gitan* is typically used in France to describe the Roma, or Romani, people, experts also used it to differentiate European repatriates of Spanish origin—in legal terms naturalized French citizens—from other European repatriate groups who left Algeria for France during the mass repatriation movement of 1962. Analyzing how they described this group, it is clear they made this differentiation because they considered *gitan* to be culturally “North African.” As one example, in a 1968 report on the activities of the youth services it had established one year earlier in the shantytown of Campagne Fenouil in the neighbourhood of l’Estaque, ATOM noted of the shantytown’s predominantly Maghrebi and *gitan* residents: “the cohabitation of these two principal ethnicities does not pose a problem.” “This may be explained,” the report continued, “by the fact that this cohabitation was already real in Algeria. Their modes of living […] are relatively close.” The report ultimately concluded that *gitan* were “arabisée,” particularly when it came to how men treated women, how parents behaved towards their children, and how the vast majority were able to speak Arabic.

Similar, if not more critical, ethno-cultural characterizations of poorly housed Muslims continued to be made into the 1970s. Noting in November 1971 that Marseille remained “fortement bidonvillissée,” a LOGIREM memorandum not only estimated that Muslim North Africans and *gitan* together made up as much as 85 percent of the city’s shantytown population, but also argued

---


that “a large proportion of these populations are very under-developed and under-civilized.”

Only a few months later in February 1972, Alfred Martin added to this argument. In the same report in which he outlined his organization’s supposed non-discriminatory approach to postcolonial shantytown clearance, Martin observed that, when it came to the different groups of shantytown residents, “it is easier to integrate a European population, whose level of civilization is quite close to ours, than North Africans still imbued with their rural milieu […] or gitans, whose sedentarization is quite recent.” Such observations were also extended to harkis living in Marseille’s shantytowns. Although administrators at ATOM and the prefecture’s Service for French Muslim Repatriates agreed that most poorly housed harkis were more than ready to move into HLMs, they also observed that a few “diehards” still “prefer to live in old apartments or shantytowns” to the “rythme lent des caravanes.”

The above characterizations reveal that very little had changed since the late 1940s. Maghrebi families living in shantytowns were considered ethnically and culturally different, even backward, and more difficult to integrate than their European immigrant or “native” French counterparts. As a result, even as welfare specialists and providers sought to institute an approach to shantytown clearance that avoided favouring one group of shantytown dwellers over another, these characterizations underscored that les familles musulmanes mal-logées remained the primary focus of integrationist social housing initiatives.

---

103 LOGIREM, “Memorandum sur le problème des bidonvilles à Marseille,” 1.
105 Into the 1970s, French officials and welfare specialists and providers continued to use the term “français musulmans” to refer to the harkis, despite the fact that it was no longer a recognized legal term: ATOM, “Reflexions sur l’action sociale à mener en 1972, au profit des Français Musulmans Rapatriés, résidant dans le département des Bouches-du-Rône.” CAC 20120054, article 98.
For their part, most poorly housed Maghrebi families living in Marseille hoped to one day occupy modern housing. Some even tried to turn the French desire to solve the shantytown “problem” to their advantage by making explicit efforts to gain re-housing assistance from local officials and welfare experts. For example, in December 1972, to demonstrate their readiness for re-housing assistance, one thousand Muslims of Algerian, Moroccan, and Tunisian origin living in the shantytown of Colgate conducted their own “open door” operation. Under this operation, the shantytown’s residents invited several high ranking municipal officials, including mayor Defferre, to inspect their dwellings and living conditions. As one unnamed resident explained to a reporter from the regional newspaper *Le Provençal*, the ultimate goal behind this operation was to show that we are as capable as any other group of living in decent conditions. It is said that we are degrading the houses, that our neighbourhood is unbearable, and that we repeat over and over again the hackneyed history of potatoes growing in bathtubs. Those who imagine us in this way have only to come and see us, our doors are always open.

In addition, according to the reporter, the shantytown’s residents used their “open door” operation as an opportunity to express to the visiting officials their desire “to be re-housed […] in the surrounding area.”

A commonly shared hope for modern housing, however, does not mean that all shantytown-dwelling Maghrebi families handled leaving their settlements in the same way. Insight into a variety of reactions is provided in the literary works of second-generation Maghrebis like Azouz Begag. In his autobiographical novel, *Le goni du Chaâba (The Shantytown Kid)*, Begag

---

108 Unnamed Muslim resident of the shantytown of Colgate, quoted in Ibid.
109 Ibid.
writes that after moving from a shantytown in the Lyon suburb of Villeurbanne to an apartment in Lyon proper in the 1960s, his relatives, the Bouchaouis’, only returned to the chaâba once to extol the advantages of modern living to his father, Bouzid. Responding to Bouzid’s insistence that he would one day install electricity in his shack, Mr. Bouchaouis exclaimed: “You don’t even have tap water. Come and see my place, and you’ll see what it’s like to turn on a switch and have hot water. It’s so convenient!”

In contrast to the Bouchaouis family, after Begag’s family made a similar move to an apartment in Lyon, his father frequently returned to the chaâba, a place where he felt more “at home,” to “look after the garden.”

It would be misguided to interpret the attachment some former shantytown-dwelling North African immigrants still had to shantytowns and shantytown life as a sign of their poor adaptation to—or outright rejection of—the “norms” of French urban society, as some officials and welfare experts did. Such ongoing attachments should instead be considered a product of the anxiety and uncertainty North African immigrants and their descendants no doubt felt after departing an environment in which they had developed a strong sense of familiarity and community. Such ongoing attachments, as MacMaster suggests, can also be linked to the important role shantytowns had played as relatively autonomous sites that enabled their Muslim residents to adapt to French society while maintaining some of their pre-migratory values and customs. Indeed, even Begag, who described the first apartment his family moved into as “the dreamworld for which we had so longed,” at times grieved in his youth over the loss of the chaâba’s “rich” life.

Into the 1970s in Marseille, the effort to clear shantytowns and re-house their residents remained a slow process. When Maghrebi families living in shantytowns did eventually receive

---

111 Begag, The Shantytown Kid, 128.
112 Ibid., 128, 162-164.
114 Begag, The Shantytown Kid, 135, 168.
social housing assistance, moreover, they had very little say over where they ended up. Indeed, the majority of families who entered local social housing complexes did so under the auspices of *la méthode marseillaise*, which continued after decolonization to follow the late colonial re-housing strategy of grouping them spatially in neighbourhoods north of “Marseille centre.” By the mid-1970s, however, questions about the effectiveness of this integrationist strategy led some in Marseille to propose different solutions to the shantytown “problem.” One solution in particular entailed promoting the movement of *les familles musulmanes mal-logées* into inner city social housing.

**The Spatial Implications of Re-Housing Poorly Housed Muslim Families**

As underscored in the previous chapter, the social housing program introduced in Marseille in 1959 followed a spatial formula according to which the transitional housing or HLM estates built to accommodate poorly housed Muslim Algerian families were situated largely in northern Marseille. Much like the other aspects of the “Marseille method” examined above, the officials and welfare experts who participated in efforts to solve the postcolonial shantytown “problem” left this spatial formula virtually unchanged. The map below provides a geographical overview of the eighteen family-oriented social housing projects that by 1972 had been acquired and constructed, or were in the process of being constructed, by LOGIREM (Fig. 7).115 As the map indicates, fourteen of these projects were located in clusters of neighbourhoods in Marseille’s northernmost arrondissements. An additional project, the HLM-PSR complex of La Gavotte-Peyret, was located even further north in the Marseille suburb of Septèmes-les-Vallons. Since most of the shantytowns cleared by LOGIREM in the decade following the Algerian War were also located in northern

115 For the information contained in Figure 7, see: Map of LOGIREM’s “Action en résorption des bidonvilles de Marseille,” May 1968. ADBR 275 J 59; Letter from Alfred Martin to Denise Jarry, 12 November 1969. ADBR 275 J 3; CLARB, map of the “Zones a forte densité d’émigrés récents et type d’habitat,” April 1974. AMM 1236 W 44.
Marseille, the result of the spatial distribution of these projects was to keep most of the families who were removed from shantytowns in that area of the city.

Figure 7. Map of LOGIREM social housing projects by 1972. Source: Created by the author using archival material from the Archives départementales des Bouches-du-Rhône and the Archives Municipales de Marseille.

It should not be ignored that three of LOGIREM’s postcolonial social housing projects—the transitional housing complexes of La Cayolle and Grand Arénas and the HLM of Baou de Sormiou—were located in the neighbourhood of Sormiou in the ninth arrondissement in southern Marseille. Far from being out of place, these projects were built near three shantytowns—Colgate,
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116 For a list of the shantytowns LOGIREM had a role in clearing, see LOGIREM, “Plan de Marseille: Implantation des Bidonvilles en 1967,” March 1968. ADBR 275 J 59; see also the statistics and map of the “Bidonvilles, baraquements, cités d’urgence encore existants à Marseille le 1er Septembre 1973” in ADBR 275 J 59.

117 It is important to note that by 1972, LOGIREM had also succeeded in moving shantytown-dwelling families into other public housing estates run by the municipal and prefectural Offices d’Habitation à Loyer Modéré: Note from Alfred Martin to the director of the FAS on the “État statistiques, au 31 Décembre 1971, des familles étrangères relogées par LOGIREM dans les programmes réalisés avec la participation financière du Fonds d’Action Sociale,” 31 January 1972. CAC 19850021, article 94.
La Grande Bastide, and Les Goudes—that officials and experts were still in the process of clearing in the early 1970s. On the surface, the close proximity between the shantytown and social housing sites of southern Marseille seemed conducive to accommodating the desire expressed by Maghrebis living in shantytowns in that area of the city to be re-housed in a nearby location. However, on closer inspection, local shantytown clearance and re-housing operations rarely, if ever, accommodated this desire. Instead, these operations focused on re-locating the inhabitants of southern Marseille’s shantytowns to social housing complexes in northern Marseille—the opposite end of the city. Against the backdrop of the clearance of the shantytowns of La Grande Bastide and Les Goudes in 1972, for example, letters and notes exchanged between LOGIREM, the prefecture, and municipal officials discussed plans to move their residents north to LOGIREM’s cité provisoire of La Bricarde as well as the city-run transitional housing complexes of La Paternelle, Bassens, and La Renaude.

The decision to move the inhabitants of Marseille’s southern shantytowns to the opposite end of the city served the spatial formula of the “Marseille method.” At the same time, it was influenced by southern Marseille’s status as a “bourgeois” residential sector. Beginning in the early nineteenth century, government offices and services, banks, and commercial establishments moved south and east of the old port. Following this movement, the city’s middle class residents implanted themselves in the inner city neighbourhoods of the fifth and sixth arrondissements. In the late 1940s and 1950s, this process accelerated in the context of Marseille’s postwar

118 LOGIREM, “Action en résorption des bidonvilles de Marseille,” May 1968; see also the statistics and map of the “Bidonvilles, baraques, cités d’urgence encore existants à Marseille le 1er Septembre 1973.”
119 Letter from J. Palazy, assistant secretary-general of the prefect of the Bouches-du-Rhône, to the deputy mayor of Marseille, 3 July 1972. AMM 1221 W 38; Letter from Jean Poggioli to Madame Casanova, the head of the Housing Department of Marseille, 10 November 1972; “Note de Service” on the “Destruction du bidonville de la ‘Grande Bastide’: Occupation de la Cité Provisoire de ‘la Bricarde’,” sent from LOGIREM to the Housing Department of Marseille, 27 November 1972. AMM 1221 W 38.
revitalization. As part of this revitalization, northern Marseille became the principal site for the expansion of industrial economic activities and the development of *grands ensembles* and other low-cost public housing projects. Meanwhile, southern and southeastern Marseille, including the eighth, ninth, and tenth arrondissements on the periphery of “Marseille centre,” became the testing ground for new approaches to modernist residential housing. This included Le Corbusier’s Unité d’Habitation, an experimental housing project completed in 1952 in the neighbourhood of Sainte-Anne in the eighth arrondissement.¹²¹ According to a study of marginalization in Marseille that was completed in 1976, these developments essentially functioned to “rapidly devalue areas in the city’s north and northeast while enhancing the value of areas in the city’s south.”¹²² As a result, by the mid-1970s, the city was virtually split in two. To the north of the dividing line formed by the old port and the Canebière boulevard extending east from it lay the more working class and industrial “quartiers populaires,” while to the south lay the more middle class and attractive “quartiers résidentiels.”¹²³

For these reasons, welfare providers and specialists insisted that shantytown-dwelling families, especially those they labelled “economically weak” or “less evolved,”¹²⁴ experienced significant difficulties living amongst the middle class residents of southern Marseille and their “very different standard of living.”¹²⁵ More importantly, they argued these same difficulties extended to the families residing in transitional housing or HLM complexes in that part of the city, to the extent they expressed doubts about the success of integrationist social housing operations

---

there. Commenting in purely socio-economic terms about his organization’s development of the HLM of Baou de Sormiou in 1970, Alfred Martin put it rather bluntly when he stated, “it [is] humanely and economically undesirable to populate [southern Marseille] essentially with poor people. The LOGIREM’s usual clientele has, in general, fewer resources than those of other HLM organizations.” 126 One year earlier, in reflection of this belief, LOGIREM had already announced that it planned to close its two transitional housing complexes in southern Marseille, La Cayolle and Grand Arénas, and re-locate their residents to other social housing sites in northern Marseille by 1973. 127

At the core of French efforts to integrate Maghrebi shantytown dwellers through social housing since the 1940s was the overarching goal to prevent the formation of geographical and psychological Muslim ghettos. Ironically, the significant focus the proponents of the “Marseille method” placed on both constructing social housing complexes and concentrating re-housing operations in northern Marseille in the decade after the Algerian War made this outcome more instead of less likely. Instead of dispersing poorly housed Muslim families widely throughout Marseille, long believed to be crucial to promoting their successful integration into French society, these initiatives functioned to group them in an area of the city housing the largest concentration of Maghrebi residents. Official census data from 1968, for example, reveals the highest percentage of Algerian immigrants living in Marseille were located in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth arrondissements. Into the 1970s, the same arrondissements were home to most of LOGIREM’s social housing developments. 128
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127 Letter from Alfred Martin to Denise Jarry, 12 November 1969. ADBR 275 J 3.
On its own, the demographic situation in northern Marseille was not enough to produce the Muslim ghettos that French officials and welfare experts feared. During the period in question, however, this situation existed alongside a problematic structural situation marked by the relatively isolated and underdeveloped urban landscape of that area of the city. As Mary Dewhurst Lewis notes, until the latter third of the twentieth century, the neighbourhoods outside of central Marseille were more accurately villages “separated from one another and isolated from the center by terrains vagues of semirural space.”129 Within the neighbourhoods of northern Marseille, more specifically, isolation from the centre was often accentuated by a lack of urban amenities and public services. Nowhere was this isolation more acute than in the lands surrounding newly-built social housing estates. Commenting on the state of social housing in northern Marseille, the 1976 study of marginalization in the city explained that “sometimes during the first years of the existence of HLM estates, there will be nothing else there but housing: no shops, no social or medico-social facilities, no playgrounds or sports fields, no buses and even no schools.”130

A good example of this isolation is offered by LOGIREM’s HLMs of Foresta-La Castellane and La Bricarde in the neighbourhood of Saint-André in the sixteenth arrondissement. Although the organization began accommodating clients in these estates in 1969 and 1973 respectively, the first secondary school in Saint-André was opened only in 1974. Families living in both estates, meanwhile, had to wait until 1975 for permanent medical clinics to be opened on nearby sites.131 By that year, even with these developments, Saint-André remained a neighbourhood that was relatively barren. Apart from the presence of LOGIREM’s cité provisoire

130 “Analyse des phénomènes de marginalisation, l’exemple de Marseille,” 10.
of La Bricarde, the neighbourhood's only other main feature were two still-to-be-cleared shantytowns housing 80 Muslim Algerian families comprising a total population of 624 people.132

In some cases, the problem of northern Marseille’s isolation and underdevelopment was further compounded by the poor physical state of social housing estates themselves. In the case of transitional housing complexes, this issue was especially acute. Already a source of concern before 1962, the cheaply constructed buildings that made up these complexes had become completely dilapidated by the early 1970s. In 1970, for example, experts working for the CLARB argued that two city-run cités in northern Marseille, Bassens and La Paternelle, “are already severely degraded and have joined the group of insalubrious housing.”133 At LOGIREM’s cités de transit in the neighbourhoods of Saint-Barthélémy and La Calade, although these experts did not note any specific problems, they did assert that both sites had become too “congested” and required demolition.134

Within a few years, contemporaries also began to raise concerns about deteriorating HLMs in northern Marseille. Although it did not indicate the location of the HLMs it singled out, a study of immigration and assimilation in France published in 1975 by the Marseille-based Institut Régional de Formation d’Adultes (IRFA, Regional Institute for Adult Education) noted that “two HLMs” opened in the city in 1972 “have already become uninhabitable.”135 The following year, the 1976 study of marginalization in Marseille noted that it only took a little over a year after the completion of the HLM of La Bricarde in 1973 for the estate to “degrade.”136 According to the

---

134 Ibid.
latter study, the principal signs an HLM had fallen into a state of degradation included broken light switches, clogged garbage chutes, and constantly malfunctioning elevators.\textsuperscript{137}

Despite the contradictions and problems associated with the spatial formula employed under the “Marseille method,” those who oversaw its implementation continued throughout the period in question to justify their actions. In various letters and reports, Alfred Martin explained that LOGIREM’s decision to develop the majority of its transitional housing and HLM complexes in northern Marseille was made for interconnected financial and philosophical reasons. Financially, the low cost of land in northern neighbourhoods enabled the organization to purchase the space necessary not only to build these complexes, but also to cluster them together in close proximity. Philosophically, in clustering these complexes together, the organization created a setting that it believed was conducive to the success of its tiered integrationist re-housing scheme.\textsuperscript{138} In particular, Martin argued that erecting \textit{cités de transit} that would “one day be demolished” on land near HLM estates functioned to “oblige” the families residing in them “to make constant efforts in relation to their adaptation.”\textsuperscript{139} Ed Naylor labels this a philosophy of “getting on” that was shared by ATOM director Louis Belpeer. According to Naylor, Belpeer took this philosophy even further by insisting the development of social housing complexes near yet-to-be-cleared shantytowns would likewise inspire shantytown dwellers to “try harder.”\textsuperscript{140}

When it came specifically to the behavior of \textit{les familles musulmanes mal-logées}, LOGIREM further justified its actions by highlighting the successes that it argued the integrationist re-housing operations of the “Marseille method” had accomplished in northern Marseille. In 1976,

\textsuperscript{137} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{138} See the letters, reports, and other correspondence sent by Martin to representatives from the FAS regarding LOGIREM’s efforts to “clear the complex of shantytowns implanted in the northern neighbourhoods of Marseille,” particularly the development of the social housing estates of Font-Vert, Les Micocouliers, Val Marie, Foresta-La Castellane, and Valmont, in CAC 19850021, article 56.
\textsuperscript{139} Martin, “À propos de l’expérience marseillaise sur la résorption des bidonvilles,” 2-4.
\textsuperscript{140} Louis Belpeer, as quoted in Naylor, “‘Un âne dans l’ascenseur’,” 433.
for example, the organization published a study of 97 Muslim families from Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia who for a decade or more had resided in the social housing complexes of La Busserine, La Visitation, Le Cap Janet, and Font-Vert. Apart from underscoring the presence of two “asocial” families living in these estates, the study observed that most of the families followed a European lifestyle, dressed in European clothing, spoke French, and regularly paid their rent. In addition, the study asserted that these families embraced the use of modern household appliances, noting: “there is always a television and a refrigerator, and sometimes a washing machine.” Finally, according to the study, the relations that these families had established with their European neighbours were generally positive. The study explained, for example, that Maghrebi and European men from the HLM-PSRs of Font-Vert and La Busserine occasionally frequented nearby cafés and racetracks together. When relations between these groups were non-existent, as was the case in the HLM of Le Cap Janet, the study insisted “there is no particular antipathy, nor friendship, only a reciprocal tolerance.”

However, despite extolling the successes of the “Marseille method,” LOGRIEM still took the opportunity in its 1976 study to argue that the effort to integrate North African immigrants into French society was far from complete. Even as the study concluded that Muslim families of Maghrebi origin “more or less copy the European example with happiness and success,” it still asserted that many “keep their particularism” and “remain prisoners of a deep and powerful atavism.” In the study, LOGIREM particularly singled out a group of “Arabic-speaking nomads” who it claimed “poorly takes care of their apartments […] and behave as if [they do]

---

141 Of the ninety-seven families examined in the study, eighty-five were of Algerian origin, eight were of Tunisian origin, and four were of Moroccan origin: LOGIREM, “Enquête sur les famille nord-africains residant encore sur les cités de la LOGIREM depuis 10 ans et plus,” 1976, ADBR 275 J 56.
142 In judging the behavior of Muslim North African families living in HLMs, LOGIREM did not separate these families according to their Algerian, Moroccan, and Tunisian origins. Instead, it separated these families into two different categories: “berbérophones” and “arabophones”: Ibid.
not have a neighbour: making noises, throwing waste from the windows, refusing to participate in the maintenance of common property, destroying doors, etc., behaviours [they consider] natural." The association no doubt made these claims to justify its ongoing operations. These claims, though, also need to be considered part and parcel of the self-perpetuating nature of French efforts to integrate Maghrebis in postcolonial Marseille. Indeed, even as LOGIREM celebrated its contributions to this effort, its tendency to continue associating Muslim North Africans with unwanted behaviours, all the while linking these behaviours to a certain “particularism,” revealed that it would always find in North African immigration a problem that needed managing and solving.

Though government officials and welfare experts at the time did not see it this way, the observations made in LOGIREM’s 1976 study can also be read as evidence of the resiliency Maghrebi families demonstrated in adapting to French society on their own terms. One needs to look no further than the study’s observations of the cooking habits of the families it examined to learn that, at the same time they used modern kitchen appliances, these families continued to eat food considered traditionally North African. As noted by the study, “a friend or relative is asked to bring back from [North Africa] ingredients and utensils not found in France, and they eat couscous prepared according to the tribal method." In other words, Muslim North Africans could embrace aspects of modern urban living while staying connected to pre-migratory customs and practices. The latter did not have to be eliminated for the former to take place.

Welfare experts’ claims about the success of the “Marseille method” also need to be set against the fact that, for many Maghrebi families living in social housing in northern Marseille, life was not easy. Although they kept poorly housed Muslim families within the confines of

143 Ibid.
144 Ibid.
Marseille’s city limits, re-housing operations in northern Marseille still moved these families into housing complexes that some official and nonofficial observers openly labelled veritable “islands of poverty.” Within these complexes, Maghrebi residents experienced socio-economic marginalization stemming from the lack of amenities and services near their habitations, as well as the physical dilapidation of those very habitations. In the mid-1970s, this situation worsened when, as a consequence of the end of France’s “thirty glorious years” of postwar economic recovery, Marseille’s manufacturing industry entered a period of decline, contributing to diminishing job opportunities and increased poverty for travailleurs Nord-Africains. Reporting on this situation in 1973, Croissance des Jeunes Nations’s correspondent noted that, although it remained a popular place of settlement for Muslims from the Maghreb, Marseille was more accurately a “capitale de l’espoir et des désillusions (capital of hope and disappointments)” in which the disappointments were mounting.

Another factor that made the lives of the Maghrebi residents of northern Marseille social housing difficult was ethno-cultural discrimination and racism. Between 1973 and 1975 in particular, a wave of racist violence struck Marseille, resulting in the murders of around a dozen Muslim men and the bombing of the Algerian consulate on the rue Dieudé. Many contemporaries blamed this outbreak of anti-Muslim racism on tensions arising from the Algerian government’s nationalization of Algerian-based French oil companies in 1971. Others, including mayor Defferre, invoked the deeply flawed “threshold tolerance” theory, when they
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146 “Analyse des phénomènes de marginalisation, l’exemple de Marseille,” 7-14.
147 Chombeau, “Marseille,” 5.
149 Omar Ouhadj and Medeleine Trebous, “L’immigration de travailleurs algériens: les responsabilités politiques et sociales de la France,” Projet (December 1972): 1236. This is also noted in Miller, “Reluctant Partnership,” 225.
linked the rise in anti-Muslim sentiment to social tensions produced in communities with higher than normal concentrations of North African immigrant residents. More recently, scholars have linked this development to a prejudicial, if not outright racist, media discourse that began in the early 1970s to decry the presence of Muslims in France. For example, in 1973, well before Nicolas Sarkozy invoked the insulting term in response to the riots in the banlieues of a number of French cities in 2005, Gabriel Domenech, in a column written in the right-wing newspaper Le Méridional, identified North African immigration as a “wild immigration that brings to our country une racaille (scum) from beyond the Mediterranean.” As Naylor notes, under the first anti-racist law passed by the French state in 1972, both Domenech and Le Méridional were prosecuted for promoting anti-Muslim racism.

Other racist media coverage directly targeted “Arabs” in northern Marseille, who were described as “dangerous” and the cause of an “active deviance.” Even the French restaurant guide Gault et Millau identified northern Marseille as “Chicago of the 1930s where Dillinger is called Mustapha.” According to the guide, it was in that area of the city where a “frenzied, sinister, idle, sick, lousy, and pathetic crowd encloses and will not leave you […] assassins, prostitutes, poor devils without a compass and without a wife, they will haunt you throughout your stay in this great city that used to be one of the most cheerful and adorable in the world.”

---

151 Temime, Migrance, 109-110.
152 Then the Interior Minister of France, Sarkozy, who would go on to serve as President between 2007 and 2012, used the term to describe the largely young ethnic minority men who participated in these riots. For scholarship on the 2005 riots, see: Joshua Cole, “Understanding the French Riots of 2005: What historical context for the ‘crise des banlieues’?” Francophone Postcolonial Studies 5, no. 2 (2007): 69-100; see also the contributions to the Riots in France online database (http://riotsfrance.ssrc.org), particularly the contributions by Jocelyne Cesari, Stéphane Dufoix, Paul Silverstein and Chantal Tetrault, and Michel Wieviorka.
153 Gabriel Domenech, quoted in Temime, Migrance, 110.
154 Naylor, “‘A system that resembles both colonialism and the invasion of France’,” 252.
156 January 1976 issue of Gault and Millau, quoted in Ibid., 39.
urban scene to gangsters or criminals named “Mustapha,” the guide promoted the idea that the Maghrebi presence in Marseille posed a threat to the city’s status and reputation.

Thus, in more ways than one, Maghrebi families living in social housing in northern Marseille faced by the mid-1970s a situation resembling the conditions that were concurrently present in the banlieues of other cities like Paris and Lyon. In those cities, the ethnic minority residents of suburban housing projects also suffered from a mixture of spatial isolation, socio-economic marginalization, and racism, forming what anthropologists Paul A. Silverstein and Chantal Tetreault label a “postcolonial urban apartheid” that has only worsened over time.157 According to Silverstein and Tetreault and others, “postcolonial urban apartheid” in effect “recreates” the centre-periphery divisions of the dual cities that formed in France’s colonies in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries,158 particularly in the tendency for postcolonial urban centres to “function in opposition to their impoverished peripheries, the latter being consistently presented in the media, state policy, and popular talk as culturally, if not racially, different from mainstream France.”159 In the case of postcolonial Marseille, it is important to remember that north-south divisions were also present in the city’s spatial layout. This observation in no way means, however, that the negative socio-economic and ethno-cultural effects associated with living in the arrondissements north of inner city Marseille were any less harmful. In fact, as the 1976 study of

157 Silverstein and Tetreault, for example, explore the implications of “postcolonial urban apartheid” in the context of the riots of 2005: Silverstein and Tetreault, “Postcolonial Urban Apartheid.”
marginalization in Marseille explained, centre-periphery and north-south divisions combined in the city to produce a “double segregation” that functioned to isolate those living in the “islands of poverty” to the north from central and southern Marseille.\(^{160}\)

Given the fact this “double segregation” was recognized by contemporary observers, it is not surprising that some in Marseille questioned the spatial formula that the architects of the “Marseille method” employed to re-house and integrate poorly housed Muslim families. In a study they submitted to the AGAM in April 1971, CLARB experts Daniel Gaillard and Pierre Jarry in general praised the overall vision of tiered integrationist re-housing schemes like the “Marseille method,” arguing they remained imperative to solving the shantytown “problem.”\(^{161}\) At the same time, though, they argued the individuals and associations who were charged with implementing the “Marseille method” had difficulties adequately incorporating Maghrebis into Marseille’s “actual urban environment.” Principal among these difficulties was the “problem” of grouping a large “densité Nord Africain” in northern Marseille, an area of the city they associated with poor “standards of buildings, neighbourhoods, and school facilities.” In their opinion, this approach ran “contrary to all theories of the diffusion and integration of minorities in the urban milieu,” and, as such, more closely resembled a “politique vivement ségrégationniste.”\(^{162}\)

Making this situation even more problematic, Gaillard and Jarry noted a trend according to which more and more Maghrebi families were settling in northern Marseille at the same time the area’s French residents were moving out. In their opinion, this trend had the potential of hindering the “adaptation” of Marseille’s Maghrebi population. Moreover, they concluded that if nothing
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\(^{160}\) “Analyse des phénomènes de marginalisation, l’exemple de Marseille,” 7-14.


\(^{162}\) Ibid.
was done to stop this trend, “the segregationist elements in this case will be reinforced without it being possible to go back.”

Responding to the concerns raised by Gaillard and Jarry, the CLARB made a concerted effort to propose and lobby for alternative solutions to re-housing and integrating poorly housed Muslim families. Studies that the association submitted to the AGAM and other municipal agencies from the early to mid-1970s furthered the common argument that stopping the “segregationist” tendencies in accommodating *les familles musulmanes mal-logées* involved ensuring this population had better access to the “same structures as the rest of society.” According to the CLARB, part of this effort involved improving the urban environment of northern Marseille. But it also involved moving Maghrebi families still living in shantytowns and other insalubrious housing into different areas of the city with sufficient employment opportunities, adequate public services like schools, and higher concentrations of “metropolitan” French people. To accomplish this latter objective, the association suggested that French officials and social housing providers expand the focus of local re-housing operations to building complexes in inner city Marseille.

In other words, though the solution they proposed differed from late colonial precedents, the administrators and experts at the CLARB still believed that *les familles musulmanes mal-logées* required French guidance and assistance.

By the early 1970s, the CLARB’s suggestions regarding the development of inner city social housing found a receptive audience in the city of Marseille. In 1971, as part of a joint venture with the CLARB and the AGAM, the municipal council launched a project to redevelop the inner city neighbourhoods north of Marseille’s old port. Known as the “opération du Centre
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163 Ibid.

Directionnel,” it sought to facilitate the construction of a new business and commercial centre and at least one new cité de transit and one new HLM—both run by LOGIREM—in the inner city redevelopment zone; though plans were later made to develop more social housing spaces under the new project. Indeed, as the AGAM explained in 1974, the Centre Directionnel project consisted of two phases. The first phase, or the “opération de Fonscolombes,” had commenced in 1971. It encompassed the creation of one 60-unit cité de transit, one 250-unit HLM, one 40-unit PLR (programme à loyer réduit), one dormitory for single male workers, and one residence for “personnes âgées.” The second phase, or the “opération des Grands Carmes,” had commenced in 1972 and included the development of one 80-unit cité de transit.\(^{165}\)

Although some contemporaries worried that the “opération du Centre Directionnel” would wind up pushing the poorly housed residents of central Marseille out to the city’s periphery,\(^{166}\) the AGAM insisted that the project’s goal was to move poorly housed residents “who are very attached to the neighbourhoods of the inner city” into inner city social housing.\(^{167}\) At the same time, the city of Marseille declared its support for re-housing initiatives that would move poorly housed French and immigrant populations living outside of “Marseille centre” into inner city neighbourhoods. To this end, it managed to secure funding for the CLARB so that the association could study which “zones” in central Marseille were “suitable for receiving these populations.”\(^{168}\) By November 1974, the CLARB published a list of eleven neighbourhoods in “Marseille centre” that it argued were capable of “truly responding to the specific demands” of local residents who required re-
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\(^{166}\) Writing about the Centre Directionnel project in 1973, for example, Chombeau, “Marseille,” 7, worried that “municipalities in general do not wish for an immigrant presence in the city centre.”


housing assistance.\textsuperscript{169} Of these eleven neighbourhoods, the association specifically identified eight in which it insisted re-housing operations would experience success in accommodating either poorly housed Muslim families or célibataires.\textsuperscript{170}

Where a lack of available land and finances prevented the development of social housing in inner city Marseille, the CLARB encouraged officials and social housing providers to turn their attention to re-housing poorly housed Muslim families in “habitats anciens”—dwellings constructed before 1948 not including HLMs, PSRs, transitional housing complexes, and shantytowns.\textsuperscript{171} The association justified this recommendation in integrationist terms. In several studies and reports, it argued that Maghrebis already living in these types of dwellings had experienced greater success in integrating into French society. Among the reasons it gave to explain this included: the fact that such dwellings typically had modest rents and were generally situated closer to places of employment and local commerce. It also underscored the tendency of the local population française to be more welcoming to Muslims living in such habitations over those living in social housing.\textsuperscript{172} By 1975, however, the CLARB noted that most of the “habitats anciens” occupied by Maghrebi residents were located north of “Marseille centre.” Given the fact these habitations were also abundant in inner city neighbourhoods, the association called on local authorities and welfare experts to undertake an “action” not only to protect and renovate them, but also to favour the implantation of North African immigrants in them.\textsuperscript{173}

\textsuperscript{169} These neighbourhoods included Noailles, Opéra, and Thiers in the first arrondissement, Chûtes-Lavie and Les Chartreux in the fourth arrondissement, Baille and Le Camas in the fifth arrondissement, Notre-Dame du Mont in the sixth arrondissement, and Bompard, Saint-Lambert, and Saint-Victor in the seventh arrondissement: CLARB, “Étude de quartiers d’habitat anciens de la ville de Marseille: Relogement du Centre Directionnel, Première Partie,” 48-56.

\textsuperscript{170} The eight neighbourhoods were Thiers, Chûtes-Lavie, Les Chartreux, Baille, Le Camas, Notre-Dame du Mont, Saint-Lambert, and Saint-Victor: Ibid.

\textsuperscript{171} Occasionally, these dwellings were also referred to as “habitats diffus.”

\textsuperscript{172} Sylvie Jarry-Marcorelles and François Lelong, “Possibilités de logements des familles immigrées dans l’habitat ancien: Rapport d’étude,” June 1975. ADBR 275 J 13; CLARB, “Étude de quartiers d’habitat anciens de la ville de Marseille: Relogement du Centre Directionnel, Première Partie”;

The CLARB’s push to enact alternative re-housing solutions should not be taken as evidence that inner city Marseille was devoid of Maghrebi residents.174 A noticeable Maghrebi community was already present in “Marseille centre” by the 1950s. Despite the efforts that were made to clear Maghrebi families from inner city neighbourhoods during decolonization, this community remained in place well into the 1960s. By 1968, official census data reveals that 5,674 Muslims of Algerian origin and their descendants lived in the neighbourhoods of central Marseille. Of this population, 5,094 (90 percent) could be found in neighbourhoods in the first, second, and third arrondissements.175 In the first arrondissement in particular, the neighbourhood of Belsunce remained into the 1970s one of the most popular areas of inner city Muslim residency. In 1973, around 33 percent of the neighbourhood’s inhabitants were identified as having an “origine maghrébine.”176 According to the Committee for the Economic Expansion of the Bouches-du-Rhône, Belsunce continued in the postcolonial era to attract a significant Maghrebi presence because it remained a more or less accessible and inclusive neighbourhood.177 As the Committee explained in its 1976 study of “Leisure and Maghrebi Immigration,” Belsunce was only “a few steps away from the city centre, avoiding the trap of the ghetto, like in the shantytowns and HLMs where it is impossible to return after 9 p.m. unless by taxi.” Moreover, the neighbourhood was

174 This can be said of other major French cities as well. In Paris, for example, the Goutte d’Or district in the eighteenth arrondissement served as an important site of North African residency and commerce in the 1970s and 1980s: Paul E. White, “Immigrants, immigrant areas and immigrant communities in postwar Paris,” in Migrants in Modern France: Population Mobility in the Later Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries, eds. Philip E. Ogden and Paul E. White (London and Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989), 195-211.

175 Muslims of Algerian origin and their descendants made up 1.5 percent of the total population of 368,252 living in inner city Marseille in 1968. I have been unable to determine how many Muslims of Moroccan and Tunisian origin and their descendants lived in this area of the city in that year: AGAM, “Proposition de localisation des zones pouvant recevoir des familles ou des travailleurs étrangers.”


177 Despite the general inclusivity of Belsunce, its Muslim North African inhabitants were not immune from the experience of ethno-cultural discrimination. In the 1970s, for example, the area in the neighbourhood surrounding the Porte d’Aix was referred to by some in Marseille derisively as the “Casbah of Marseille” and “dirty”: Ibid., 31-34.
“open to several population currents,” so much so that “le mode de vie maghrébin” and “le mode de vie occidental” actively combined there to form a “culture particulière.”

According to the CLARB, most of the Maghrebi families who lived in inner city Marseille by the mid-1970s occupied private apartment complexes or homes and possessed “all of the present standards of viability,” including regular employment. Even so, the association argued that some of these families also experienced difficulties getting by. As an example, in 1974, experts working for the CLARB pointed to the “familles Maghrébines”—a group that included Algerians, Moroccans, Tunisians, and gitans—who resided in Parc Bellevue, a five-building, 814-unit private apartment complex in the neighbourhood of Saint-Mauront. As the experts explained, after several months of paying the higher rent required to reside in private apartment units, some of these families could no longer afford to occupy Parc Bellevue. As a result, they fell delinquent on their rents and were eventually evicted.

In this context, the CLARB’s push to develop social housing in and improve the “habitats anciens” of “Marseille centre” was not only about dispersing poorly housed Muslim families more widely throughout the city. It was also about providing a greater diversity of “normal” housing options to the Maghrebi families who were already living in inner city neighbourhoods. Indeed, as part of the expansion of the Centre Directionnel project in the mid-1970s, the CLARB was even asked by the SONACOTRA to help facilitate the development of a new transit and welcome centre.

---

178 Ibid., 36. Recent scholarship argues that Belsunce has, into the last decade, remained a relatively inclusive neighbourhood, mainly because it continues to be a centre of immigrant commercial activity and has avoided becoming fully gentrified. As such, according to this scholarship, the neighbourhood continues to offer immigrants living in Marseille “opportunities for social and economic interaction in the metropolitan core”: Katharyne Mitchell, “Marseille’s Not for Burning: Comparative Networks of Integration and Exclusion in Two French Cities,” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 101, no. 2 (2011): 404-423; see also Sylvie Mazzella, “Le quartier Belsunce à Marseille: Les immigrés dans les traces de la ville bourgeoise,” *Les Annales de la recherche urbaine* no. 72 (1996): 119-125.

179 According to the CLARB, the Parc Bellevue opened in 1957 and was originally occupied by European repatriates who settled in Marseille in the context of decolonization. By 1967, however, the complex’s original repatriate residents had moved out and were replaced by “familles Maghrébines.” By 1968, most of the 668 Maghrebi families who lived in the neighbourhood of Saint-Mauront occupied units in Parc Bellevue: CLARB, “Étude du quartier de Saint-Mauront,” 1974, 3-14. ADBR 275 J 69.
in the neighbourhood of Belsunce. Once built, one of the main goals of this centre was to help the Maghrebi and other immigrant residents of Belsunce living in unstable housing conditions find more stable and permanent housing.180

Conclusion

In exploring the response to the shantytown “problem” in postcolonial Marseille, this chapter has sought to add new layers to our understanding of the legacies of late colonial efforts to integrate Maghrebis into French society. It demonstrates that after decolonization, even after welfare associations like ATOM and LOGIREM abandoned their exclusive focus on Muslim Algerians, they continued to view Maghrebis collectively as a special group in need of special attention. The continuation of specialized efforts to integrate Maghrebis living in the city after 1962 had a lot to do with the ongoing blame French officials and welfare experts placed on North African immigration for causing the “shantytown” problem. For these officials and experts, poorly housed Muslim North Africans in general, and les familles musulmanes mal-logées in particular, remained a group apart when compared to other poorly housed immigrant or “foreign” groups. Into the 1970s, they largely continued to consider the Maghrebi presence in shantytowns a product of backward ethno-cultural customs and practices as opposed to poor socio-economic circumstances.

This chapter also shows that even as colonial attitudes, ideals, and strategies continued to exert influence on the French response to postcolonial Marseille’s shantytown “problem,” they did not prevent the emergence of alternative shantytown clearance and re-housing solutions. In the early 1970s, the “Marseille method,” which for over a decade had served as the framework through which the integration of the city’s shantytown dwellers was structured, began to be criticized. A

particular source of criticism was the CLARB, a new private welfare association created in 1964 to specifically address the shantytown “problem.” In response to what it claimed were the pitfalls of the spatial formula of *la méthode marseillaise*, particularly its tendency to “segregate” Maghrebis in the neighbourhoods of northern Marseille, the CLARB made efforts to redirect the focus of local re-housing operations to the neighbourhoods of inner city Marseille. By 1975, although the association’s efforts in this regard were barely off the ground, it had already achieved some success. In 1971, the association, in conjunction with municipal authorities, initiated a redevelopment project that not only facilitated the construction of inner city social housing complexes, but also encouraged moving poorly housed immigrants, including poorly housed Muslim families, from northern Marseille into these complexes.

Whatever approach that was taken to realize the elimination of postcolonial Marseille’s shantytown “problem,” the fact remains that *bidonvilles* remained by the mid-1970s a part of the city’s urban environment. Statistics compiled by municipal officials in late 1974 indicate, for example, that Marseille still contained seven shantytowns with a population of 2,194 people.¹⁸¹ Some observers who commented on the city’s housing situation at the time, however, suggested that this number was closer to 5,000.¹⁸² Moreover, by the mid-1970s, the deterioration of local social housing complexes had become an equally problematic issue that French officials, welfare specialists, and social service providers were only beginning to address.

After 1975, efforts continued to be made to respond to these issues by constructing social housing spaces in inner city Marseille. In the end, however, the pursuit of alternative re-housing approaches by associations like the CLARB could not erase the indelible mark the “Marseille method” had left when it came to the spatial distribution of social housing projects and the


settlement patterns of North African immigrants. To this day, the greatest concentration of social housing in the city in general, and social housing containing large numbers of residents of Maghrebi origin in particular, can still be found in the arrondissements north of “Marseille centre.” Since most of the neighbourhoods in these arrondissements remain poorer and more socially isolated in comparison to Marseille’s other neighbourhoods, their Maghrebi residents—similar to those who settled or were re-housed in northern Marseille during the late colonial era and the years immediately following the Algerian War—continue to face issues like socio-economic marginalization and ethno-cultural discrimination.¹⁸³

¹⁸³ For an examination of recent trends related to this issue, see: Anna Grzegorczyk, “Socio-spatial diversity of Marseille at the turn of the 21st century,” Bulletin of Geography: Socio-economic Series, no. 17 (2012): 45-55. According to Grzegorczyk, social exclusion and racial discrimination remained into the 1990s and early 2000s prevalent issues for North African immigrants in Marseille. For North African immigrants living in inner city Marseille during that period, however, the experience of social exclusion and racial discrimination was mitigated by their more central location in the city and the dissemination of specific municipal policies.
Chapter 4
Action Familiale in Postcolonial Marseille

The significant attention that was paid to solving Marseille’s shantytown “problem” after decolonization underscores how French officials and welfare experts continued to view Maghrebis living in the city, particularly those who were poorly housed, as a special group in need of special attention. However, in making this observation, it is important to remember that the ongoing French project to integrate Maghrebi families into French society involved more than simply ensuring they lived in “normal” housing. It also involved “penetrating” their homes and shaping their behaviours and values in accordance with majority French cultural and social norms, mainly under the auspices of a socio-educative action familiale.

This chapter takes as its subject the action familiale initiatives carried out in postcolonial Marseille, from which welfare associations like ATOM sought to encourage Maghrebi families to abandon their traditional, and supposedly backward, cultural behaviours so that they could adopt a “French” lifestyle. At issue again are the legacies of late colonial North African-focused action sociale. A focus on postcolonial action familiale initiatives enables us to examine whether or not local welfare specialists and providers followed late colonial precedents or if, as in the case of shantytown clearance and re-housing operations, colonial and alternative postcolonial approaches to integrating Maghrebi families coexisted under a more complex dynamic of continuity and change. It also allows us to explore in more detail how the families targeted by these initiatives perceived, responded to, and even shaped the types of social aid they received. Finally, it enables us to question what the implications of Maghrebi families’ engagement with French social welfare were for their incorporation into French society.

Similar to LOGIREM in the domain of social housing, welfare associations that carried out action familiale initiatives in postcolonial Marseille could not avoid running up against the
changing immigration priorities of the French state. As part of the state’s gradual shift towards a “new immigration policy” from the mid-1960s to the early 1970s, which saw the immigration of single white European men receive priority over the immigration of non-European workers and European and non-European families, these associations were encouraged by government authorities to redirect the bulk of their attention and resources to the reception and control of newly arriving immigrant workers. However, even as they responded to this change in immigration policy, these associations continued to provide socio-educative services to immigrant families. Some associations even devoted considerable attention to expanding their family-oriented welfare initiatives. In the late 1960s, for example, ATOM began opening social centres in LOGIREM-built HLM complexes as a way to “follow” families that had been re-housed from shantytowns and transitional housing complexes. At the same time, it expanded its socio-educative services for women and developed new services and programs for children and adolescents. Underscoring yet again the self-perpetuating nature of French efforts to integrate Maghrebiis living in Marseille after decolonization, local welfare experts justified these efforts by citing the ongoing need to address the “peculiarities” and “particularities” of “familles maghrébines.”

The ongoing focus on assisting and integrating Maghrebi families living in Marseille in the 1960s and 1970s in no way means the attitudes, ideals, and strategies that defined late colonial North African-focused action familiale initiatives carried over into the postcolonial era unchanged. The decision to implement ATOM social centres in LOGIREM-built HLMs itself reveals that some local specialists and social service providers—even those who participated in ensuring the continuation of late colonial shantytown clearance and social housing strategies after decolonization—no longer viewed residency in “normal” housing as the endpoint of Maghrebi families’ integration. In their opinion, more needed to be done to ensure these families were

adopting French customs and practices and not reverting back to pre-migratory ways of living. As this chapter shows, by 1975, this same sentiment would come to inform other new strategies that, interestingly, also responded to demands for certain forms of assistance that were voiced by some clients of Maghrebi origin.

Regulating North African Immigration after Decolonization

In examining further the effort that was made in postcolonial Marseille to integrate Maghrebi families into French society, the French state’s shifting stance toward the immigration of Muslims from the Maghreb should not be ignored. As Gildas Simon and Daniel Noin explained in the journal *Hommes et Migrations* in 1973, during the late colonial era, “migration maghrébine” was encouraged by government officials, so much so that Muslim Algerian migrants could enter France “without an employment contract and without suffering from any restrictions related to their age, health or professional aptitudes.” This approach provided metropolitan France with the low-wage workers it needed to recover economically in the aftermath of World War II and, in the process, underscored the ease with which those workers could be procured from France’s colonies. In the particular case of Algerian immigration, it also reflected France’s long-held assimilationist stance towards Algeria.

After decolonization, however, the state’s attitude toward North African immigration shifted. Like it did in the domain of *action sociale*, the collapse of the French colonial empire brought changes to France’s national immigration policy. Over the course of the 1960s and into the 1970s, the government in Paris engaged in a stricter policy of “control and regulation” that sought to limit the incoming flow of emigrant workers and families from Algeria, Morocco, and

---

Tunisia. During the same period, it favoured immigration, typically of single male workers, from European Economic Community (EEC) member states.

A number of reasons can be given to explain this postcolonial shift. Principal among these reasons were demands made by some government bureaucrats to increase the number of white Europeans in France’s immigrant workforce. Bureaucrats at the Labour Ministry, including Labour Minister Gilbert Grandval, were especially keen on prioritizing the recruitment of white male workers from nearby Spain, Portugal, and Italy, as well as from Eastern Europe, to aid in France’s postwar economic recovery and expansion. In an effort to attract these workers, who he considered to be more “desirable” and “assimilable,” Grandval even called for improvements to be made to the country’s immigrant welfare system.

The Labour Ministry’s postcolonial push to favour the immigration of white European workers was not new. Since the interwar era, demographic experts and bureaucrats such as Georges Mauco and Albert Sauvy had espoused a racialized approach to immigration that called on the French state to favour the immigration of foreigners who, in their opinion, possessed a higher potential to assimilate into the “human structure of France.” In particular, Mauco, as undersecretary of state responsible for immigration and foreigners’ services under the Third Republic, argued that immigrants of “Nordic” and “Mediterranean” origin possessed the highest degrees of assimilability, while those of “Arabic” origin possessed the lowest. After World War II, he continued to espouse these ideas as secretary of the Consultative Committee on Population and the Family formed under de Gaulle’s provisional government, using this platform to propose

---

3 Ibid.
4 For a thorough examination of this shift in immigration policy, see Silverman, Deconstructing the Nation.
6 The ministry also had a history of attempting to restrict the migration of Muslim Algerians, particularly during the interwar era, when it was under the leadership of Camille Chautemps: Rosenberg, Policing Paris, 144.
the creation of a quota system in France that would prioritize the immigration of foreigners of “preferred ethnicities.”

After 1945, Mauco and Sauvy also promoted a restrictive, and ultimately racist, approach to Algerian immigration under which the entry of Muslims of Algerian origin into France would be accepted as long as they were subsequently “isolated” or “segregated” from the rest of French society. Though the racialized approach to immigration espoused by Mauco and Sauvy was never realized, Grandval’s opinions about the desirability and assimilability of white European immigrant workers underscore that, at least in some official circles, racialized conceptions of foreigners continued into the postcolonial era to inform authorities’ attitudes about immigration.

Another reason that can be given to explain the emergence of efforts to control and regulate the entry of North African immigrants in the postcolonial era were the ongoing concerns some French authorities had about North African immigration. For example, citing the link that official and nonofficial observers in Marseille had drawn between North African immigration and the shantytown “problem,” Bouches-du-Rhône prefect Robert Cousin argued in 1964 that stronger measures needed to be imposed to control the flow of Muslim North Africans into France. Similar arguments were made by other government authorities about the ongoing influx into the country of supposedly North African “nationalist” operatives. In the opinion of Interior Ministry bureaucrats, North African nationalists threatened not only to destabilize the morale of France’s Muslim population, but also to “provoke turmoil” in the French public’s opinion of that

---

8 Lyons, The Civilizing Mission in the Metropole, 33-34.
population. Concerns about this issue at the Interior Ministry were so serious that Interior Minister Roger Frey ordered prefectoral officials and police services to closely monitor the activities of groups like the FF-FLN who, under the new moniker Amicale des Algériens en Europe (AAE, Friends of the Algerians in Europe), continued after decolonization to operate in France on behalf of the Algerian government.

Into the 1970s, prominent municipal authorities and politicians like mayor Gaston Defferre continued to raise concerns about the local presence of North African immigrants. Reacting to the rise of anti-Muslim racism in Marseille at the time, Defferre penned several newspaper articles and gave a series of interviews in which he denounced xenophobia, but also blamed the settlement of high numbers of “North Africans” who did not follow “French” ways of living for provoking xenophobic reactions. At the same time, he raised concerns about French employers’ ongoing use of foreign, mainly North African immigrant, workers, arguing that the former exploited the latter and, in the process, took jobs away from “French” workers. Any sympathy Defferre had for North African immigrants was thus couched in a racialized rhetoric that also presented their presence in France as a “problem.”

During the late colonial era, when compared to the immigration of Muslim Algerians, the immigration of Muslims from Morocco and Tunisia was more tightly regulated by the French state. Under the auspices of the Office National d’Immigration, Muslim Moroccan and Tunisian men were recruited to work in a number of metropolitan industrial enterprises. To limit the duration of their stay in France, the ONI only offered these men short-term labour contracts. After

---

10 Letter from Interior Minister Roger Frey to the prefects of France on the “Manifestations publiques organisées par l’ADAF,” 26 May 1964. ADBR 137 W 426.

11 Before taking the name Amicale des Algériens en Europe, the FF-FLN was for a short time known as the Amicale des Algériens en France.

12 See, for example, Interior Ministry intelligence files on “Activité Nationaliste Nord-Africain en métropole” in ADBR 137 W 426.

13 Naylor, “‘A system that resembles both colonialism and the invasion of France’,” 255-263.
decolonization, this practice remained unchanged.\textsuperscript{14} However, as part of the postcolonial alteration of France’s national immigration policy, efforts were made to streamline the ONI’s labour recruitment practices. In 1963, for example, the government of Charles de Gaulle finalized separate immigration agreements with Morocco and Tunisia under which the ONI was authorized to establish permanent recruiting offices in the cities of Casablanca and Tunis.\textsuperscript{15} These offices were ultimately responsible for screening potential labour recruits from both countries in accordance with a government approved recruitment plan. Under this plan, successful recruits were predominantly men who government authorities deemed medically, legally, and professionally capable of entering and contributing to France’s immigrant workforce.\textsuperscript{16}

The state’s decision to leave the ONI in charge of overseeing the migration flows from Morocco and Tunisia underscores that, in the context of its shifting approach towards immigration, it favoured the immigration of single male Moroccan and Tunisian workers over the immigration of entire Moroccan and Tunisian families. Further evidence of this approach is provided by the separate social security conventions that France concluded with Morocco and Tunisia in 1965, which sought to discourage Muslim Moroccan and Tunisian families from migrating to France. Prior to decolonization, as a means of encouraging their presence in the country, the French state distributed welfare benefits like \textit{allocations familiales} only to the families of Muslim Moroccan and Tunisian workers living in France. Under the new social security conventions, however, these same benefits were extended to the families of workers living in Morocco and Tunisia.\textsuperscript{17} On paper, these conventions underscored the state’s desire to do away with one of the principal incentives

\textsuperscript{14} Alba and Silberman, “Decolonization Immigrations,” 1175.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{17} See the documents on “Saisonniers Marocains” and “Travailleurs saisonniers Tunisiens” in CAC 19940250, article 1.
that for over a decade had motivated Muslim Moroccan and Tunisian families to cross the Mediterranean Sea to France. In practice, however, the state stopped short of fully eliminating this incentive. Much like they did for Muslim Algerian families before and after decolonization, government authorities maintained a pattern of distribution according to which families living in France received higher family allowances than those who stayed in Morocco and Tunisia.18

When it came to the issue of Algerian immigration, the implementation of tighter controls and regulations in the postcolonial era was more complicated due to the circumstances that led to Algeria’s independence. Along with bringing an end to the Algerian War, the Evian Accords of March 1962 kept in place a number of the key privileges French authorities had granted to Muslim Algerians in the aftermath of World War II. Notably, the accords included a clause maintaining the freedom of circulation between France and Algeria—first instituted under the 1947 Organic Statute of Algeria—after Algerian independence. According to contemporary observers, the accords also ensured that Algerian workers could continue to come to France “without an employment contract and live there without work or residency permits.”19 These privileges, together with the implementation of a policy of family re-grouping that enabled Algerian workers to be joined by their spouses and children in France, made it difficult for French authorities to restrict the flow of Algerian immigrants into the country.20 Recognizing this situation, some authorities began in the aftermath of the Algerian War to “denounce the clause concerning the free circulation of people,”21 signalling their desire to negotiate a new Franco-Algerian immigration agreement.

---

This agreement, known as the Nekkache-Grandval accord, was not completed until 1964.\textsuperscript{22} In the meantime, the French state tried to unilaterally control the number of Algerian immigrants in France. Even before Algeria declared its independence in July 1962, the Algerian Affairs Ministry issued a decree denying entry to the country to “French Muslim repatriates” who did not leave Algeria under an officially organized repatriation plan. Less than a year after Algerian independence, government authorities turned their attention to regulating, and ultimately restricting, the immigration of male Algerian workers (Fig. 8). In the spring of 1963, they implemented a “sanitary control system” in Marseille and other French cities that required incoming \textit{travailleurs Algériens} to pass a medical examination in order to gain entry into France. By the spring of 1964, officials in Marseille noted that 10 percent of all Algerian workers who were subjected to this system were “refoulés” (denied entry and sent back to Algeria).\textsuperscript{23} By that time, the scope of this system had already expanded to other groups of Algerian migrants. In November 1963, for example, responding to concerns that some Algerian workers were identifying themselves as tourists upon arrival in France to avoid the “contrôle sanitaire,” officials in Marseille began to impose medical examinations on incoming male Algerian tourists.\textsuperscript{24}

The implementation of the “sanitary control system” should be understood as the French state’s first step toward the elimination of the free circulation principle as it pertained to Algerian immigrant workers. The next step would come with the Nekkache-Grandval accord of 1964. One of the key provisions of the 1964 agreement was the imposition of a quota system that limited the number of Algerian workers allowed to enter France each year to around 12,000.\textsuperscript{25} This yearly

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{23} Note on the “Arrivée de passagers Algériens et Tunisiens, réunion des 20 et 21 Mars 1964” by the Special Commissioner of the Port of Marseille. ADBR 22 J 9.
\textsuperscript{24} Note on the “Contrôle médical des travailleurs algériens” by the Special Commissioner of the Port of Marseille, 15 November 1963. ADBR 22 J 9.
\textsuperscript{25} The 1964 agreement also included a provision offering vocational training to Algerian immigrant workers: Miller, “Reluctant Partnership,” 223-224.
quota remained in place until 1968, at which point a new ten-year labour accord struck between the French and Algerian governments raised it to 35,000. In 1971, this number was revised again when, in response to the nationalization of French oil companies in Algeria, the government of Georges Pompidou lowered the yearly quota to 25,000.26

![Figure 8. Algerian men arriving in Marseille, September 1963. Source: ADBR 137 W 426. Reprinted with the permission of the Archives départementales des Bouches-du-Rhône.](image)

In 1964, French authorities also took aim at the free circulation of Algerian immigrant families. Under the Nekkache-Grandval accord, new rules were introduced placing tighter controls on the French policy of family re-grouping as it pertained to Algerian immigrant families. Before they could enter France, families re-grouping with travailleurs Algériens in the country were now required to prove that they would reside in adequate housing with a “regularly employed head of household.”27 This proof came in the form of an “attestation”—typically a housing certificate—that these families were required to obtain from a high ranking official in their future city of residence and present to immigration officials upon their arrival in France. If these families could

---

26 Ibid., 224-225; see also Weil, *La France et ses étrangers*, 96-99.
not provide an “attestation,” they were denied admission into the country and sent back to Algeria.  

Unlike in the case of the restrictive sanitary controls placed on the entry of Algerian immigrant workers, French authorities provided no statistics indicating how many Algerian families were “refoulés” as a result of this housing requirement. However, in 1969, ATOM did observe that, when it came to the arrival of Algerian immigrants in Marseille, “family re-groupings have entered a period of decline.” In the end, whether this policy was an effective immigration control or not, French authorities strengthened the criterion under which Algerian families were permitted or denied entry into France. Beginning in 1971, for example, in addition to needing a housing “attestation,” the wives and children of travailleurs Algériens wishing to migrate to France were required to pass medical evaluations conducted by either the ONI or Algerian authorities before they left Algeria.

Putting Down Roots in Postcolonial France

Even as their immigration to France was increasingly placed under tighter controls and regulations, Maghrebis’ presence in the country remained substantial. Statistics compiled by the Interior Ministry indicate that between 1963 and 1973 the combined population of Muslims of Algerian, Moroccan, and Tunisian origin living in France grew from 580,260 to over 1.1 million.

---

30 Office of the Minister of State in charge of Social Affairs, “Procedure applicable à la venue en France des familles de travailleurs algériens,” April 1971. CAC 19860269, article 10.
31 Much like during the late colonial era, Muslim Algerians continued to make up the largest percentage of this population, growing from 480,000 in 1963 to 798,690 in 1973. The populations of Muslim Moroccans and Muslim Tunisians living in France during this same period grew from 60,743 to 218,146 and 39,517 to 119,546 respectively: Lesme, Immigration et Mecanismes d’Assimilation, 5.
By 1976, this number had reached approximately 1.35 million. More importantly, it was during this period that an increasing number of Muslims from the Maghreb decided to permanently settle in the country.

For Muslims from Algeria, this development underscores what Sayad labels the third stage of their migration to France. According to Sayad, by the 1970s, the internal networks within, not to mention the solidarity of, France’s Algerian immigrant population had developed to the point of enabling the “cohesion” of a “little society” on the other side of the Mediterranean Sea. This process was further solidified by 1975. In 1973, in response to the rise in racist violence against Muslims living in Marseille and other French cities at the time, Algeria temporarily suspended the emigration of Algerian nationals to France. One year later, amid growing fears of rising unemployment stemming from the 1973 oil crisis, the government of Valéry Giscard d’Estaing formally closed France’s borders to non-EEC immigration. Far from being a complete ban, however, the French state did establish a family reunification program that allowed family members to join immigrant workers living in France. In the context of these developments, the families of Algerian immigrant workers overwhelmingly chose to leave Algeria and settle in France.

In the case of Muslims from Morocco and Tunisia, permanent settlement had more to do with social and economic push and pull factors than it did with the presence of well-entrenched immigrant communities. After decolonization, the independent governments of Tunisia and Morocco each placed a priority on social and economic development, notably in the educational

---

32 Of this population, 900,000 were Algeria, 300,000 were Morrocan, and close to 200,000 were Tunisian: Alain Girad, “Les immigrés du Maghreb. Études sur l'adaptation en milieu urbain. Présentation d’un cahier de l’INED,” *Population* 32, no. 2 (1977): 405.


and industrial sectors. In both countries, these developments wound up attracting a growing number of rural dwellers to large urban centres. Unfortunately, in the two decades after independence, the demand for labour in these urban centres far outpaced the supply, resulting in increasing unemployment and under-employment. One of the major consequences of this development was labour emigration to France.\(^{35}\) Despite the immigration controls imposed by the French state in the 1960s, Moroccan and Tunisian workers still viewed France as an attractive destination to emigrate to, notably for the advantages it continued to offer to immigrant workers, including higher salaries and better unemployment benefits, health benefits, and family allowances. Because of these advantages, many of the workers who managed to pass through France’s postcolonial immigration controls ended up bringing their families to the country and putting down roots there.\(^{36}\)

In addition to continuing to receive the majority of this migratory influx after decolonization, Marseille remained a prime place of settlement for a growing North African immigrant population. In 1973, *Croissance des Jeunes Nations*’s correspondent Christiane Chombeau linked Maghrebis’ decision to stay in Marseille to a number of factors. Notably, for the Maghrebis living there, she argued the city was a “ville méditerranéenne” that “recalled” the geographical and social climate of cities in the Maghreb. “In Marseille,” she explained, “at least there is sunshine. You can live most of the year in the street. And then there is a whole network of friends that makes the worker never feel alone.” In addition, Chombeau noted the importance central Marseille continued to play in the lives of local *travailleurs Nord-Africains*: “in the city

\(^{35}\) It should be noted that while France was the main destination of Moroccan and Tunisian emigrant labour in the 1960s and 1970s, it was not the only destination. In the case of the emigration of Tunisian workers during those decades, for example, Taamallah notes that migratory currents were also directed toward West Germany, Holland, and Belgium; Taamallah, “L’évolution de l’émigration tunisienne en Europe occidentale et ses impacts socio-économiques,” 187.

centre, he knows that he can find a ‘tuyau’ (pipeline) if he is unemployed, that he will find at the rue de l’Étoile or the rue Bernard du Bois a marabout, a healer, a notary public, and finally a compatriot that he can solicit.” To further underscore the attachment some of these workers had to Marseille, she argued, rather hyperbolically, that after briefly leaving to find other opportunities in “a northern city,” they “returned declaring ‘I am not strong enough’ […] to face a life of isolation.”

For all of the advantages permanent settlement in Marseille offered, however, there were also difficulties. We have already explored how after decolonization thousands of Maghrebis in the city still wound up suffering from poor housing opportunities, which forced them to live in shantytowns and other insalubrious housing. Others remained stuck for years in transitional or temporary housing, under the promise that they would one day gain acceptance into an HLM apartment or some other type of “normal” housing. For those who avoided these situations, there was still the issue of racism and discrimination which, as it did in the early 1970s, occasionally took the form of anti-Muslim violence.

Outside of these difficulties, a number of other issues also shaped the experiences of Maghrebis who permanently settled in France after decolonization. For example, as sociologist Lahouari Addi argues, many maintained strong psychological and familial ties to the Maghreb. For first-generation Algerian immigrants especially, these ties typically manifested themselves in the idea, or “myth,” that they and their children would one day return to their country of origin under the right circumstances. For these immigrants, the “myth” of return functioned as a way to avoid “ideas of integration or assimilation” and remain “immune to the passage of time, living in the same mindset as on the day [they] emigrated.” More specifically, according to Addi, it can be considered part of a concerted effort made by those who believed in it to maintain “an idealized

37 Chombeau, “Marseille,” 5-6.
view of Algerian society and of relations between one generation and the next, as if family structures had not changed, as if new aspirations had not appeared, notably among the younger generation.” In other words, the “myth” of return became a way to cope with the changes that inevitably came from putting down roots in France. As Addi observes, it also became a source of tension between parents and children within North African immigrant families, especially when the latter refused to believe in it.38

In the postcolonial era, another issue that complicated the settlement experiences of North African immigrants in general, and North African immigrant families in particular, was the issue of citizenship. At the time of Algeria’s independence, the majority of the Algerian immigrants living in France, when forced by the French state, chose to adopt Algerian citizenship. Thus, similar to non-naturalized immigrants from Morocco and Tunisia living in the country after decolonization, they legally became foreign nationals on French soil. In contrast, due to the French Nationality Code at the time, second-generation Maghrebis who were born in France automatically became French citizens at birth or when they reached the age of majority.39 The only descendants of Muslim immigrants from North Africa who did not automatically acquire French citizenship were the children of Muslim Algerian parents born in France before 1963. At the time of Algeria’s independence, these individuals lost their French citizenship if they or their parents did not inform the French state that they desired to keep it. The French state did, however, leave the door open


39 Under revisions to Article 23 of the French Nationality Code introduced in 1973, the principle of double jus soli, which automatically “attributed French citizenship at birth to a person born in France of noncitizen parents when at least one parent was also born in France,” was extended to second-generation Algerians born in France on or after 1 January 1963. Second-generation Moroccans and Tunisians acquired French citizenship upon reaching the age of majority thanks to Article 44 of the French Nationality Code. Based on the principle of jus soli, Article 44 “permitted the acquisition of French citizenship ‘without formality’ at the age of majority by individuals born in France, of noncitizen parents, and residing there for the preceding five years, as long as they fulfill[ed] certain conditions”: Miriam Feldblum, Reconstructing Citizenship: The Politics of Nationality Reform and Immigration in Contemporary France (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999), 25-27.
for them to obtain a French identity card, and thus “resume” their French citizenship, at a later date.  

For North African immigrant families, this issue produced confusion, tension, and conflict. Many first-generation North African immigrant parents likened the acquisition of French citizenship to “the abandoning of moral, religious, and cultural values and a unilateral break with the political collectivity in which [they] originated.” Some even considered it outright “treason” against their origins and roots. According to Addi, North African immigrant parents’ concerns were somewhat tempered by the automatic way in which most of their children acquired French citizenship, which they came to view as an “inescapable fact of life” that was outside of their control. Still, underscoring the tension that came to be associated with this issue, even some of the parents who took this view chose to ignore, or outright refused to acknowledge, their children’s acquisition of French citizenship. Acute conflicts were also still possible in Algerian immigrant families with children born in France before 1963 who ultimately chose to “resume” their French citizenship. In many cases, the parents of these children viewed the latter’s decision as an affront to everything Algeria had fought for to gain its independence.

Outside of internal family conflicts, the issue of citizenship also became a source of political tension in France. Some in the country, especially those on the political right, opposed
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40 Hargreaves, *Multi-Ethnic France*, 123.
41 It is also important to note that, as a result of the nationality laws passed by the governments of Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia after decolonization, second-generation North Africans also acquired the citizenship of their parents at birth. This followed the principle of *jus sanguinis*, which encompasses the ideas that nationality and citizenship is passed on through parental dissent. In other words, at birth or upon reaching the age of majority, these children held two nationalities: Addi, “Nationality and Algerian Immigrants in France,” 219-223; Sayad, *The Suffering of the Immigrant*, 241-242.
42 Addi, “Nationality and Algerian Immigrants in France,” 220. Though his article focuses mainly on the issue of nationality and Algerian immigration, Addi also argues that first-generation Moroccan and Tunisian immigrant parents adopted the “same attitude” about the nationality issue as their Algerian counterparts.
44 Addi, “Nationality and Algerian Immigrants in France,” 223. In a similar vein, Sayad argues that some parents considered their children’s automatic acquisition of French nationality a “collectively imposed restraint”: Sayad, *The Suffering of the Immigrant*, 248-250.
the automatic transference of French citizenship to the children of North African immigrant parents. They questioned whether these children could adopt French values and also expressed concerns about their loyalty to France. Others went so far as to label these children an “enemy within” that posed a threat to the country.\textsuperscript{46} By 1975, however, these concerns were largely confined to rhetoric. It was only after the electoral victories of centre-right governments in the 1980s and 1990s, for example, that serious efforts were made to act on them legislatively.\textsuperscript{47}

**Integrating Maghrebi Families in Postcolonial Marseille**

After decolonization, the effort to regulate and control North African immigration gave officials and welfare experts in Marseille yet another reason to place a special focus on assisting and integrating Muslim North Africans. As ATOM explained in its activity report for 1969, it responded to the French state’s “progressive application of new regulations concerning” North African immigration by modifying its welcoming and reception services. In that year, for example, the association took charge of delivering housing certificates to the families of Algerian workers wishing to re-group in Marseille.\textsuperscript{48} Before it assumed this task, ATOM was already involved in the “sanitary control system” that had been established in the city in 1963 to regulate Algerian immigration. In 1964, the prefecture had contracted the association to run an accommodation centre, the Centre d’Arenc, located near Marseille’s port to handle what authorities identified as

\textsuperscript{46} Hargreaves, *Multi-Ethnic France*, 123-124.

\textsuperscript{47} For example, in 1993, in the context of debates over whether or not the children of foreign nationals born in France had to do more to prove they were truly French, a law was passed eliminating the automatic transference of French citizenship to the second generation once they reached the age of majority. Under this new law, these individuals were required between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one to formally declare to French authorities their intent to become French citizens. This requirement was later repealed in 1998, at which time the children of foreign nationals born in France once again acquired French citizenship automatically at the age of majority providing they still lived in France and had lived there for at least five years, consecutively or non-consecutively, during their adolescence: Weil, *How to Be French*, 162-167.

the “expulsion of Algerians denied entry to France for reasons of public health.”

Since the main purpose of the sanitary control system was to limit the arrival of male Algerian workers, most of the individuals accommodated by the centre were Algerian men who were officially classified as “refoulés sanitaires.” However, shortly after it opened, the centre also became involved in deporting workers and families of Algerian origin living in Marseille who had come to the attention of the prefecture for reasons of unemployment, poor material or sanitary conditions, and poor adaptation.

For ATOM, involvement in the regulation and control of postcolonial North African immigration was not without consequence. Soon, the association found itself involved in national government initiatives to organize and monitor the entry of all immigrants into France. By 1975, as part of a national immigration reception system created by the Labour Ministry in 1973, the association’s responsibilities had expanded to running a new departmental welcome service for foreign workers and their families in the Bouches-du-Rhône. Officially established in September 1974, the service’s goal was to “accelerate the process of inserting and promoting foreign workers” by providing support in the areas of reception, information, and administrative aid. To accomplish this goal, ATOM worked in tandem with officials at the ONI to accommodate newly arriving immigrants and, when necessary, to enact procedures to deport unwanted immigrants.

Because of its involvement in the departmental welcome service, ATOM indicated in its activity report for 1974 that its role in providing reception services to “foreigners” entering France
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49 Special Commissioner of the Port of Marseille, note on “le rôle et le fonctionnement du centre d’hébergement d’Arenc dans l’immigration, le refoulement, le rapatriement, ou l’expulsion de ressortissants Algériens,” 12 June 1964. ADBR 22 J 9; Naylor, “Un âne dans l’ascenseur,” 432.

50 Special Commissioner of the Port of Marseille, note on “le rôle et le fonctionnement du centre d’hébergement d’Arenc dans l’immigration, le refoulement, le rapatriement, ou l’expulsion de ressortissants Algériens”; Special Commissioner of the Port of Marseille, note on the “Contrôle médical des travailleurs algériens,” 25 April 1963. ADBR 22 J 9.

had been “amplified.” Indeed, the departmental service’s reach extended throughout the entire Bouches-du-Rhône and, as a result, made ATOM a key player in national and regional government efforts to monitor and control the flow of immigrants into France. Still, by 1975, despite this expanded role, ATOM only dedicated 30 percent of its entire operation to providing reception, information, and orientation services to immigrant clients. The remaining 70 percent of the association’s actions consisted of providing socio-educative action familiale services to immigrant families in Marseille and its surrounding region. The association justified its ongoing focus on delivering socio-educative action familiale services by insisting that the immigration of families remained a source of “social problems” and, thus, an important issue of concern in Marseille. In making this argument, the association particularly drew attention to the high number of “Maghrebi families” in the city that by 1974 had risen to between 5,000 and 6,000 and comprised a total population of as much as 60,000. In doing so, it revealed that it continued to view North African immigration as a problem that needed solving.

ATOM was not the only welfare association in Marseille to direct this type of ongoing attention to carrying out action familiale initiatives. As the Interior Ministry’s Migrant Liaison and Promotion Service indicated in 1970, the development of a “social and educative action” for families was only second to the clearance of shantytowns on the list of objectives of the city’s postcolonial immigrant welfare network. Moreover, the network on the whole remained fixated on directing this “action” towards Muslim families of Maghrebi origin. Much of this ongoing fixation had to do with the blame that official and nonofficial observers alike had levelled at Maghrebi families for the “bidonvillisation” of Marseille. But, according to the SLPM, Maghrebi
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53 Meeting of the board of directors of the FAS, 18 October 1973. CAC 19870258, article 43.
families also continued to attract special attention for what it insisted were the “very difficult social problems” their presence in the city continued to pose, including their supposedly “partial or general ignorance of the French language, their maladjustment to our institutions and our system of life, and their ignorance of their rights and duties.”

It is not that welfare experts believed that all Maghrebi families living in postcolonial Marseille required an integrationist action familiale. As part of the role it assumed in delivering housing certificates to Muslim Algerian families, ATOM explained in 1969 that it came into contact with “a considerable number of Algerians […] who, fortunately, have never needed our services.” The association added, moreover, that it “was surprised to discover that those who do not have, or have not had, problems could count themselves by the hundreds, if not the thousands, and that their insertion in the urban fabric seems totally complete.” Such recognition, however, did not stop Marseille welfare specialists and providers from continuing to label Maghrebi families a group of “particular importance” that still required their special attention and assistance.

It should be noted that the ongoing effort local social service providers made to direct action familiale initiatives at Maghrebi families unfolded as new North African-run services were being implanted in the city that sought to strengthen North African immigrants’ ties to their countries of origin. For example, the Algerian government, through the AAE, as well as the consulate it opened in Marseille in May 1963, ran classes that offered Arabic language instruction to Algerian immigrants living in the city. The central motivation behind these classes was, as Algerian President Houari Boumédiène explained in a speech delivered in 1973, to help Algerian immigrants maintain a connection to Algeria’s national language and, by extension, their “Algerian

56 Ibid., 1-5.
59 Letter from the chief of the fourth division of the Marseille police to the Chief Commissioner of the Departmental Service of General Intelligence on the “Climat de la colonie algérienne dans la IXe Région,” 28 August 1963.
personality.”

By that time, efforts to “impregnate” Algerian families who had immigrated to France with an Algerian cultural identity were also being made through AAE-developed programs for Algerian women and children. Through these classes and programs, the AAE and the Algerian consulate thus offered Algerian immigrants and their descendants an alternative to attaching themselves to French society and culture.

In this regard, North African-run services posed a potential problem for French integrationist efforts. However, in spite of this potential problem, and maybe because of it, local officials who commented on the services offered by organizations like the AAE treated their actions and objectives dismissively. Some local officials, no doubt convinced of the superiority of French social welfare, even insisted that most Algerian immigrants in Marseille who had sought out the assistance of North African-run services ended up “unsatisfied” and subsequently “returned to the French social services.”

As part of the special focus they continued to place on the integration of Maghrebi families, the specialists and social service providers who worked within Marseille’s postcolonial immigrant welfare network remained convinced that adult Muslim North African women required specialized attention. Into the 1970s, ATOM claimed that, in terms of their integration into French economic and social life, immigrant women in general still lagged behind their “husbands and brothers.” At the same time, though, the association echoed the argument furthered in the late colonial era by Simone Belppeer and other welfare experts that women “represented, for the most part, a stabilizing and dynamic force in the family unit.” When it came to Maghrebi women in particular, ATOM
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60 Houari Boumédiène, speech delivered at the AAE’s “Conférence nationale sur l’émigration,” 12-14 January 1973. CAC 19940250, article 1.
61 Reports on “la jeunesse émigré” and “la femme algérienne émigré” delivered at the AAE’s “Conférence nationale sur l’émigration.”
62 Letter from the chief of the fourth division of the Marseille police to the Chief Commissioner of the Departmental Service of General Intelligence on the “Climat de la colonie algérienne dans la IXe Région.”
maintained its long-held belief that they exhibited the greatest influence in determining their families’ behaviour and development. As the association argued in 1966, in Maghrebi families, “the normalizing element is the mother. She either slows her family’s progress or enables her family to thrive.” Thus, it remained the association’s opinion that the successful integration of Maghrebi families hinged primarily on the integration of Maghrebi women. In reflection of the importance they continued to ascribe to immigrant women in general, and North African immigrant women in particular, welfare specialists and providers in Marseille concentrated into the 1970s on developing more female-specific socio-educative family assistance services and programs. Like it did before decolonization, ATOM assumed a central position in this effort, particularly through the social centres it opened in local social housing complexes. Indicating the attention these centres devoted to assisting and integrating adult women, the association, in its postcolonial activity reports, more aptly described them as “centres féminins.” By 1975, it ran eleven social centres. In 1974 alone, these centres monitored over 2,500 families and delivered socio-educative classes to over 300 women. Underscoring the significant attention they continued to receive, ATOM noted that most of the women who attended these classes were “Maghrebi.”

In the postcolonial era, the integrationist approach ATOM took in its social centres followed late colonial precedents. As the association explained in its activity report for 1970, its social centres focused on assisting and integrating their female clients through an action féminine that delivered home economics classes in sewing, cooking, and early childhood care, as well as through French language and literacy classes (Fig. 9). The goal underpinning this action féminine, moreover, continued to be ensuring that female clients fulfilled their supposedly natural roles as

housewives and mothers, which ATOM and other welfare associations still believed was essential to making needed social, cultural, and psychological “modifications” to the families they targeted, as well as to ensuring these families adapted to the conditions of French urban life.\(^68\) Indeed, ATOM insisted into the 1970s that the participation of Maghrebi women in home economics classes remained the best means through which it could engage with the “Muslim milieu” and shape the behaviours and values of Maghrebi families.\(^69\)

Thus, as the *action féminine* that was directed at adult Maghrebi women living in postcolonial Marseille by associations like ATOM demonstrates, local welfare experts continued to view the ideally integrated Maghrebi family as a family that more or less conformed to French patriarchal norms, with a male breadwinner and a female homemaker. What’s more, they clearly continued to believe that, by espousing these patriarchal norms while promoting conformity to French ways of living, they were helping to turn Maghrebi families away from pre-migratory social
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and cultural practices that they considered inappropriate and backward. But did the vision of the integrated Maghrebi family that they sought to realize actually reflect the lived experiences and realities of Maghrebi families living in Marseille after decolonization? More specifically, did it reflect the lived experiences and realities of Maghrebi women?

Some insight into these questions is offered by the studies of the North African immigrant population of Marseille that were conducted in the 1970s by associations like LOGIREM and the CLARB. In its 1974 study of the immigrant populations living in the neighbourhood of Saint-Mauront, the CLARB noted that “the percentage of female workers is below the Marseille average,” a situation it linked to “the lack of activity of the women of Maghrebi origin.” Two years later, LOGIREM provided a more detailed picture of the ways in which Maghrebi families—at least those living in local social housing—were structured. In its 1976 study of 97 Maghrebi families that had for a decade or more lived in HLMs or HLM-PSRs in northern Marseille, the association described most as having a male head of household who worked and a female homemaker who stayed at home and raised children. Only two of the families evaluated in the study had female heads of households who, according to LOGIREM, ended up in the positions they did because they were widows who received “relatively substantial pensions” after their husbands died in workplace accidents.

Despite what these studies show, however, not all Maghrebi families living in postcolonial Marseille were structured around men’s and women’s “traditional” gender roles. Included among the participants at a roundtable on the “conditions of Maghrebi women in France” that was conducted in Marseille in 1976, for example, were three Muslim Algerian women and one Muslim
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71 According to LOGIREM, 21 of the male heads of households it studied suffered from disabilities or sicknesses that prevented them from gaining regular employment: LOGIREM, “Enquête sur les familles nord-africains résidant encore sur les cités de la LOGIREM depuis 10 ans et plus,” 1976.
72 Ibid.
Moroccan woman who did not conform to the long-held gender-based ideals of the project to integrate Maghrebis into French society. Indeed, one of these women ("F") was unmarried and worked as a preschool assistant, another ("Z") was unemployed and lived with her parents but had previously worked as a dairywoman, and two ("L" and "A") were married and enrolled in professional job training programs. All four women expressed a desire to work outside the home and to not fulfill an exclusively domestic role. What’s more, each viewed employment as an opportunity to free themselves from the domestic sphere and gain greater personal and economic independence. As "Z" explained to the roundtable, “I found a job not to stay at home to do the housework because I did not have freedom there.” Similarly, “L” explained that she “looked for work to not depend on my family, even materially. I did not feel equal and I wanted to get out of my pots and pans.”

According to the roundtable’s participants, in asserting, or attempting to assert, their independence outside the home, Maghrebi women did not always receive the full support of their families. As local social worker Evelyn Dauphne argued at the roundtable, a “major problem” in many North African immigrant families was “the prohibition of […] women’s employment,” which she noted was usually imposed by fathers and husbands. However, if this was an effort on Dauphne’s part to underscore an ongoing intransigence in Muslim North African views of the role of women in the family, this sentiment was tempered by the roundtable’s Maghrebi participants. Speaking to this issue, for example, “L” admitted that, after she had enrolled in an adult professional job training centre, her family initially found it “very difficult” to accept her decision: “They believed that I was going to abandon my husband, my son, and that I was preparing for a
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divorce.” After some time, though, she explained that her family underwent a “positive evolution” and came to eventually accept her desire to find employment.\(^{74}\)

The effort some Maghrebi women living in Marseille made to assert their personal and economic independence can be considered one aspect of the broader changes that occurred within metropolitan French society after World War II. As Sarah Fishman has recently asserted, the postwar era marked an important period of change in the country when it came to attitudes about gender and family life. In particular, while fundamental ideas about the ideal family in which men and women fulfilled their “traditional” gender roles continued after the war to be espoused, there was also greater recognition, and acceptance, of women’s work outside the home. It was after the war, moreover, that a growing number of women throughout France actively sought out job training assistance and employment, often in new professions that emerged in the context of France’s postwar modernization.\(^{75}\) In the specific case of Maghrebi women, statistics compiled by Jeanne Singer-Kerel indicate that the growth in North African migration to France after 1945 was accompanied by an increase in the number of Maghrebi women who found employment in the country. According to Singer-Kerel, the number of “active,” or employed, women of Algerian, Moroccan, and Tunisian origin living in France grew from 272 to 6,684 between 1946 and 1962. During that period, the majority of these female Maghrebi workers were employed in the service or consumer goods industries.\(^{76}\)

For Maghrebi women, scholars have also noted that decolonization offered opportunities for greater independence in France and North Africa. As Marnia Lazreg argues, Muslim Algerian
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\(^{74}\) Ibid.

\(^{75}\) Fishman, From Vichy to the Sexual Revolution: Gender and Family Life in Postwar France, 1-54.

\(^{76}\) Of the 272 Muslim women working in France in 1946, 158 were from Algeria, 68 were from Morocco, and 46 were from Tunisia. Of the 6,684 Muslim women working in France in 1962, 4,424 were from Algeria, 880 were from Morocco, and 1,380 were from Tunisia: Singer-Kerel, “Mobilisation et mobilité des forces de travail: système rotatif et intégration salariale,” 83-88.
women who participated in the Algerian independence movement as moudjahidat (or women fighters) for the FLN “radically upset the value system that had hitherto governed gender relations by stepping out of their usual home-centered social roles and into the world of urban and guerrilla warfare.”

Even though their participation largely conformed to what Lazreg calls “a ‘traditional’ pattern of gender roles,” according to which they assumed subordinate positions to men and were responsible for tasks like purchasing and preparing food, obtaining medical supplies, and transporting weapons, it still gave them an opportunity to assert their political and social agency, which they continued to fight for after 1962.

The roundtable that took place in Marseille in 1976 underscores that local welfare experts were well aware of the desire of some Maghrebi women to gain greater personal and economic independence, particularly through work outside the home. But this recognition was far from new. Lyons underscores, for example, how officials and experts involved in North African-focused action sociale initiatives in metropolitan France during the Algerian War occasionally came into contact with Maghrebi women who asserted their independence from French and North African patriarchal norms.

In Marseille specifically, Louis Belpeer noted in 1959 that “certain young women who attend ATOM’s courses have asked for help to acquire the means to earn a living.” This statement suggests that Maghrebi women used the opportunity of their engagement with local welfare experts—no doubt in the context of those experts’ efforts to transform them into modern
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78 After 1962, for example, Lazreg argues that Muslim women in Algeria focused on asserting their rights as citizens: Lazreg, *The Eloquence of Silence*, 123-165.


80 Note from Louis Belpeer to the CTAMs of Marseille on “Action sociale éducative en faveur des femmes musulmanes,” 1959.
homemakers—to demand different forms of social assistance that would allow them independence outside the home. However, despite Belpeer’s recognition of this issue, which he identified as a new “problem” his association was “studying,” it is clear that, into the postcolonial era, ATOM maintained a strong attachment to the gender-based strategies it had employed since the early 1950s to integrate adult Maghrebi women into French society.

Nevertheless, after decolonization, changes were apparent in other aspects of the action familiale initiatives directed at Maghrebi and other immigrant families in Marseille. For one, ongoing anxieties over the ability of immigrant families to adjust to life in France led to a rethinking of late colonial assertions that families living in HLMs were bien évolué and no longer in need of integrationist assistance. As noted in the previous chapter, such anxieties were even expressed in the studies and reports of welfare associations that carried out, and at the same time lauded the accomplishments of, the re-housing operations of the “Marseille method.” The administrators who ran these associations expressed similar sentiments. As LOGIREM director Alfred Martin noted in his 1970 report on Marseille’s shantytown “problem,” even after they had moved from transitional housing to HLM complexes, most Maghrebi families “still present several peculiarities” that “distinguish them from their neighbours,” including their “names” and “religious practices.” In addition, Martin worried that some Maghrebi families living in HLMs would not stay integrated, but instead revert back to pre-migratory ways of living, arguing that “even if the father, mother, and children adopt a European lifestyle, the grandparents, when they are present, retain a non-European style of dress, and the grandmother especially reminds the family of its oriental origins.”81 These anxieties revealed that experts like Martin had trouble envisioning a situation in which Muslim North Africans did not require French assistance and

guidance. They also ensured that the reach of local socio-educative family assistance services and programs would extend beyond shantytowns and transitional housing.

Indeed, Martin’s association had already begun in the late 1960s to invite ATOM to open social centres in some of the HLM complexes it operated so that both associations could “follow” recently re-housed “European and Maghrebi families.” The first of these centres was opened in the HLM-PSR of Font-Vert in 1968. A second centre opened the following year in the HLM-PSR of Les Micocouliers. At LOGIREM and ATOM, no secret was made of the reason behind the establishment of these centres. Even after they had reached what was meant to be the pinnacle of la méthode marseillaise’s tiered integrationist re-housing scheme, some families, in the opinion of both associations, still needed to be “constantly or regularly monitored so that they can adapt to their new conditions of existence.” During the first year of operation of its centre at Font-Vert, ATOM indicated that it monitored 431 families and made 804 home visits. The household monitors and social workers who performed these tasks remained especially interested in improving their clients’ socio-cultural “level,” a concern that, as we have already seen, was closely associated with poorly housed Maghrebi families. Further confirming welfare experts’ ongoing preoccupation with the Maghrebi inhabitants of HLMs, the CLARB, in a 1974 report on “Les Travailleurs Étrangers à Marseille,” explained that HLM-based social centres specifically targeted housing complexes “with high percentages of North Africans.”
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82 Meeting of the board of directors of the FAS, 19 September 1969. CAC 19850021, article 94.
84 ATOM, “Centre socio-éducatif des ‘Micocouliers’,” June 1969. CAC 19850021, article 94.
85 Meeting of the board of directors of the FAS, 10 November 1967.
87 ATOM, “Centre socio-éducatif des ‘Micocouliers’.”
Integrating Immigrant Families in their Entireties

Thus, the introduction of ATOM social centres in LOGIREM-built HLMs symbolized an important development in *action familiale* initiatives in Marseille, one revealing that even the integrationist ideas and approaches of social service providers with deep roots in late colonial North African-focused social welfare were not always static and unchanging. But it was not the only element of change apparent in these initiatives after decolonization. Though the delivery of specialized services to adult women undeniably remained the central priority guiding the *action familiale* of Marseille’s postcolonial immigrant welfare network, local specialists and social service providers became increasingly occupied with addressing the issue of immigrant family integration through assistance for another group of clients: young people, a group ranging from children and adolescents to unmarried men and women in their early twenties. In doing so, they seemingly underscored their acceptance of the permanency of the settlement of North African immigrants and other minority groups in France.

As part of its *bidonville*-related outreach, ATOM began in 1966 to open clubs offering educational, sports, and leisure services to teenage boys between the ages of fourteen and eighteen living in shantytowns. Around the same time, its social centres also began delivering an “enseignement régulier” (mainstream education) to adolescent girls and young women between the ages of fourteen and twenty. The association justified the development of these services by arguing that their importance extended beyond simply assisting “children and adolescents” and other young people. As the association asserted in its activity report for 1968, it provided these youth services to round out all it was doing in the domain of *action féminine* to assist immigrant families in adjusting to their new lives in France. It was only through helping its young clients find
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a “stability and fulfillment that their parents have never known” that the association truly believed it could “promote the family in its entirety.”

From the mid-1960s, similar ideas about the importance of youth services to fostering the integration of entire immigrant families appear to have influenced the creation of three new welfare associations in Marseille. The first of these associations, the Centre Provençal d’Enseignement Ménager (Home Economics Training Centre of Provence), was a regional government agency founded in 1964. Beginning in 1965, it ran training centres that provided home economics classes to adolescent girls between the ages of fourteen and sixteen, mostly from “metropolitan” French families. However, the association also solicited funding from national government agencies like the FAS so that it could make spaces in its various training centres available to adolescent girls from “foreign families.” For example, in 1965, thanks to FAS funding, it opened 28 spaces at its training centre of “La Mazarde” in Marseille’s fifteenth arrondissement up to clients it classified as “étrangères.” In total, the centre accommodated 103 clients in that year. In accommodating young clients of “foreign” origin, the association’s president, a Mr. Regis, explained in 1969 that its goal was to ensure immigrant families underwent the “profound mutations” that he believed they needed to undergo in order to adapt to life in France.

The second association, the Comité Départemental d’Information pour les Nomades des Bouches-du-Rhône (CDIN, Departmental Information Committee for the Nomadic Peoples of the Bouches-du-Rhône), was another regional government agency that began operating in 1967.

---

91 Meeting of the FAS board of directors, 19 September 1969. CAC 19850021, article 94.
93 Letter from Mr. Regis to the director of the FAS, 20 May 1969. CAC 19850021, article 94.
94 The CDIN reported directly to a national interministerial agency, the Comité National d’Information et d’Action Sociales pour les ‘Gens de Voyage’ et les Personnes d’Origine Nomade (CNIN, National Information and Social Action Committee for Travelling and Nomadic Peoples): Meeting of the FAS board of directors, 13 November 1969. CAC 19850021, article 94.
Created to facilitate the integration of so-called “nomadic” immigrant families living in shantytowns, it sought to accomplish this objective by developing socio-educative services for young children and adolescents. At an outpost it established in the shantytown of Campagne Fenouil, it provided short-term home economics and literacy classes to adolescent girls and young women, ran a social club for boys and girls between the ages of six and fifteen, and organized a youth soccer team. At another outpost it implanted in the shantytown of Colgate, it ran an apprenticeship centre that offered educational and social training exclusively to young boys.95

The final association, the Association pour la Réinsertion de l’Enfance et de l’Adolescence (ARENA, Association for the Reintegration of Children and Adolescents), was a private charity created in 1968. Active in Marseille’s shantytowns and transitional housing complexes, its primary objective was to create a variety of youth educational and leisure services to foster the cultural and social incorporation of “displaced” children and adolescents “of both sexes.” At the same time, it sought to transform entire families, arguing in 1968 that the integration of young people was essential to the “physical, intellectual, and moral development” of supposedly “deficient family environments.”96 Putting it another way, the ARENA asserted in its activity report for 1973 that “our social role […] translates into the ‘global’ care of the family […] in order to ensure their situation does not deteriorate.”97 Thus, similar to the purpose behind the implantation of ATOM social centres in LOGIREM-built HLMs, the development of immigrant youth services also responded to welfare experts’ fears that the immigrant families they interacted with would revert back to pre-migratory and, in their opinion, backward ways of living.

An idea of how administrators at these associations utilized youth services would play to facilitate the “global” care and integration of North African immigrant families is offered by the
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ARENA’s activity report for 1972. According to the report, the association’s youth educational and leisure services were designed to counteract the handicaps posed by a supposedly “poor social adaptation” by ensuring that their young recipients were capable of living a “normal” life socially, psychologically, and emotionally. In this regard, the “monitors” who delivered these services took on the role of surrogate parents who, through constant interaction with the association’s young clients, sought to raise a new generation of “French” youth. Indeed, the ARENA even tasked its monitors with organizing a yearly two-month-long summer camp in a region outside of Marseille for upwards of 300 children and adolescents between the ages of four and fifteen. This summer camp had two goals: “relaxation and physical health on the one hand, education and psychological and moral balance on the other.” Explicit in this effort was the association’s belief that its young clients could not rely on their parents to properly prepare them for life in France. These associations also clearly believed that by assisting and integrating young people from immigrant families under the umbrella of a broader action familiale, they were helping to influence and reinforce the integration of their young clients’ parents.

In more ways than one, the focus that local welfare experts placed on integrating young people from immigrant families can be considered an offshoot of the larger effort that was made in France after World War II to mold the cultural, moral, and civic character of “metropolitan” French youth. As Richard Jobs has expertly shown, young people became a widespread source of hope and promise in the context of efforts to rebuild and rejuvenate postwar France. Through popular education and leisure programs that placed, among other things, an emphasis on sport, travel, art, film, and physical fitness, Jobs argues the French state strove “to enfranchise France’s future citizens into the political, cultural, and even military life” of the country. The belief underpinning the creation of these programs was that “improving the young would in the end

---

improve France by creating an ideal citizenry capable of active participation in a modern republic based on democratic and egalitarian ideals.” Echoes of this effort were clearly evident in the immigrant youth initiatives of welfare associations like the ARENA, which went even further in believing their services could have a transformative effect on entire immigrant families.

Although they were open to clients of all immigrant origins, a close examination of the young people who attended the postcolonial immigrant youth services outlined above reveals that the majority came from Maghrebi families. As the ARENA explained in the early 1970s, approximately 50 percent of the young people it accommodated were “North African.” An additional 15 percent of its clients were classified as gitans.100 At the CDIN, 100 percent of the clients who received assistance came from families of gitan origin.101 Since both associations were mainly active in shantytowns, where families from the Maghreb remained an important group of concern, these numbers are not surprising.102 Similar numbers, though, were also reported by the youth services delivered out of local social housing complexes. In 1967, for example, ATOM’s social centres in Marseille provided an “enseignement régulier” to 282 young women. Of this number, 181 (or 64 percent) were identified as “Algerians,” “Moroccans,” or “Tunisians,” while another 48 (or 17 percent) were identified as “gitanes.”103 The following year, these numbers increased slightly to 186 and 51 respectively, though their overall percentages dropped to 57 percent and 16 percent. In that year, the association’s “enseignement régulier” service also

99 In other parts of his study, it should be noted that Jobs also explores the various “problems” that came to be associated with young people in postwar France: Richard Ivan Jobs, Riding the New Wave: Youth and the Rejuvenation of France after the Second World War (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2007), 92-137; see also Sheila K. Nowinski, “Peasants into Farmers: The Jeunesse agricole catholique and the modernization of rural France, 1930-1960” (PhD, University of Notre Dame, 2012).
101 Note from the SLPM to the FAS on the “Demande de subvention présentée par le Comité Départemental d’Information pour les Nomades des Bouches-du-Rhônes,” 3 November 1969. CAC 19850021, article 94.
102 For example, over 70 percent of the people living in the shantytowns where the ARENA was active were from North African immigrant families: ARENA, “Compte-Rendu d’activité 1973-1974,” 1.
accommodated 20 “française musulmane” (or *harkis*).\(^{104}\) At the Centre Provençal d’Enseignement Ménager, meanwhile, even though administrators provided no exact statistics, they insisted that most of their “foreign” clients were “jeunes filles maghrébines.”\(^{105}\)

These numbers are yet another sign of the ongoing preoccupation with the integration of North African immigrant families in postcolonial Marseille. They also underscore the value welfare experts saw in shifting more of their focus to assisting Muslim North African youth. Interestingly, when it came to young people from North African immigrant families, contemporaries observed that most were actually encouraged by their parents to “enter more and more into French society,” typically through attendance in French schools.\(^{106}\) Muslim North African youth were also consumers of French mass media at a time when, as Alec Hargreaves notes, the French state exhibited almost complete control over the content delivered via radio and television.\(^{107}\)

As a result of these factors, some contemporaries observed that the descendants of North African immigrants grew up as “young French people.” For example, in a report detailing the experiences of children from Algerian immigrant families who had settled in Marseille in the 1960s and 1970s, the Regional Institute for Adult Education in Marseille noted that Muslim Algerian youth spoke French and dressed in a French manner. Moreover, the report insisted they lived “according to the same cultural model” as children from “metropolitan” French families, complete with the same modes of leisure and consumption, even the same “aspirations.” Because of their attachment to French society, the report also argued that Muslim Algerian youth formed relatively
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weak attachments to the Islamic faith. Even though these young people continued to identify themselves as Muslim, the report insisted “they practically ignore all Islamic theological doctrines” and “do not participate in traditional family or religious celebrations.”

In comparison to the observations of the Regional Institute for Adult Education in Marseille, welfare experts throughout France continued to express concerns about the maintenance of customary social and cultural practices within North African immigrant families. Administrators and specialists at LOGIREM, for example, worried about first-generation North African immigrants’ ongoing attachment to Islamic religious values and customs, especially when it came to their efforts to pass these values and customs on to their children. As the association claimed in 1976, Islam “has kept its deep hold on […] North African families,” often to the detriment of the “evolution of the young and their attraction to a European lifestyle.” Other experts worried about the continuation of practices like child marriage. As Renée Bley, the long-serving director of the Paris-based welfare association Service Social Familial Nord-Africain (SSFNA, North African Family Social Service), observed in a 1969 article on the “adaptation” of Muslim Algerian adolescents, some Algerian immigrants continued to arrange their children’s marriages, even when their children were underage and a “legal marriage” was not yet possible.

According to some experts, the retention of customary social and cultural practices within France’s Maghrebi population produced a situation in which Muslim North African youth became caught between the cultural traditions of France’s majority ethnic population and the cultural
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traditions of their parents. In their opinion, as the observations made by LOGIREM in 1976 indicate, this situation hindered young Muslims’ integration into French society. Moreover, experts blamed this situation for causing a growing number of Muslim North African youth to engage in unwelcome behaviours and habits, including those that fell within the realm of juvenile delinquency.111 As experts from the CLARB explained in the early 1970s, acts of Muslim juvenile delinquency in Marseille, including the vandalism of public property, the looting of stores, and automobile theft, were highest among young people living in the so-called Muslim ghettos of the city’s northern arrondissements, places long associated with the retention of pre-migratory ways of living.112 In this regard, the development of postcolonial immigrant youth services, particularly those that were delivered out of outposts or social centres in shantytowns and social housing complexes, represented an effort on the part of local welfare providers to prevent the formation of these behaviours and habits.

The connection that French welfare experts made between the retention of customary social and cultural practices and young Muslim North Africans’ engagement in unwelcome behaviours and habits must be set against the lived experiences of the children of North African immigrants. In their literary works, many second-generation Maghrebi writers who grew up in France during the period in question chronicle the journeys of young people of North African immigrant origin as they move between—and try to navigate—the different cultural spaces they encounter. In the process, these writers explore the consequences of such journeys, the most significant being the manifestation of identity crises.113 In Le gone du Chaâba, for example, Azouz Begag writes how,

111 Ibid.
113 For additional insight into the writings of second-generation Maghrebis, see: Alec G. Hargreaves, “Resistance at the Margins: Writers of Maghrebi immigrant origin in France,” in Post-colonial Cultures in France, 226-239.
as a young child attending French public school, he strove to “to prove that I was capable of being like them [the French], indeed, better than them,”\textsuperscript{114} but still felt “ashamed” and “scared” when his fellow gone’s accused him of being more “French” than “Arab.”\textsuperscript{115}

Contrary to the view of French welfare experts, Begag and other second-generation Maghrebi writers do not present the consequences of moving between different cultural spaces as a detriment to young Muslims’ incorporation into French society. Instead, they portray them as part of a formative process through which the children of North African immigrants become culturally hybrid, adopting customs and values common among France’s majority ethnic population while keeping others associated with their Maghrebi cultural heritage. Here, Begag again provides excellent insight, underscoring that he grew up speaking both French and an Algerian dialect of Arabic, as well as internalizing “French” (i.e. notions of hygiene and correct behaviour) and “Muslim” (i.e. notions of happiness and good and bad luck) socio-cultural codes.\textsuperscript{116} Implicit in such representations of cultural hybridity is an attempt to carve a legitimate place for Muslims of North African origin within conventional notions of French identity and society.\textsuperscript{117}

When second-generation Maghrebi writers do address young Muslims’ engagement in unwelcome behaviours and habits, they connect them to a completely different set of factors. A clear example here is provided by Medhi Charef’s novel, \textit{Le thé au harem d’Archi Ahmed} (\textit{Tea in the Harem}). Majid, the novel’s eighteen-year-old protagonist, lives with his Algerian family in a Paris suburb, where he gets expelled from technical college, uses drugs, and partakes in other delinquent behaviours like pickpocketing and robbery. However, even though Majid is described early in the novel as “neither French nor Arab” and “the son of immigrants—caught between two

\begin{footnotes}
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cultures, two histories, two languages and two colours of skin,”¹¹⁸ his delinquent behaviours are not presented as a product of his bi-cultural condition. Instead, they are portrayed as a consequence of socio-economic marginalization and ethno-cultural discrimination, a reaction to feelings of despair and rejection engendered by life in a “concrete jungle” on the margins of France’s largest city and, by extension, French society. As Charef, through the narrator of his novel, exclaims rather bleakly, “You never recover from the concrete. It never leaves you [. . .] It follows you everywhere. And because you were born into it, it will never give you up.”¹¹⁹

**Services for Maghrebi Children and Adolescents**

So far this chapter has focused on the intensification of youth-oriented efforts to integrate Maghrebi families living in postcolonial Marseille. That does not mean the integration of Maghrebi children and adolescents was an unimportant issue in the city before decolonization. At ATOM especially, the evolutionary progress of children from Muslim North African families had attracted the attention of administrators and social workers since the early 1950s. Indeed, in her 1954 study of a group of migrants from the Ouargla region of Algeria that had settled in the neighbourhood of La Calade, Simone Belppeer devoted an entire section to assessing the health and nutrition of their children. She also used the study as an opportunity to assess the ability of children of Muslim Algerian origin to integrate into metropolitan France’s public education system, noting: “The school-aged children attend the local school of La Calade and are almost all in the preparatory class. As soon as they speak French, usually after one and a half years of schooling for the girls,
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two years for the boys, they make rapid progress to the point of being only two years behind their metropolitan comrades of the same age.”\footnote{Simone Belpeer, “Familles vivant en monde clos: un groupe d’émigrés des territoires du sud de l’Algérie installés à Marseille (Hiver 1953-1954),” in ESNA, “Situation et aspirations de la famille nord-africain en Métropole,” 23-24.}

Also in 1954, in the larger study it conducted of 101 Algerian families living in Marseille, ATOM identified the “education of children” as one of the criteria on which it judged whether or not Maghrebi families were successfully integrating into the French “milieu.” In general, the study noted that 70 children from these families attended French schools, concluding “the relationships these children have with their teachers seem good in general and the quality of their work seems good in the majority of cases.”\footnote{INED, \textit{Les Algériens en France}, 143.}

If these studies are any indication, experts who worked within the North African-focused welfare network of late colonial Marseille viewed French schools as important integrationist tools. These studies also suggest that most experts were content with leaving the majority of the responsibility for fostering the integration of Maghrebi children and adolescents in the hands of the French public education system. As Simone Belpeer argued in her 1954 study, attendance at French primary schools enabled children from Maghrebi families to undergo a “rapid” adaptation, particularly since it was at school where they received French language instruction and had the opportunity to “integrate with metropolitan children.”\footnote{Belpeer, “Familles vivant en monde clos,” 23-24.} Outside of this study, Belpeer also promoted the importance of French schooling for Maghrebi children and adolescents to French authorities. Writing to the prefect in 1952, she asserted that French schools provided young Muslims a “basic education” and the “knowledge of French,” ensuring that they would “integrate without doubt into the native [metropolitan French] population.”\footnote{Belpeer, “Note sur le problème des familles nord-africaines dans le département des Bouches-du-Rhône en 1952,” 5.} If gaps did form in the
integrationist action of French schools, Belppeer insisted that socio-educative family assistance services for Maghrebi women, like those offered by their association, would bridge them. Ideally, as we have already seen, the goal behind these services was to produce modern or “Western” household atmospheres that, among other things, introduced Maghrebi children to French cuisine, hygienic practices, and clothing.124

A glimpse into how French schools functioned as a tool to integrate young Muslims into French society is provided by Azouz Begag. It was at the public school near the shantytown in which he lived as a young boy that Begag learned the French language and was told by his teacher that “we are all descendants of the Gauls.”125 At the same school, he also received lessons in good manners and the rules of proper hygiene. Underscoring that these lessons were largely geared towards “metropolitan” French students’ understandings of these issues, Begag writes that, in one lesson on hygiene, his teacher,

```
talked for a few minutes about cleanliness, asking questions such as: Is it important to be clean? How many times a day should you wash? The French pupils answered enthusiastically because they had learned all about these things at home. They talked about bathtubs, washbasins, and even toothbrushes and toothpaste. If folks in Le Chaâba had been told that the rules of cleanliness needed so much attention, they would have laughed out loud.126
```

According to Begag, these lessons differed greatly from his own experience growing up in an Algerian family in the chaâba.127 In this regard, they functioned to inculcate France’s minority Maghrebi population with majority ethnic French behaviours and values.

When it came to French efforts to integrate young Muslims of North African origin into French society, it appears that welfare experts’ belief in the effectiveness of French schooling and socio-educative family assistance services produced a situation in which specialized services for
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the children of North African immigrants were slow to develop. In Marseille, the first welfare association dedicated to providing integrationist action sociale exclusively to young Muslim North African boys and girls, the Comité Intermouvements Auprès des Évacués (CIMADE, Cooperative Committee for the Displaced), was not established until 1957, three years into the Algerian War. A Paris-based Protestant religious charity, it specialized in the development of social clubs that delivered educational and leisure programs to Muslim Algerian children and adolescents between the ages of six and eighteen. Before 1957, the only other welfare services available to Maghrebi youth in the city were two remedial education classes for adolescents, opened in 1952 by the Bouches-du-Rhône’s Office of Academic Inspection, and the vocational pre-training program offered by the CANA. All of these services specifically accommodated boys and young men. Absent direct services for girls and young women, the home economics classes that ATOM had originally established for adult Muslim North African women did open up a small number of spaces for young female clients.

In the context of decolonization, officials, welfare specialists, and social service providers in Marseille expressed growing concerns about the involvement of young Maghrebis in anti-colonial nationalism. By the end of the Algerian War, they had also begun to openly worry about the presence of a rising number of “jeunes musulmans” in the city who they considered either “under-educated” or “normally educated” but living in families who failed to provide the “educational and moral support that should normally accompany the instruction delivered at school.” In a 1960 memo on the “problems posed by young Muslim Algerians,” Alfred Martin warned prefect-IGAME Haas-Picard that young Muslim Algerian boys who received an
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inadequate education ended up “knowing nothing more than street games and […] the distractions offered by jukeboxes and bars.” Moreover, he insisted that a lack of education made them “susceptible to every kind of perversion,” going so far as to label them a “danger” to the city—a claim that no doubt carried extra weight given that it was made at the height of the Algerian War. When it came to young Muslim Algerian girls, Martin spoke directly to ongoing efforts to “free” them from pre-migratory patriarchal family structures, alerting the prefect-IGAME to what he asserted was the problematic tendency of their parents to keep them “under close guardianship until their marriage, which occurs most often when they are still young.”

Despite these concerns, however, the number of social aid services available to Muslim children and adolescents of North African origin in late colonial Marseille remained small. Indeed, to underscore that more needed to be done in the domain of North African-focused action sociale to address these issues, Martin reported in 1960 that, together, the youth services offered by CIMADE and ATOM only had the capacity to accommodate around 75 school age children. By 1962, Marseille’s CTAMs observed that this number had only increased to 175.

Thus, it was not until after decolonization that serious efforts were made to develop specialized services for Maghrebi youth in Marseille. By that point, North African-focused welfare associations had not only shifted their attention to delivering social welfare to all immigrant youth, but had also begun to emphasize the value of youth services to broader action familiale initiatives. Despite these changes, the objectives that guided the specialized assistance offered to children and adolescents from North African immigrant families after decolonization remained consistent with the aid offered to Maghrebi youth during the late colonial era. Whether they were delivered before
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or after 1962, youth educational and leisure services were designed, as Alfred Martin explained in 1960, to “complement” the “general education” provided by French schools while at the same time “awakening” their young clients to “Western notions of modern life.” At the same time, they sought to ensure that their young clients, similar to their adult clients, conformed to the gender-based integrationist objectives of North African-focused *action sociale*. Services for young males, for example, were structured around the creation of future workers and heads of households, while services for young females were structured around the creation of future wives and mothers.

Though the overarching objectives of late colonial efforts to assist and integrate Maghrebi youth in Marseille persisted into the postcolonial era, the strategies that welfare specialists and providers employed to realize them did not always follow suit. In fact, after decolonization, new approaches to assisting and integrating children and adolescents from North African and other immigrant families emerged at the same time local welfare associations started focusing on the “global” care of immigrant families. What is interesting, for the purposes of this study, is that some of these new approaches even suggested that local welfare specialists and providers had begun to quietly redefine their expectations for young people from immigrant families, particularly when it came to their roles in French society.

A good example of this shift in postcolonial strategy is provided by an analysis of the “enseignement régulier” ATOM delivered to adolescent girls and young women from the mid-1960s. Indeed, in its activity report for 1970, the association explained that it considered the purpose of its “enseignement régulier” program to be “no different from the overall purpose of the socio-educative action or training delivered to adult women.” In this regard, the program provided “general education and household training” to its young female clients to prepare them for a future
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in the domestic sphere as homemakers.\textsuperscript{135} Thus, on the surface, it sought to make a new generation of modern French wives and mothers. Even though it reiterated these old objectives and strategies, however, the association had already begun to “experiment” with new types of assistance for adolescent girls and young women from immigrant families—something it did not do for adult women. For example, in 1968, ATOM indicated that, for the first time in its history, it provided 30 of the 327 clients enrolled in its “enseignement régulier” program classes in vocational pre-training that prepared them for a “formation professionnelle des adultes,” which they would later receive at a government-run professional job training centre.\textsuperscript{136} The following year, the association provided vocational pre-training assistance to another 26 clients. Of those 26 clients, it indicated 11 were admitted into adult professional job training centres that prepared them for work as stenographers, typists, or garment and textile workers.\textsuperscript{137}

ATOM was not the only welfare association in postcolonial Marseille to employ this new integrationist strategy. Alongside its home economics training classes, the Centre Provençal d’Enseignement Ménager began in 1968 to offer “technical education” classes that enabled adolescent female clients between the ages of fourteen and eighteen to complete vocational high school diplomas in “shorthand typing” (Certificat d’aptitude professionnel de Sténo-dactylo) and the “health professions” (Brevet d’enseignement professionnel “Carrières Sanitaires”). To underscore this shift, the association was renamed the Centre Provençal d’Enseignement Ménager et Professionnel.\textsuperscript{138}

Thus, within Marseille’s postcolonial immigrant welfare network, old objectives and strategies started in the late 1960s to overlap with new approaches to assisting and integrating

\textsuperscript{138} Meeting of the FAS board of directors, 19 September 1969.
young females from immigrant families. More importantly, unlike in the case of *action féminine* services for adult women, these new approaches suggest that associations like ATOM were finally beginning to think in new ways about the social and gender roles of not only their young female clients, but of women from immigrant families in general. Indeed, in providing vocational pre-training classes as part of its “enseignement régulier” program, ATOM implicitly signalled that it no longer strictly adhered to the view that a woman’s principal—and natural—place was inside the home as a wife and mother. Instead, this program symbolized that the association had taken up a more nuanced view that welcomed, even encouraged, some of its young female clients to actively participate, and obtain their independence, in the public sphere.

This shift in thinking was further solidified in the early 1970s when ATOM, together with the CANA and the Pre-Training Centre of Marseille (CPM), formed a group to lobby the prefecture and the city of Marseille to create new vocational pre-training centres for male and female adolescents from “foreign” families.\textsuperscript{139} In 1974, the CANA, an association that until that year had only targeted adolescent boys and young men, even started admitting adolescent Maghrebi girls into a new *préformation féminine* program that trained them for work as professional seamstresses or as employees in large department stores.\textsuperscript{140} If these developments responded to a practical need for immigrant female workers to fill certain professions in the French workforce, the associations involved made no indication that this was the case. Instead, commenting on these developments in May 1974, Louis Belppeer explained that they responded to “a very spectacular evolution that is taking shape in young girls, and particularly in young Maghrebi girls. More and More, adolescent girls desire to obtain vocational training, hoping very likely to find through it an economic independence that would release them from the traditional constraints of the family.”\textsuperscript{141}

\textsuperscript{139} SLPM, “Rapport du groupe emploi et formation professionnelle,” 15 April 1975. AMM 438 W 479.
Two observations can be made from Belpeer’s statement. First, in expressing their desire to either receive vocational training or find employment, young Maghrebi women and girls played a role in influencing the creation of new specialized services that diverged from late colonial precedents. Second, even as they responded to what, in their opinion, amounted to a push away from traditional family environments, local welfare experts found another way to voice their ongoing concerns about Maghrebis’ ability to integrate into French society. Indeed, in commenting further on the types of jobs that administrators at ATOM and CANA envisioned adolescent Maghrebi girls could perform in French department stores, Belpeer noted: “we are not yet convinced that their cultural level on the one hand, and the acceptance of the Marseille clientele on the other, will allow them to access the position of cashier, nor the position of saleswoman in direct contact with the public.”142 In other words, the independence that Maghrebi girls and young Maghrebi women achieved by entering the workforce was not fully liberating.

Conclusion

Between 1962 and 1975, even as they turned their attention to accommodating immigrants of all origins and became involved in national government efforts to place tighter controls on North African immigration, welfare specialists and providers in Marseille remained fixated on the integration of Maghrebi families. But those years also represented a period of flux in efforts to provide an integrationist action familiale to Maghrebi clients. On the surface, associations like ATOM continued their late colonial efforts to create integrated Maghrebi families that conformed to “traditional” family structures. Socio-educative services for adult Maghrebi women, the main element of local action familiale initiatives, still centered on creating modern homemakers that followed French domestic norms.

142 Ibid., 10.
However, at the same time, ongoing concerns about Maghrebi families’ ability to successfully integrate into French society led local welfare specialists and providers to expand their integrationist efforts. On the one hand, they began inserting specialized services in HLM complexes—places that before 1962 were considered the ultimate symbols of a successful integration. On the other hand, they increasingly turned their attention to assisting children and adolescents, establishing a growing number of youth services to ensure the “global” integration of entire North African and other immigrant families. What’s more, these expanded services often reflected new ways of thinking about the immigrant family and the social roles of its members. The vocational pre-training services that associations like ATOM began to establish for adolescent girls and young women, particularly those from North African immigrant families, in the late 1960s are an important case in point. They deviated from old objectives about fitting women into their apparently natural roles as wives and mothers, offering young women a chance to obtain their personal and economic independence outside the home.
Chapter 5
The Centre d’Accueil Nord-Africain de Marseille: Social Welfare and the problème des jeunes musulmans

By continuing to place a special focus on integrating Maghrebi families, welfare specialists and providers in postcolonial Marseille, as we have seen, did not limit their attention to adult Maghrebi women. Young Muslims of North African immigrant origin also increasingly garnered their focus, namely in the context of action familiale initiatives that sought to realize the “global” care of entire immigrant families. For these experts, the delivery of socio-educative assistance to young people from North African immigrant families represented an added opportunity to guide and shape these families socially, culturally, economically, and morally, ensuring they abandoned their supposedly backward customary social and cultural practices. The previous chapter primarily looked at this topic through the lens of services that targeted young Maghrebi women and girls. This chapter seeks to expand on this point of exploration by unpacking in more detail the specialized services and programs that catered to young Maghrebi men and boys in Marseille. It also serves as a coda to the preceding four chapters, examining the North African-focused integrationist action sociale initiatives that were undertaken in the city between 1945 and 1975 with a narrower focus on how local officials and experts responded to the “problem” of integrating Muslim North African youth into the communauté métropolitaine.

This chapter takes as its primary focus the origins and operations of the one private association in Marseille that counted young Maghrebi men and boys as its main clientele and considered the “problem” of integrating them into French society its central concern, the North African Welcome Centre of Marseille (CANA). Originally created in 1950 to run a temporary shelter service for single Maghrebi men in need, the CANA quickly expanded its operations to provide vocational pre-training assistance to young Maghrebi men and boys. Through a vocational pre-training program it created in 1952, the association sought to aid young Maghrebi trainees, or
stagiaires, by supplying them with the technical training they needed to join the French labour market and contribute to France’s economic growth. As annual activity reports produced by the CANA in the early 1950s explained, this program’s principal mandate was to facilitate the integration of young Muslim men and boys of North African origin into French society by transforming them into modern French workers.¹ This effort would take on added importance during the Algerian War, when government authorities, welfare specialists, and social service providers identified préformation professionnelle (or vocational pre-training) as an essential means of turning male Muslim youth, particularly those of Algerian origin, away from involvement in anti-colonial nationalism.

In examining the CANA’s handling of the Muslim youth “problem” in late colonial and postcolonial Marseille, this chapter again seeks to add new insights to the existing scholarship in this field of research. It demonstrates that, even though they were a minor focus within late colonial Marseille’s North African-focused welfare network, male Maghrebi youth still constituted important targets of integrationist action sociale, namely due to the links that came to be drawn between their integration and efforts to rebuild France in the aftermath of World War II. It also traces how welfare associations that specialized in the delivery of services and programs to Muslim North African youth became engaged in the fight against North African nationalism, paying particular attention to efforts that were made during the Algerian War to win young Muslim Algerian men and boys over to French society by strengthening their economic ties to the metropole. Finally, this chapter underscores the attention the “problème des jeunes musulmans” continued to receive in the postcolonial era while also highlighting issues of change related to the integrationist attitude and approach of the CANA.

¹ CANA, activity reports from 1952 to 1954. ADBR 246 J 3.
Even though the CANA accommodated a smaller number of clients than other welfare associations that provided aid to Maghrebis living in Marseille, it became a key service in the city amid efforts to address the “problème des jeunes musulmans.” To better understand the effort that was made in Marseille to solve the “problem” of young Muslims’ integration, this chapter begins by outlining the creation of the CANA and examining its place within the city’s North African-focused welfare network during the late colonial era. Attention is then given to how French officials, welfare specialists, and social service providers responded to the “problème des jeunes musulmans” during decolonization, as well as to how this response shaped préformation professionnelle initiatives in Marseille. The chapter ends by examining the postcolonial operations of the CANA. Like other North African-focused associations with origins in the late colonial era, it remained into the postcolonial era committed to facilitating the integration of Maghrebs into French society. However, the approach it took to assisting and integrating male Maghrebi youth after decolonization did not simply follow late colonial precedents. Instead, its approach changed over time in response to the different ways in which it viewed the “problème des jeunes musulmans.” Significant changes were made in the decade or so after 1962, for example, when the association shifted away from its effort to transform Maghrebi stagiaires into model French workers in favour of a more balanced socio-economic and socio-cultural integrationist strategy intent on facilitating its young clients’ “personal development.”

The Establishment of the Centre d’Accueil Nord-Africain de Marseille

The origins of the CANA can be traced back to 1950. In that year, prefect Jean Baylot charged ATOM with creating a new private welfare association to provide, from a welcome centre located in the neighbourhood of Saint-Louis, temporary shelter services to male Muslim “citizens”
from France’s North African colonies. However, under the direction of ATOM director Louis Belpeer and president Marc Fraissinet, the association expanded its mission. In addition to providing temporary shelter services, it delivered specialized assistance to young Muslim North African men who, despite their “promise,” were considered by its administrators to be unprepared for life in France due to “a low level of culture, weak physical health, and poor work habits.” In particular, when the doors to the CANA’s welcome centre officially opened in June 1952, it ran a vocational pre-training program that offered young men and boys between the ages of seventeen and twenty-five an “initiation into metropolitan life” through job training and technical education classes. The association’s primary goal was to use this program to integrate its young male clients, or trainees, by preparing them for one of two outcomes—employment in France or further instruction in an adult professional job training centre.

The creation of the CANA demonstrated the interest municipal and prefectural officials had in providing specialized assistance to young Maghrebi men and boys in Marseille. The association’s board of directors included representatives from the offices of the prefect and general council of the Bouches-du-Rhône, the city of Marseille, and the Departmental Directorate of Labour and Manpower. It also developed its services in collaboration with local welfare experts,
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2 Note on the history and activities of the CANA provided to Prime Minister Michel Debré by the Office of the Prefect of the Bouches-du-Rhône, 4 June 1959. ADBR 138 W 57. While the historical note provided to Debré outlined that Baylot’s efforts to establish the CANA began in 1951, archival sources from the prefecture of the Bouches-du-Rhône reveal that the association was actually created one year earlier: Conseil d’Administration du CANA, “Statuts 1950,” 10 July 1950. ADBR 218 W 57. Moreover, the location of the CANA, in an area of the neighbourhood of Saint-Louis known as La Campagne de l’Éveque, was determined in 1950: Note from Jean Baylot to the Labour Ministry on the “création d’un Centre d’hébergement destine aux Nord-Africains nécessiteux,” 22 March 1950. ADBR 138 W 57.
3 Belpeer and Fraissinet were, respectively, the founding director and president of both associations.
4 In 1954 alone, the CANA provided temporary shelter services to over 3,000 Algerian migrants: Alfred Martin, “Réalisations sociales en faveur des populations immigrés originaires d’Algérie,” 14 May 1955. ADBR 138 W 57.
5 Note on the history and activities of the CANA provided to French Prime Minister Michel Debré by the Office of the Prefect of the Bouches-du-Rhône, 4 June 1959.
7 Ibid., 1-2.
8 Conseil d’Administration du CANA, “Statuts 1950.”
including Alfred Martin and CSNA social inspectors.\textsuperscript{9} Despite the involvement of these various government authorities and experts, however, social workers from ATOM, under the supervision of Louis Belpree, were responsible for administering the CANA’s welfare initiatives.\textsuperscript{10} This arrangement effectively meant that the CANA served as an extension of ATOM’s charitable outreach, one that complemented the latter’s efforts to provide gender-based skills to adult Maghrebi women and young Maghrebi girls.

Due to the relatively slow development of specialized services for Maghrebi youth in late colonial Marseille, the CANA’s vocational pre-training program was a vital addition to the city’s North African-focused welfare network, enabling a larger number of Maghrebi youth to receive guidance under the network’s larger integrationist project. Underscoring its importance in this regard, the association received significant financial support from several government agencies to develop and maintain its operations. The construction of the facilities within which it delivered its services, for example, was funded through a 350,000-franc subsidy provided by the Interior Ministry.\textsuperscript{11} During its first year of existence, it received additional subsidies from both the Interministerial Commission for the Coordination of Muslim Social Affairs (80,000 francs) and the General Council of the Bouches-du-Rhône (35,000 francs).\textsuperscript{12}

The CANA was not the only private welfare organization in late colonial France to make job training the cornerstone of the aid it delivered to young Maghrebi men and boys. For example, the social Catholic organization Aide Morale aux Nord-Africains (AMANA, Moral Aid for North Africans)—the first charitable institution for North African migrants established in France after

\textsuperscript{11} Marc Fraissinet, “Note sur le Centre d’accueil nord-africain (CANA) de Marseille,” 20 October 1960. ADBR 138 W 57.
World War II—started offering job training and housing assistance to adolescent Algerian boys in Paris in 1947. In the early 1950s, the Association de la Maison de l’Afrique du Nord (Association of the North African House) began providing similar services to young Maghrebi men and boys living in transitional housing in Lyon.

Similar to other North African-focused action sociale initiatives, the effort that French officials, welfare specialists, and social service providers made to deliver vocational pre-training assistance to young Maghrebi men and boys grew largely out of concerns that their integration into French society represented a “problem.” Indeed, officials and welfare experts alike believed that without proper education and stable employment, young Maghrebi men and boys would experience difficulties adapting to life in France and, in turn, become isolated from, and unwilling to partake in, French society. Private welfare associations that provided vocational pre-training services sought to address these concerns by giving their clients the opportunity to improve their material and social conditions. As the CANA’s annual report for 1953 explained, trainees were taught the technical skills they needed not only to work in France, but also to become a part of the French national community. Although the main objective of this technical education was integration into French society, in the larger metropolitan context it also had important economic implications, creating what one high ranking official labelled “a category of workers” capable of contributing to “our [France’s] economic development.” In this regard, late colonial vocational pre-training services also fit under the umbrella of action sociale for adult Maghrebi men.

13 The AMANA was established in 1945: Lyons, The Civilizing Mission in the Metropole, 56.
According to Louis Belpeer, to facilitate the integration of young Muslim North African men and boys, the CANA designed its vocational pre-training program to deliver “as much knowledge as possible in the shortest amount of time.”\(^\text{18}\) Over a period lasting between two to three months, trainees were put through an intensive regime of classes in three different subjects: “enseignement académique” (general education), “initiation à la vie métropolitaine” (introduction to metropolitan life), and “préformation manuelle” (pre-training in manual labour).\(^\text{19}\) The program’s weekly training schedule, spread out over five 8-hour work days, consisted of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days per week</th>
<th>Préformation manuelle</th>
<th>Enseignement académique</th>
<th>Initiation à la vie métropolitaine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1(^\text{20})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Run by instructors from the National Education Ministry and CANA moniteurs d’adaptation,\(^\text{21}\) classes in “enseignement académique” and “initiation à la vie métropolitaine” functioned to reinforce notions of the “rules governing […] normal ways of living in metropolitan France.”\(^\text{22}\) Modelled after educational materials published by Études Sociales Nord-Africains,\(^\text{23}\) the former offered lessons in the French language, calculus, hygiene, and civics. The latter, meanwhile, focused on teaching what Belpeer referred to as “the sum of a whole series of behaviours that are extremely familiar to us [the French people] when it comes to civil status, social administration, labour legislation, social security, and family allowances.”\(^\text{24}\)


\(^{22}\) Note from Alfred Martin to prefect-IGAME Haas-Picard on the “sujet des cours de préformation professionnelle fonctionnant au Centre d’Accueil Nord-Africain de Marseille-Saint-Louis,” 9 December 1955. ADBR 138 W 56.


\(^{24}\) Belpeer, “Le Centre d’Accueil Nord-Africain de Marseille,” 2.
Finally, classes in “préformation manuelle” focused on familiarizing trainees with the different tools and skills of manual labourers. In an effort to prepare young Maghrebi men for the realities of modern French industry, the job training monitors (or moniteurs professionnels) who taught these classes placed special emphasis on the metalworking and electrical trades, excavation and demolition work, carpentry, and masonry.25 They also accompanied trainees to authentic chantiers (construction or building sites) to allow them to observe the “proper life” and “discipline” of manual labourers.26

After six weeks of instruction and training, the CANA’s stagiaires took an examination that determined whether or not they were capable of joining the French labour market or entering an adult professional job training centre. The association encouraged the majority of the trainees who passed the examination to seek employment or additional professional training as masons. It advised the trainees that it deemed the most “educated” and “adapted” to pursue careers as metalworkers or electricians. In contrast, the association considered the trainees who did not pass the examination unprepared to leave the program. As a consequence, it obligated them to take an additional period of training (or stage spécial), followed by another examination, to qualify for graduation.27

Statistics provided by the CANA in 1954 indicate that 439 clients entered the association’s vocational pre-training program during its first two years of operation. Of this number, 234 gained acceptance into several different adult professional job training centres. This result, according to the association, represented tangible evidence of the “success” it had achieved in assisting and

---

integrating young Maghrebi men.\textsuperscript{28} Beyond statistics, the association bolstered this claim by providing accounts of the achievements of individual trainees. In its activity report for 1953, for example, it recounted the case of a young Berber of Algerian origin who entered the vocational pre-training program in 1952 unable to speak French, but graduated and eventually rose to the top of his class at the adult professional job training centre in Rivesaltes.\textsuperscript{29}

The young Maghrebi men and boys who entered the CANA’s vocational pre-training program no doubt received the knowledge and skills they needed to find employment in metropolitan France. That does not mean, however, that their relationship with the association and its integrationist mission was always smooth or uncomplicated. In one incident from February 1954, thirty-four CANA trainees, unhappy with the food the association was offering them, staged a two-day protest that caught the attention of the prefecture. Asked by the prefect to investigate, then CTAM Alfred Martin reported that the protest was led by three “resisters” (réfractaires) who had put pressure on their fellow trainees to participate. Dismissing any wrongdoing on the part of the CANA, Martin noted that, with the association’s blessing, he personally intervened in the matter, expelling two of the lead protestors from the vocational pre-training program and temporarily suspending the other. Martin’s harsh response to the so-called resisters is surprising given what they were protesting. It is also odd that the CANA went along with such a harsh response, suggesting that the protest was not the first incident of trainee discontent the association had faced since its founding.\textsuperscript{30}

Nevertheless, in a few short years, the CANA had become an important cog in the North African-focused welfare network of late colonial Marseille, especially when it came to the delivery of vocational training.

\textsuperscript{30} Note from Alfred Martin to prefect-IGAME André Pelabon on the “incident au Centre d’Accueil de la Campagne l’Evêque à Marseille,” 27 February 1954. ADBR 138 W 49.
of *action sociale* to young Maghrebi men and boys. From the mid-1950s, the association’s importance in this regard would only increase as local efforts to solve the Muslim youth “problem” merged with national efforts to halt the process of decolonization in French North Africa.

**The “Problem” of Muslim Youth and North African Nationalism**

The struggle for independence from French colonial rule in North Africa added a new dimension to the “problem” of Muslim youth. In the 1950s in France and its North African colonies, a number of North African-run youth clubs and associations that had previously expressed anti-colonial sentiments joined a growing chorus of nationalist voices in openly demanding independence for Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia. In France specifically, some of the earliest youth groups to actively engage in anti-colonial nationalist activities were university student associations. The most prominent of these associations was the Association des Étudiants Musulmans Nord-Africains en France (Association of Muslim North African Students in France), a group that had existed in Paris since the late 1920s. Containing student members from all three of France’s North African colonies, it mostly focused on distributing anti-colonial pamphlets in major cities like Paris and Marseille. Occasionally, however, it also organized rallies and strikes to protest against the continuation of French colonialism.

With the outbreak of the Algerian War in November 1954, an even greater number of young Muslims became involved in the cause of anti-colonial nationalism. On 3 December 1954, one month into the war, the youth wing of Ferhat Abbas’s nationalist party Union Démocratique du Manifeste Algérien (UDMA, Democratic Union of the Algerian Manifesto) published an open
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31 Letter from the head of the Service Social Marocain of the Office of the Moroccan Protectorate in France to the Director of the Interior of the Moroccan Protectorate, 11 March 1952. CADN 1MA200, article 434.
32 For example, l’Amicale des Tunisiens de Provence (The Friends of the Tunisians of Provence), an affiliate of the Association of Muslim North African Students in France in Marseille, was prone to organizing student hunger strikes at the Cité Universitaire de Marseille: Interior Ministry, report on the “Étudiants nord-africains Aix-Marseille,” 19 March 1952. CADN 1MA200, article 434.
letter to Interior Minister François Mitterrand that called the idea that “Algeria constitutes three French departments” a “fiction designed to hide from the eyes of the world the enslavement of the Algerian people.” Other resolutions published by this group in the nationalist newspaper République Algérienne called on Algerian youth to join the fight to end the French colonial regime and form an Algerian Republic. For its part, the FLN used its newspaper organ El Moudjahid to recruit young Muslim Algerians to the nationalist struggle by explaining the benefits they would receive if they engaged in anti-colonial activities. These benefits included freedom from “colonial structures” and “the traditional authority of their fathers,” as well as an opportunity to shape Algeria’s future.

Given the fact that Morocco and Tunisia gained their independence in 1956, it should come as no surprise that French authorities became preoccupied with the anti-colonial activities of Muslim Algerian youth. Officials on both sides of the Mediterranean raised concerns about the spread of “subversive propaganda” by the FLN and other nationalist groups, arguing that it made “impressionable” young Algerians more susceptible to joining the struggle against France. Reports filed by French military officials in Algeria are littered with notes on how easily young Algerians, especially young men in their late teens and early twenties, were swayed by the FLN to abandon their jobs and families and join the “rebellion.” Some reports went so far as to suggest that young
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33 La Jeunesse de l’Union Démocratique du Manifeste Algérien (JUDMA), “Lettre ouverte de le JUDMA à M. le ministre de l’Intérieur,” La République Algérienne, 3 December 1954. CADN 21POA, article 56. Interestingly, during the interwar era, Ferhat Abbas led the Jeune Algérien (Young Algerian) movement, which demanded full equality for indigenous Algerians while at the same time acknowledging France’s sovereignty over Algeria. For a thorough analysis of the political activities of the UDMA, as well as the evolution of Ferhat Abbas’s views on the emancipation of Algeria, see Salah el Din Zein el Tayeb, “The Europeanized Algerians and the Emancipation of Algeria,” Middle Eastern Studies 22, no. 2 (1986): 206-235.

34 JUDMA, “Une résolution de la JUDMA,” La République Algérienne, 13 May 1955. CADN 21POA, article 56.

35 Mhamed Yazid, Minister of Information for the FLN’s government-in-exile during the Algerian War, “La Jeunesse Algérienne dans la Révolution,” El Moudjahid, 25 April 1960. CADN 21POA, article 53. On the role played by EL Moudjahid in the FLN’s struggle for Algerian independence, see Monique Gadant, Islam et nationalisme en Algérie d’après ‘El Moudjagid’, organe central du FLN de 1956 à 1962 (Paris: L’Harmattan, 1988). Interestingly, it was during the early years of the Algerian War that the French military launched a failed campaign to convince French youth of the value of military service. According to Jobs, the campaign largely failed due to the opposition many young people in France expressed against the conflict: Jobs, Riding the New Wave, 128-137.
men who had previously migrated to France were secretly returning to Algeria to “swell the rebel ranks.”

Members of the colonial administration in Algeria expressed similar concerns. In a report penned in 1961, for example, Mahdi Belhaddad, the prefect of the department of Batna, explained that it was not uncommon to observe young Algerians actively taking part in street demonstrations, spraying nationalist graffiti, and participating in the armed struggle. Despite expressing optimism that these youth recognized “the need to maintain close ties with France,” Belhaddad argued that they remained easy prey for FLN recruiters because their young minds were easily seduced into a “collective psychosis which leads them to feel a revolutionary soul.”

In metropolitan France, the real or potential involvement of Muslim Algerian youth in the conflict also brought added attention to the issue of Algerian migration and settlement. Official records indicate that the pattern of increased Algerian migration to France documented since the end of World War II continued well into the Algeria War, with the number of françias musulmans d’Algérie living in the metropole growing by 57,433 to over 280,000 between January 1954 and December 1955. By the end of the war, France’s Muslim Algerian population numbered over 350,000. For government authorities throughout France, the continued growth of this population in the midst of the conflict presented a number of challenges, including the potential for violence from the fighting in Algeria to spread to the metropole—a concern that in the early part of the war.

38 According to one demographic study, between 1947 and 1955, the total net migration of Algerian Muslims to France was 247,664. Jean-Jacques Rager, L’émigration en France des musulmans d’Algérie, 16-35; see also INED, Les Algériens en France, 44-47.
39 MacMaster, Colonial Migrants and Racism, 189.
was closely associated with the migration of Muslim Algerian youth. In Marseille, for example, top officials feared that the arrival of young male migrants from areas of intense fighting could have negative consequences (incidences fâcheuses) if nothing was done to place them in a “favorable physical and psychological state.”

These fears were apparently realized in October 1955, when a contingent of “impressionable” young Muslim Algerian men arrived in Marseille from the department of Constantine, which only a month earlier had experienced considerable violence following a FLN-led massacre of Europeans in the city of Philippeville. In response to their arrival, prefect IGAME Haas-Picard wrote to the Interior Ministry’s Algerian and Overseas Departments Service, warning it that some of them had come to France to “prepare for combat.” Well before the FF-FLN had formally established its tax collection system in metropolitan France to support the nationalist rebellion, he also reported: “these young Algerians were seen in a number of bars soliciting contributions and filling in a notebook the names of those who contributed. The contribution they typically demand is [10 francs].”

As the Algerian War progressed, the supposedly impressionable nature of Maghrebi youth would remain a source of concern in Marseille. In 1961, a report on “la jeunesse musulmane” that was submitted to Charles Sienne, France’s Principal Inspector of Population and Social Welfare, expressed worry about the “sensitivity” of young Muslim North Africans in the city to the “political events” happening around them. In particular, the report asserted, “their attitude varies rapidly following the fluctuations of the events in Algeria, of the political discourse pronounced
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40 Haas-Picard, “La migration musulmane algérienne en metropole.”
42 Letter from Raymond Haas-Picard to the Interior Ministry’s Algerian and Overseas Departments Service on the “Activités des nationalistes algériens à Marseille,” 19 October 1955. ADBR 137 W 382.
43 Haas-Picard, “Activités des nationalistes algériens à Marseille.”
by the representatives of the French government and the leaders of the rebellion.” Moreover, according to the report, this “sensitivity” made “the actions of the organizations who seek to satisfy the needs of Muslim North Africans difficult; in certain cases, it obstructs their actions completely.”

Thus, against the backdrop of the Algerian War, the “problème des jeunes musulmans” primarily became a problem of Algerian nationalism. One consequence of this view was that Muslim Algerian youth became the targets of the repressive measures French officials and police services employed to root out the FF-FLN. Efforts to eliminate enclaves of FLN activity and influence in the shantytowns of France’s major cities meant that young Muslim Algerians were subject to anti-bidonvilles strategies such as the physical destruction of property and forced relocations. Information on Algerians as young as nineteen was registered into the Renseignements Généraux’s anti-nationalist intelligence database, which metropolitan government officials and police services used to monitor and repress the activities of Algerian nationalist sympathizers and operatives. Young Muslim Algerian men also faced anti-FLN actions that included daily stop-and-search operations, administrative and police arrests, and weeks of internment. In 1958, a special prison camp was even established at Thol in the department of Ain to hold young men between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five who were suspected of engaging in the nationalist movement.
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46 As noted in Chapter 2, these intelligence files were regularly bolstered by information collected by SAT officers and other welfare providers and specialists. They were also supplemented by census gathering initiatives and public health inspections: House and MacMaster, Paris 1961, 67-77; Chaubin and Chevrel, “Identifier les nationalistes Algériens: les fichiers Z,” 332-339.
Repressive measures alone, however, would not deter Muslim Algerian youth from partaking in the nationalist struggle. As part of the effort that was made during the war to convince Algerians to “embrace France” through Algerian-focused welfare initiatives, officials, welfare specialists, and social service providers in France and Algeria increasingly turned to integrationist action sociale as a way to undermine the FLN’s influence among young Muslim Algerians in the metropole. In Algeria, one of the key proponents of this effort was General Maurice Challe, a French Air Force general. In a government circular released in March 1959, Challe explained that winning over young Muslim Algerians was imperative to defeating the FLN because, at over five million strong, they represented the “present” and “future” of Algérie française. To obtain the support of Muslim Algerian youth, he argued, “we must gain their trust through human contact and make them impervious to the subversive ideology of our enemy.” According to Challe, this effort entailed teaching them how to enter French culture and civilization, particularly through social services designed to facilitate their civic and national “evolution.” But it also involved improving their material conditions by making them active participants in the economic development and modernization of Algeria.

In France, similar arguments were furthered by experts at organizations like Études Sociales Nord-Africains in Paris. In a 1955 issue of its journal Cahiers Nord-Africains, which specifically addressed the topic of “Les jeunes Nord-Africains en Métropole,” the organization noted: “do not forget that close to fifty percent of the Algerian population […] is under the age of twenty.” Leaving no doubt about what it considered to be the importance of deterring this young
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50 Maurice Challe, “Instruction,” 4 March 1959. ANOM ALG 4SAS/91. Along with supporting the use of action sociale to win over young Muslim Algerian’s, Challe launched a military pacification effort in 1959 to eliminate the Armée de Libération Nationale (ALN, National Liberation Army), the armed wing of the FLN. Only two years after writing this circular, however, Challe would go on to participate in the Algiers putsch of April 1961, the failed coup d’état against President de Gaulle that was launched in an effort to prevent Algeria’s independence: Maurice Faivre, “Le Plan Challe,” Revue Historique des Armées, no. 1 (2005): 108-117.
population from becoming involved in the nationalist struggle, the organization asserted that specialized measures needed to be taken “by our [French] action sociale” to prevent them from becoming “destitute” or potential “threats.”

In the specific case of young Muslim men and boys of Algerian origin living in metropolitan France during the Algerian War, French officials and welfare experts continued to view the issue of their integration through an economic lens. For example, writing in Cahiers Nord-Africains’s 1955 issue on “Les jeunes Nord-Africains en Métropole,” Elisabeth Malet, the North African affairs liaison for the Social Security office of Paris, identified “labour, apprenticeship, and vocational training” as the tools necessary to encourage the “civic and social development” of young Muslim Algerian men living in France. In the same year, prefect-IGAME Haas-Picard argued that solving the problem of young Muslim Algerian males’ integration in the wake of the “events in Algeria” involved helping them join the national labour market. Beyond such arguments, other high ranking bureaucrats, echoing claims made by top officials before 1954, labelled young male migrants from France’s colonies a “force” essential to the economic development of the metropole. In particular, they considered young Muslim Algerian men a source of labour that was vital to meeting the demands of France’s booming post-World War II economy and to maintaining its continued growth.

Another factor that encouraged the continuation of this economically-based integrationist strategy was the apparent enthusiasm of young Muslim Algerian men and boys. Social service providers reported that many young male Muslim Algerian clients came to them in hopes of
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53 Haas-Picard, “La migration musulmane algérienne en métropole.”
54 High Committee on the Youth of France and the Overseas Territories, “Réunion inaugurale,” 12 July 1955, 3-4. CAC 19860269, article 2.
acquiring vocational training or pre-training assistance. For example, after failing to gain acceptance into a vocational training school in Paris, one sixteen-year-old boy wrote to an AMANA social worker in 1955 requesting that she help him enter another training program so that he could learn a trade. In another case, an eighteen-year-old boy, who had previously left France after failing to find employment there, wrote to the AMANA to express his desire to return to the metropole and, with the association’s assistance, “make a living.”55

For all of these reasons, officials and experts considered specialized services that focused on teaching young Muslim Algerian men the same skills as metropolitan French workers essential to strengthening their social and economic ties to France and to convincing them to embrace modern French civilization.56 As a result, government authorities stressed the importance of both public and private sector welfare initiatives that delivered those types of services to male Muslim youth in France and Algeria,57 and government agencies allocated funds to support their operations.

Promoting Préformation Professionnelle during the Algerian War

The French commitment to providing social aid through préformation professionnelle was signalled in 1955 when the Labour Ministry announced plans to establish as many as four new job training centres throughout the metropole that would exclusively serve young Muslim Algerian male clients.58 By 1960, private welfare associations and government programs in the departments of the Bouches-du-Rhône, Moselle, Nord, Rhône, and Seine offered twenty-three different

vocational pre-training courses to young Muslim Algerian men and boys.\textsuperscript{59} During the last four years of the Algerian War, these services were primarily funded by the FAS, which in 1961 alone dedicated over five million francs of its annual budget to job training programs and other youth and family services that targeted Algerians living in France.\textsuperscript{60}

As part of the modernization efforts of the Constantine Plan, the FAS also provided financial support to associations that offered job training assistance to young Muslim men and boys in Algeria.\textsuperscript{61} Chief among these associations was the Service de Formation des Jeunes en Algérie (SFJA, Service for the Training of Young Algerians), which was founded in December 1958 by the General Delegation in Algeria.\textsuperscript{62} Run by officials from French Algeria’s Office of Civil and Military Affairs, the SFJA worked closely with colonial civilian and military authorities to provide complimentary services to the “traditional services” offered by the Algerian branches of the Ministries of Education, Labour, Agriculture, and Industry.\textsuperscript{63} Its principal objective, given the ongoing war, was to simultaneously “destroy the myth of the FLN and exalt the French homeland,”\textsuperscript{64} by providing undereducated male and female Muslim youth a basic education, teaching them their civic rights and duties, and preparing them for participation in “French” Algeria’s industrialization and modernization.\textsuperscript{65} Through these initiatives, it was also assumed that the SFJA’s young clients would develop “pride in being French.”\textsuperscript{66}

\textsuperscript{59} CTAM report, second trimester 1960. ADBR 138 W 17.  
\textsuperscript{60} FAS, “Rapport d’activité: année 1961.” CAC 19770391, article 2.  
\textsuperscript{61} André J. Villeneuve, lead member of the working group on “social welfare” for the President of the Council on Algerian Affairs, “Compte-Rendu d’Activité,” 1959. ANOM FM 81F 190.  
\textsuperscript{63} Ibid; General Delegate of the Government and the Commander in Chief of the Forces in Algeria, “Projet d’arrêté créant un Service de la Jeunesse en Algérie,” 19 November 1958. ANOM FM 81F 75.  
\textsuperscript{64} While the SFJA was established in December 1958, it came after months of efforts to establish a large social aid program for Muslim youth in Algeria: “Fiche concernant le Service Central de la Jeunesse chargé du rassemblement, de la formation et de l’emploi de la jeunesse,” 10 September 1958. ANOM FM 81F 75.  
\textsuperscript{65} SFJA, “Plan d’action du service de formation des jeunes en Algérie pour l’année 1959,” 2. ANOM FM 81F 1554;  
\textsuperscript{66} “Fiche concernant le Service Central de la Jeunesse chargé du rassemblement, de la formation et de l’emploi de la jeunesse.”
To accomplish its objectives, the SFJA ran a variety of “adaptation” centres, including a series of vocational pre-training centres (or Centres de Formation des Jeunes en Algérie) for young male clients between the ages of fourteen and twenty.\(^6^7\) Similar to the vocational pre-training services offered to young Maghrebi men in metropolitan France, these pre-training centres were designed to familiarize the SFJA’s clients with the realities of modern industry and to transform them into modern workers capable of aiding the development of late colonial Algeria’s various industrial and agricultural enterprises. But the SFJA also envisioned that some of its clients would go on to receive additional training at adult professional job training centres in metropolitan France, which they likened to an additional “phase of instruction” in the “discipline and habits of Western life” that would ensure their social, cultural, and economic “progress.”\(^6^8\)

In Marseille, the belief that vocational pre-training could simultaneously integrate young Muslim Algerian men into French society and turn them away from the nationalist rebellion meant that the CANA remained an invaluable organization within the North African-focused welfare network. In the months prior to the Algerian War, the CANA had already expressed interest in “definitively” narrowing its focus to “serving […] as a level of preparation” for “jeunes Algériens.”\(^6^9\) After the outbreak of the conflict, it considered this shift in focus a necessity. Indeed, commenting on the operations of the CANA in 1957, Louis Belpeer argued that, in placing special focus on preparing young Muslim Algerian men and boys to enter “l’industrie métropolitaine,” the association contributed to “reinforcing the links between Algeria and the metropole.”\(^7^0\)

---

67 In addition to the Centres de Formation des Jeunes en Algérie, the SFJA ran separate Sports Centres (Foyers Sportifs) and Youth Centres (Foyers de Jeunes): SFJA, “Plan d’action du service de formation des jeunes en Algérie pour l’année 1959,” 2-5.
As part of its new focus on exclusively assisting and integrating Muslim Algerian clients, the CANA also sought to spread its services to more young Algerian men and boys, increasing the number of trainees it admitted into its vocational pre-training program from 355 in 1954 to 558 in 1955. In 1955, to accommodate even more trainees, the association received a 45,000-franc subsidy from the Interior Ministry to construct a new pavilion at its centre in the neighbourhood of Saint-Louis. Finished in 1959, this pavilion, which consisted of four classrooms and a recreation centre, enabled the CANA to increase the maximum number of clients it could accept into each instructional unit from forty to eighty. Tied to this development, the association began in 1959 to receive a monthly contingent of forty trainees from youth centres in Algeria. This practice, which functioned to coordinate efforts between youth services in France and Algeria, was considered by leading officials and welfare experts an important means of extending to young Muslim men living in Algeria the “benefits” of “contact with metropolitan social and economic life.”

Over the course of the Algerian War, the CANA provided vocational pre-training support to over 2,500 young Muslim Algerian men and boys. By 1962, however, it was not the only

71 Of the 913 clients the CANA served between 1954 and 1956, 662 gained acceptance into forty-one different FPA centres. Martin, “Analyse des principes de fonctionnement et des méthodes d’enseignement des sections de préparation à la FPA: fonctionnant au Centre d’accueil de Marseille,” 2.
73 Fraissinet, “Note sur le Centre d’accueil nord-africain (CANA) de Marseille.”
74 Haas-Picard, “Projet d’extension des possibilités de préformation professionnelle du Centre d’Accueil Nord-Africain à Marseille”; Plenier, “La Jeunesse Musulman,” 5. The total cost to build the new pavillon came in at over 100,000 francs: Note on the “Projet d’aménagement au centre d’accueil nord-africain de Marseille-St. Louis,” delivered to prefect-IGAME Haas-Picard, 18 February 1959, 1. ADBR 138 W 57.
76 French officials in Algeria discussed sending as many as 5,000 adolescent Muslim Algerian boys between the ages of fourteen and nineteen to France annually to realize this goal: Secretariat of the State of Algeria, “Plein emploi de la jeunesse musulmane urbaine d’Algérie. Réunion interministérielle du 28 janvier 1958,” 3.
77 The most complete statistics provided by the CANA indicate that it provided job training support to 2,667 clients from June 1952 to June 1960: Marc Fraissinet, “Note sur le Centre d’accueil nord-africain (CANA) de Marseille,” 20 October 1960. ADBR 138 W 57.
organization of its kind in Marseille. Efforts to integrate young Muslim Algerian men in Marseille also included an initiative spearheaded in 1955 by the prefecture and ATOM to develop a new private welfare association, the Pre-Training Centre of Marseille (CPM), in the neighbourhood of La Croix-Rouge that, like the CANA, focused on the delivery of vocational pre-training services. According to Louis Belpeer, this initiative was part of an effort to advance the vocational pre-training training assistance available to young Muslim Algerian men in the city from a “laboratory” to an “industrial” stage. In total, four government agencies, including the FAS, committed funds to support the construction and operations of the CPM.

Opened in October 1961, the new association was significantly larger than the CANA, containing enough space to house and train units of 250 clients over instructional periods lasting as long as two and a half months. Following educational and training models developed at the CANA, the CPM estimated that the new centre could accommodate as many as 2,000 young Muslim Algerian men per year. Like the CANA, the CPM also extended its reach beyond the Marseille region, pledging before it opened to maintain a quota of trainees recruited directly from Algeria that would not drop below 65 percent.

---

78 ATOM, “Projet de création d’un centre d’accueil et de régulation à Marseille,” 20 September 1955. ADBR 138 W 56. Interestingly, the CPM was established on 18 April 1958, but did not begin operating until the fall of 1961: General Secretariat of Algerian Affairs, “Protocole relatif aux obligations et à la répartition des compétences entre les départements ministériels appelés à participer à la préformation professionnelle dispensée au Centre de Marseille,” 1959, 1. ADBR 239 J 2.


80 In addition to the FAS, the Interior and Labour Ministries, as well as the General Delegation of the French Government in Algeria all contributed funds to the CPM: Fraissinet, “Note sur le Centre d’accueil nord-africain (CANA) de Marseille”; Martin, “Note sur l’action sociale spécialisée dans les Bouches-du-Rhône en faveur des populations musulmanes algériennes,” 20 May 1960, 8. In 1959 alone, the FAS contributed 70,000 francs to the CPM’s construction: General Secretariat of Algerian Affairs, “Protocole relatif aux obligations et à la répartition des compétences entre les départements ministériels appelés à participer à la préformation professionnelle dispensée au Centre de Marseille,” 2.


82 ATOM, “Projet de création d’un centre d’accueil et de régulation à Marseille.”

83 General Secretariat of Algerian Affairs, “Protocole relatif aux obligations et à la répartition des compétences entre les départements ministériels appelés à participer à la préformation professionnelle dispensée au Centre de Marseille,” 1.
The creation of the CPM marked an important turning point in the daily operations of the CANA. As CTAM Yves Bourdonneau explained in early 1962, upon its opening, the new centre “took over […] the programs and goals of the CANA,” becoming the exclusive provider of vocational pre-training assistance to young Muslim Algerian men between the ages of seventeen and twenty-five in Marseille. In response to this change, the CANA reoriented its focus to integrating adolescent Muslim Algeria boys between the ages of fourteen and seventeen into the “modern, industrial, and Western world.” In reorienting its focus in this way, the association explained that it sought to prevent adolescent Muslim Algerian boys from falling into “moral danger” and becoming a “danger” to public order.

Thus, far from being a simple shift in focus, the CANA’s reorganization responded to heightened concerns about Muslim Algerian children and adolescents that arose in the final years of the war, particularly in the context of the ongoing migration of Muslim Algerian families to France. Indeed, in the early 1960s, as we have already noted, Alfred Martin began to raise concerns about the growing presence of under-educated or poorly-raised Muslim Algerian youth in Marseille who he claimed were “susceptible to every kind of perversion.” Around the same time, similar concerns were expressed by CANA president Fraissinet. Writing to prefect-IGAME Haas-Picard in February 1960, Fraissinet linked the ever-growing number of Muslim Algerian families living in the city, which surpassed 2,500 by the end of the conflict, to the development of “an Algerian adolescence living on the margins of society.” Without providing any evidence to

---

84 Note from Yves Bourdonneau to prefect-IGAME Haas-Picard, 17 March 1962. CAC 19850021, article 12.
85 Official plans to reorient the CANA’s focus were announced in April 1961: CANA, “Projet de reconversion,” April 1961. CAC 19850021, article 73; Note from Raymond Haas-Picard to the Interior Ministry on the “Projet de reconversion du centre d’accueil nord-africain,” 8 June 1961, 2. ADBR 138 W 57.
86 CANA, undated report on “Service ‘Adolescents’: Fonctionnement.” CAC 19850021, article 73.
87 Martin, “Problèmes posés par les jeunes musulmans algériens,” 1.
89 Note from Marc Fraissinet to prefect-IGAME Haas-Picard on “le problème des jeunes algériens,” 3 February 1960, 3. ADBR 138 W 61.
support his claim, Fraissinet also argued that most Muslims of Algerian origin under the age of seventeen who had moved to France with their families were poorly educated and, as a result, had trouble integrating into “la vie métropolitaine.” Reflecting the views of an expert well versed in the “problems” of the Maghrebi presence in the metropole, he blamed young Muslim Algerians’ poor education and integration on their families’ “pedantic traditionalism.” Moreover, he claimed that the maintenance of pre-migratory traditions within Muslim Algerian families made “jeunes Algériens” vulnerable not only to becoming isolated and unemployed, but also to finding themselves “in moral danger” and free to engage in “all kinds of degradation.”

Despite these concerns, however, very little was done in Marseille during the Algerian War to develop specialized services and programs for Muslim Algerian children and adolescents. By 1962, ATOM and the CIMADE, the main providers of social assistance to Muslim Algerian children and adolescents in the city, only contained enough spaces in their separate youth services to accommodate 175 clients. For experts like Martin, this gap in the reach of local North African-focused welfare associations represented a serious problem, especially given the fact that, by 1960, Marseille contained the majority of the approximately 6,500 Muslims of Algerian origin under the age of sixteen living in the Bouches-du-Rhône. In this context, the CANA’s decision to redirect its attention to adolescent Muslim boys of Algerian origin was a welcome development for those involved in the North African-focused welfare network. As prefect-IGAME Haas-Picard explained in a 1961 report on the CANA’s reorganization, the association’s experience and expertise could now be used to bring into existence a “supplementary course of action” that would “ensure the encadrement and advancement” of an even younger group of Muslim Algerians.

---

90 Ibid., 2.
91 CTAM report, second trimester 1962.
92 Martin, “Problèmes posés par les jeunes musulmans algériens,” 1.
way, it can also be argued that in reorienting its focus to a younger group of clients, the CANA strategically redirected its operations so that it could maintain an important position within the welfare network.

The reorganized CANA began accepting new clients in February 1962, one month before the public announcement of the Evian Accords. Consisting of space for dormitories and a number of classrooms, it functioned as a boarding school where upwards of 48 adolescent boys resided for ten months while they received educational training based on an integrationist curriculum. During this ten-month training program, clients attended classes in remedial education and “initiation à la vie moderne” (initiation into modern life) that aimed to improve their literacy and provide them a basic education. Similar to the services previously offered by the CANA under its vocational pre-training program, clients also received instruction in “enseignement manuel et technique” (manual and technical instruction)—a class devoted to teaching them the knowledge and skills they needed to eventually find employment in France.94 Thus, despite its shift in focus to adolescent boys, the CANA remained until the end of the Algerian War committed to facilitating the integration of male Muslim Algerian youth by transforming them into modern French workers. This commitment was further expressed in an official report on the CANA’s activities from March 1962, which explained that the association’s main objective was to prepare its adolescent clients for entrance into either the CPM or other technical education programs that would provide them with further vocational training.95

Related to this main objective, the reorganized CANA also envisioned “removing” young Muslim Algerian clients, especially those who it considered poorly educated and at “moral risk,” from “the relative or absolute isolation in which they live.” Far from being forced to enter the ten-

94 Ibid., 2-3.
month training program, however, clients applied to enter it, and therefore engaged with the association voluntarily. Moreover, upon their acceptance into the program, clients’ families paid the association a monthly 60-franc “participation” fee. The suggestion here is that the CANA targeted clients from families who expressed a desire to integrate, despite their presumed backwardness. Underscoring its interest in closely monitoring the social, cultural, and economic integration of its clients and their families, the association noted before the new training program opened that it preferred to admit “adolescents whose parents live in France, and as much as possible in the Marseille region, in order to stay in stay in constant contact with their families.”96

The CANA and the “Problem” of Muslim Youth after Decolonization

Algeria formally declared its independence in July 1962. Three months later, in October 1962, the CANA admitted a group of 48 adolescent Muslim Algerian boys into its ten-month training program.97 This development signified that, although the Algerian War may have ended, the association’s effort to integrate young Muslim Algerian males into French society had not. Indeed, in the decade after Algerian independence, a familiar pattern emerged at the CANA. Similar to other welfare associations with roots in late colonial Marseille’s North African-focused welfare network, the CANA reiterated its commitment to managing and solving the “problem” of Muslim youth. More specifically, it continued to request subsidies from the FAS and other government agencies on the basis of responding to the needs of “young” or “adolescent” Muslim Algerian boys.

The strongest advocate for continuity at the association was Louis Belpeer who, in addition to retaining his position at ATOM, stayed on as the CANA’s director after 1962. Writing to the FAS in February 1963, for example, Belpeer expressed his hope that the agency would “continue

to help us to sustain an effort that has already achieved tangible results and whose success is certain in the Algerian milieu.”\textsuperscript{98} For Belpeer, despite over a decade of “tangible results,” the CANA’s work was not yet complete, a claim he bolstered by underscoring the continuing presence of “undereducated” Muslim Algerian youth in Marseille who required further integration “due to the circumstances in which they [live].”\textsuperscript{99}

In the immediate aftermath of the Algerian War, Belpeer’s arguments were positively received by several members of the FAS’s board of directors, including Michel Massenet, a fierce supporter of the maintenance of specialized services for Muslim Algerians.\textsuperscript{100} In an April 1963 meeting, Massenet and two other FAS board members not only spoke in favour of granting funds to the CANA, but also “emphasized the desirability of […] an institution of this kind in a region like Marseille where there are a large number of young Algerians, some who are recent arrivals to France and as a result are insufficiently adapted to the life of our country.”\textsuperscript{101} This claim, at least for a short period of time, managed to sway the majority of the FAS’s board of directors to support the CANA in its effort to provide aid exclusively to adolescent Muslim Algerian boys. By October 1964, funds allocated by the FAS even enabled the CANA to expand its services to more Muslim Algerian clients, bringing the number of adolescent boys of Algerian immigrant origin it admitted into its ten-month training program from 48 to 72.\textsuperscript{102}

Within a few short years, however, the CANA followed other local welfare associations like ATOM and LOGIREM in gradually abandoning its exclusive focus on Muslim Algerian clients and turning its attention to reaching a broader group of clients of varying ethnic and national

\textsuperscript{98} Letter from Louis Belpeer to the president of the FAS, 6 February 1963. CAC 19850021, article 18.
\textsuperscript{99} Letter from Louis Belpeer to the director of the FAS, 30 January 1964. CAC 19850021, article 20.
\textsuperscript{100} After serving as Délégué à l’action sociale pour les français musulmans de l’Algérie en métropole, Massenet was named the director of the Direction de la population et des migrations (DPM) in 1966: Lyons, “Social Welfare, French Muslims and Decolonization in France,” 81-86.
\textsuperscript{101} Meeting of the FAS board of directors, 19 Avril 1963. CAC 19850021, article 73.
\textsuperscript{102} Letter from Belpeer to the director of the FAS, 13 October 1964. CAC 19850021, article 20.
origins. The first indication of this shift comes from the CANA’s activity report for 1966, which reveals that while adolescent Muslim Algerian boys continued to occupy the largest number of spaces at the association, they were joined, in growing number, by adolescent males from a variety of immigrant families. During the first three months of 1966, for example, 60 (or 83 percent) of the 72 clients accommodated by the association were classified as “algériens.” The remaining spaces were occupied by 6 “tunisiens,” 2 “marocains,” 3 “Français musulmans” or harkis, and 1 “africain noir.” These numbers remained relatively consistent until October 1966, when the number of clients accommodated by the CANA expanded to 100. As part of this expansion, the association opened its doors to 16 adolescent boys from gitan families. After 1966, the clientele accommodated by the association would broaden even further with the inclusion of clients from Middle Eastern and European immigrant families, as well as “metropolitan” French families.

Thus, on the surface, the CANA began in the mid-1960s to move away from an exclusive focus on adolescent Muslim Algerian boys. However, similar to the approaches taken by other local North African-focused welfare associations after 1962, its shift away from Algerian-focused integrationist action sociale far from constituted a clean break from its colonial origins and past. A closer look at the objectives outlined by the CANA after it began to diversify its clientele reveals that its mandate to solve the “problem” of Muslim youth remained unaltered. Indeed, even after the association began to welcome clients of non-North African immigrant origin into its youth training program, it placed considerable emphasis on assisting “jeunes nord-africains,” a broader category that, as we have already observed, had come to include Algerians, Moroccans, Tunisians, harkis, and gitans. For the CANA, the children of North African immigrants, especially adolescent

---


104 According to CANA records, the first adolescent boys from European immigrant and “metropolitan” French families to enter the association’s youth training program did so in 1967: CANA, “Rapport d’activités pour l’année 1968,” 1; see also CANA, “Rapport d’activités pour l’année 1970,” 1. CAC 19850021, article 94.
boys, continued to be a source of concern and, more than any other group of young people—immigrant or otherwise—in Marseille, required its special assistance. The association’s ongoing preoccupation with young Maghrebi or Muslim North African clients in this regard was also recognized by national government agencies like the FAS and the SLPM, which into the 1970s continued to describe the CANA as “a centre that accommodates young North African boys.”

An examination of the CANA’s postcolonial activities suggests that its ongoing preoccupation with adolescent boys of North African immigrant origin had a lot to do with the attention it devoted to accommodating clients living in shantytowns and transitional housing. Statistics reported by Belppeer in 1967 indicate that 53 percent of the clients accommodated by the CANA in 1966 came from families living in bidonvilles or cités de transit. Two years later, in its activity report for 1968, the association noted that, alone, 55 percent of its clients lived in shantytowns or other “derelict areas,” while another 18 percent lived in cités d’urgence. To justify these numbers, the association consistently raised concerns about adolescent Maghrebi boys who lived in shantytowns and other housing situations it labelled “unfavorable,” suggesting that, on the whole, they were either poorly educated or completely illiterate and in significant need of an “initiation into modern life.”

In this regard, the CANA’s postcolonial operations fell in line with those of other local providers of specialized youth services like the ARENA and the CDIN, who dedicated the majority of their attention to assisting children and adolescents from shantytown-dwelling North African immigrant families.

---

105 Meeting of the FAS board of directors, 16 février 1967. CAC 19850021, article 37; see also SLPM, “Action sociale spécialisée en faveur des travailleurs étrangers dans les Bouches-du-Rhône,” 7-10.
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But the CANA’s fixation with integrating adolescent Maghrebi boys was not limited to the issue of housing. Into the 1970s, the association’s administrators also singled out boys from North African immigrant families—whether they lived in shantytowns, transitional housing, or “normal” housing—for their apparent proclivity to “settle into marginality and squarely turn their backs on society.” Reporting on the CANA’s operations in 1974, Belpser argued that it was not uncommon for Maghrebi boys, once they reached the age of fifteen, to form gangs, engage in suspicious activities, and “follow a pattern of pre-delinquency that very quickly leads to crime.” As evidence to support this claim, he noted that 42 percent of the young men under supervision at the Centre for the Observation of Minors at Marseille’s Baumettes Prison were of “North African” origin. According to Belpser, without proper guidance, adolescent Maghrebi boys ran the risk of completely descending into criminality, a development that, in his opinion, increased their chances of experiencing “rejection” and “xenophobia” and becoming fully excluded from the rest of French society.109

Here again we see the self-perpetuating nature of integrationist efforts that targeted the Maghrebi population of postcolonial Marseille at work. Even as the CANA worked to prevent adolescent Maghrebi boys from experiencing discrimination and becoming marginalized, it blamed these outcomes on problems that, in its view, stemmed from an inability to adequately integrate into French society. Other welfare specialists and providers, as noted earlier, explicitly linked young Muslim North Africans’ engagement in delinquent behaviours to the enduring presence of traditional, and supposedly backward, immigrant family milieus on metropolitan French soil. The experts who worked for the CANA were no different. In the association’s activity report for 1972, they laid social and professional “handicaps” like juvenile delinquency at the feet of Muslim North African families who continued to practice habits and behaviours that apparently

did not “fit in our [French] society.” As a result of the “maladjustment” of their families, CANA experts insisted that adolescent Maghrebi boys exhibited “characteristics such as personality disorders, emotional immaturity, delayed physical development, impulsivity, and physical or mental impairments.” Also concerning for these experts was that, even among their own Maghrebi clients, “this maladjustment manifests itself in insufficient work, irregular effort, a lack of attention, and a disinterest in the disciplines being taught.”

Clearly the links the CANA drew between maladjusted Muslim North African families and “handicaps” like juvenile delinquency had echoes of late colonial characterizations of poorly adapted Muslim youth as a potential threat. When the association turned to offer solutions to this “problem,” however, it revealed that its attitudes about—and approach towards—assisting and integrating its adolescent male clients had become more multifaceted since the end of the Algerian War. In the late 1960s in particular, it began to shift its attention away from simply using vocational pre-training services to integrate adolescent boys. In place of this more narrow focus, it turned to underscoring the need to facilitate the comprehensive, or “global,” transformation of entire families. This shift, as we have already seen, came to define action familiale initiatives undertaken in postcolonial Marseille. By 1975, part of this shift at the CANA even involved opening a new préformation féminine program offering vocational pre-training to adolescent Maghrebi girls. But, as Belppeer explained in 1967, it also involved working to ensure that the socio-educative services offered to women and girls from immigrant families in Marseille “found their extension in the development of the adolescent boys living alongside them.”

Further insight into what the shift in the CANA’s postcolonial strategy entailed is offered by Belppeer’s report on the association’s operations from 1974. According to Belppeer, even though

---

vocational pre-training remained an important aspect of the CANA’s mandate, its priorities no longer rested solely on “an economic preoccupation orienting […] adolescents to the working world.” In addition to a *préformation professionnelle*, he explained the association believed its clients required “a preventative treatment (*prophylaxie*) of their civic character aimed at normalizing their activities and inserting them into the social fabric” of France. In other words, the effort it made to integrate its adolescent male clients no longer entailed simply teaching them how to work in France and guiding them into the national labour market. It now required what Belppeer referred to as an “insertion socio-économique et socio-culturelle.”

In other activity reports published in the late 1960s and early 1970s, the CANA insisted that its new approach to integrating its clients focused more on facilitating their “personal development” so that they could properly “advance” into a “normal life.” By implementing this new approach, the association thus carved itself out an ever-expanding role in local efforts to shape the behaviours and habits of adolescent boys from North African and other immigrant families. Indeed, as the association asserted in 1973, its new approach “permitted” it “to intervene in every moment of everyday life to suggest to our students how they should behave or to rectify their behaviour as needed (manner of dress, interpersonal and social relations, cleanliness, etc.). In short, it is the constant application of an education in practical life skills.”

In moving towards an integrationist approach that valued teaching its adolescent male clients how to live in French society over training them how to work in it, the CANA made a number of changes to its postcolonial practices. In the terminology it used to describe its clients, for example, it gradually abandoned the label *stagiaire* (trainee) in favour of the term *élève*.

---


At the same time, in place of the late colonial moniker “centre de préformation” (pre-training centre), the association began to refer to itself as a “centre scolaire” (educational centre). On the surface, these terminological changes seem rather innocuous, especially given the fact that the association had exclusively specialized in assisting school-aged youth since 1962. But the shift away from even a terminological emphasis on vocational pre-training does serve to underscore the effort the association made to forge a new direction in the way it approached the integration of its young clients.

More concrete evidence of the CANA’s effort to forge a new integrationist approach can be found in the changes it made to how it evaluated its clients’ adjustment to life in France. As the association’s annual report for 1970 explained, it no longer based its evaluation of the “personal development” and “evolution” of its young clients solely on what schools, job training centres, apprenticeship programs, or jobs they moved on to after receiving its assistance—the evaluative approach it followed during the late colonial period. Instead, it placed a greater emphasis on assessing the ethnic, cultural, and residential environments in which its clients lived, as well as the level of personal development they achieved under the association’s supervision—a more intensive approach that measured their open-mindedness to adopting majority French social and cultural norms.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined the efforts that were made by the Centre d’Accueil Nord-Africain de Marseille to solve the “problème des jeunes musulmans” in late colonial and postcolonial Marseille. For French officials and welfare experts, the “problem” of young Muslims’
integration became a growing concern after World War II in the context of the increased migration and settlement of Maghrebi families. They believed that Maghrebi youth ran the risk of becoming isolated from the rest of French society if services were not provided to help them properly adjust to life in France. Opened in 1952, the CANA’s response to this concern was to develop a gender-based vocational pre-training program that sought to help young Maghrebi men and boys integrate into metropolitan French society by transforming them into modern French workers.

The CANA’s vocational pre-training program gained added importance during the Algerian War amid growing concerns about the involvement of Muslim Algerian youth in the Algerian nationalist movement. In the early stages of the conflict, *préformation professionnelle* was identified as an important means of pulling male Muslim Algerian youth away from the FLN and towards French society. By the late 1950s, government agencies like the FAS contributed substantial funds to welfare associations in France and Algeria that provided job training services exclusively to young Algerian Muslim men and boys. In Marseille, the importance accorded to vocational pre-training was underscored not only by efforts that were made to increase the capacity of the CANA, but also by the development of a new, and substantially larger association, the CPM. Opened in late 1961, the CPM replaced the CANA as the exclusive provider of vocational pre-training assistance to young Muslim Algerian men between the ages of seventeen and twenty-five in Marseille. In turn, the CANA shifted its attention to offering vocational pre-training to a younger clientele, opening in the waning months of the Algerian War a new ten-month training program that targeted adolescent Muslim Algerian boys between the ages of fourteen and seventeen.

After 1962, the CANA made a concerted effort to maintain an exclusive focus on adolescent Muslim Algerian boys, particularly those living in Marseille’s shantytowns and transitional housing complexes. But, like other North African-focused welfare associations in the city that exclusively targeted Muslim Algerian clients during the Algerian War, its postcolonial
preoccupation with Muslim Algerian youth did not last. By the mid-1960s, it expanded its services to youth of other ethnic and national origins. At the same time, it made changes to the way it approached and evaluated its clients’ integration, replacing its long-held emphasis on creating modern French workers with a more balanced model that placed equal emphasis on their social, cultural, and economic advancement, as well as their “personal development.” These changes did not signify, however, that the association had abandoned its late colonial origins and goals. Well into the 1970s, adolescent boys from North African immigrant families remained its main clientele. More importantly, the association continued to follow its founding mandate to solve the “problem” of Muslim youth, placing particular emphasis on efforts to counter the negative influences of supposedly backward and inferior North African immigrant family environments. For the CANA, young Muslim North Africans still required special attention and assistance.

In the postcolonial era, even though most young Muslims of North African immigrant origin held French citizenship, the fact they continued to be viewed as a special case underscores that their place in French society was far from straightforward. Whether intended or not, claims furthered by administrators at the CANA and other associations that the integration of young Muslims still required work fed into official and media discourses that both stereotyped North African immigrants and their descendants as different and labelled their very presence in France a “problem.” These discourses, already articulated before 1975, began in the 1980s to directly associate second-generation Maghrebis with an even larger “immigrant” problem. Young males of Muslim Algerian descent received the bulk of this attention. In particular, they were singled out by government officials, politicians, and members of the French press for their supposed criminality and tendency to reject integration. In this regard, North African immigrants and their
descendants faced ongoing discrimination, which only served to strengthen the exclusion some felt from the rest of French society.\textsuperscript{118}

\textsuperscript{118} House, “The Colonial and Post-Colonial Dimensions of Algerian Migration to France.”
Conclusion

This dissertation has explored how French officials, welfare specialists, and social service providers in Marseille responded to the immigration of Muslims from the Maghreb region of North Africa in the three decades following World War II. French officials and welfare experts associated Maghrebis with a number of customs and behaviours that they considered backward and antithetical to majority French social and cultural norms. Their answer to this “problem” was to undertake a project, underscored by the development of specialized action sociale services and programs, to “integrate” Maghrebis into modern French society by persuading them to abandon their presumed inferiorities while teaching them to adopt a “French” lifestyle.

In the late colonial era, a network of North African-focused welfare associations run by either metropolitan government institutions, colonial government agencies, or private charities formed the backbone of this integrationist project. Because of Marseille’s position as France’s principal Mediterranean port and key point of contact with its three North African colonies, this welfare network broadly sought to help Muslims from Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia socially, culturally, and economically adjust to their new lives in the metropole. At the same time, the officials, specialists, and social service providers who worked within this network promoted a gender-based approach to integrationist North African-focused action sociale. On the one hand, they provided professional job training to Maghrebi men as a means of creating modern French workers. On the other, they provided home economics training to Maghrebi women as a means of creating modern French homemakers. In taking this approach, French officials and welfare experts believed that Maghrebis’ successful integration into French society would only come once they adequately fulfilled their supposedly natural gender roles. Such an approach also reveals the paternalist logic that informed North African-focused action sociale initiatives, accentuated by the belief that a proper and successful integration could only happen under French tutelage.
Decolonization brought about the intensification of efforts to integrate the Maghrebi population of Marseille, underscored by the involvement of national government welfare agencies such as the FAS and the SONACOTRAL, as well as the latter’s subsidiary LOGIREM. In the process, French officials and welfare experts began to exclusively target *français musulmans d’Algérie*, who had acquired French citizenship in the aftermath of World War II. Faced with the threat of losing the jewel of France’s colonial empire, they began to employ specialized welfare services and programs as tools to simultaneously strengthen Muslim Algerians’ ties to France and weaken their ties to the FLN and its fight for independence. Concomitantly, during the Algerian War of Independence, they increasingly made it possible for the operations of the North African-focused welfare network to overlap with those of a separate network of anti-nationalist surveillance and repression. From the outset of the conflict, welfare specialists such as the IGAME and CTAMs of France’s ninth military district contributed to the actions of both networks. By 1959, the CTAMs oversaw the operations of the SAT, a new Algerian-focused welfare association that helped gather intelligence on Marseille’s Muslim Algerian residents. By that year, other local North African-focused welfare associations had also begun to engage in initiatives, including shantytown clearance and re-housing operations, to remove Muslim Algerians from areas of FLN influence.

The exclusive targeting of *français musulmans d’Algérie* during decolonization did not stop Algeria from obtaining its independence. It did, however, contribute to the development of *la méthode marseillaise*, a major, but flawed, social housing program to assist and integrate shantytown-dwelling Muslim Algerian families, which became the central focus of Marseille’s North African-focused welfare network in the final years of the Algerian War. It also positioned the welfare network to take on a central role in responding to the mass repatriation movement that accompanied the end of the conflict in 1962. For those and other reasons, welfare specialists and providers who operated within the welfare network were able to both justify and maintain services
and programs that exclusively sought to integrate Muslim Algerian clients in the years immediately following Algerian independence. However, by the mid-1960s, as part of a larger effort to forget the colonial origins of North African-focused integrationist action sociale initiatives throughout metropolitan France, they made their services available to clients of all national and ethnic origins. In the process, Marseille’s North African-focused welfare network transformed into an immigrant welfare network.

Although they shifted away from specifically directing integrationist services toward Maghrebi clients after decolonization, French officials and welfare experts in postcolonial Marseille did not stop viewing North African immigration as a “problem” that needed managing and solving. Instead, they still widely viewed Muslims from France’s now former North African colonies collectively as a special group that continued to require their specialized attention and assistance, thereby preventing Maghrebis from disappearing into an undifferentiated mass of immigrants. A major factor that kept the integration of Maghrebis at the forefront of their minds was Marseille’s geographic position. Into the 1970s, the city remained France’s main port of North African immigration. But officials and experts also continued to associate Maghrebis with a number of local problems and difficulties, including the presence and growth of shantytowns. Moreover, they continued to differentiate Maghrebis from other immigrant groups, especially for what they identified as the former’s ethno-cultural backwardness and propensity to maintain pre-migratory ways of living.

By continuing to place special focus on the Maghrebi presence in postcolonial Marseille, French officials, welfare specialists, and social service providers ensured that the project to integrate Maghrebis into French society outlived decolonization. In the postcolonial era, a key feature of this project was its tendency toward self-perpetuation. Even though French officials and welfare experts extolled the successes that, in their opinion, had been accomplished by North
African-focused integrationist action sociale services and programs since the late 1940s, they still consistently identified the so-called deficiencies of North African immigrants and their descendants as sources of significant concern. Some even feared that Maghrebis, after receiving French assistance and guidance, would revert back to pre-migratory ways of living. Their response was to expand the reach of local integrationist initiatives. In the late 1960s, HLM estates, long considered a sign of successful Maghrebi integration, began to feature specialized services previously reserved for residents of shantytowns and transitional housing complexes. At the same time, local welfare providers, fueled by an interest in facilitating the “global” care and integration of Maghrebi families, started to incorporate youth services into action familiale initiatives that until that point had specifically targeted adult Maghrebi women.

As a legacy of French colonialism, the project to integrate Maghrebis living in postcolonial Marseille relied heavily on welfare associations whose origins were tied to the North African-focused welfare network that existed in the city prior to 1962. In their effort to shape the behaviours and values of their Maghrebi clients, these associations continued to utilize colonial strategies and techniques. Most prominently, LOGIREM and ATOM, the two associations that led local efforts to solve the shantytown “problem,” remained into the 1970s committed to implementing the “Marseille method” approach to social housing, which moved poorly housed Muslim North African families into transitional housing or HLM complexes situated in northern Marseille. But postcolonial efforts to integrate local Muslim North African residents did not always follow late colonial precedents. In the early 1970s, acting on concerns that the “Marseille method” was too segregationist, the CLARB, a new welfare association created after decolonization, championed the implementation of an alternative approach to social housing assistance that re-housed poorly housed Muslim North Africans in inner city Marseille. Further demonstrating the complex dynamic of continuity and change that defined integrationist action sociale initiatives that targeted
Maghrebi clients after decolonization, formerly North African-focused welfare providers were themselves not averse to employing a mixture of old and new integrationist strategies. In the domain of *action familiale*, administrators at associations like ATOM preserved long-standing services that sought to transform adult Maghrebi women into modern French homemakers and at the same time created new services designed to prepare adolescent Maghrebi girls and young Maghrebi women for employment outside of the home.

Thus, by 1975, the ability of North African immigrants and their descendants to adjust to life in France remained a source of considerable anxiety for French officials and welfare experts in Marseille. However, as the period in question came to a close, the local response to this “problem” became closely tied to an entirely new set of national welfare initiatives that differed from previous integrationist efforts. Launched in October 1974 by Paul Dijoud, the Minister of State for Immigrant Workers, these new initiatives drew from the French concept of “le droit à la différence” (the right to be different), which supported minority ethnic groups’ retention of their cultural traditions.¹ In Marseille, the centerpiece of these initiatives was the Maison de l’Etranger (Home from Abroad), a new public sector welfare organization that operated under the supervision of the municipal council. Created in January 1976, it developed an *action culturelle* to facilitate immigrants’ “insertion […] into the life of the city” while helping them stay connected to their cultures of origin. As part of this *action culturelle*, it organized expositions and concerts that showcased the artistic and musical traditions of local immigrant groups.² Outside of the actions of the Maison de l’Etranger, other initiatives undertaken in Marseille included the delivery of “mother tongue” language instruction to the children of immigrants in French public schools. For Muslim

² The Maison de l’Etranger was the centrepiece of a package of measures introduced in Marseille following an agreement between Paul Dijoud and Marseille mayor Gaston Defferre: Maison de l’Etranger, “Marseille ville ouverte: projet d’action culturelle pour 1978-1979,” August 1978. AMM 1020 W 33.
immigrants from North Africa and elsewhere, spaces for Islamic worship were established in HLM estates and dormitories for foreign workers.³

On the surface, these new initiatives appeared to encourage the cultural diversity of France’s immigrant population, suggesting that, within official circles at least, immigrants’ cultural differences were no longer considered roadblocks to their incorporation into French society. However, on closer inspection, the aims underpinning these initiatives were far from straightforward. Dijoud, for example, supported efforts to assist immigrants in staying connected to their cultural heritage as a means of keeping the door to their possible return home open. A similar approach was taken by Dijoud’s successor, Lionel Stoléru, who supported deportation as the natural response not only to surpluses in France’s foreign labour force, but also to people of immigrant origin who experienced difficulties adjusting to life in France. Moreover, although the concept of “the right to be different” received significant support from those on the French political left, welfare initiatives that drew from this concept were also undercut by negative views about immigrants’ adaptability to France.⁴ In Marseille, a common feature of media discourse on these initiatives was pessimism regarding their ability to solve the “problem” of Muslim North African immigration.⁵ Racist public discourse on these initiatives also continued to associate the Maghrebi presence in the city with “ghettos” where residents kept “goats in bathtubs.”⁶

By the mid-1980s, with the rise of the far-right Front National and polemical debates over immigration in France, the French state abandoned initiatives based on concepts of cultural pluralism like “the right to be different.” Since then, “integration” has served as the principal goal

---
⁴ Hargreaves, Multi-Ethnic France, 182-183.
⁵ Meury, “A Marseille la situation des immigrés nécessite des mesures urgentes,” 18.
guiding the state’s response to the presence of immigrants and their descendants in the country. However, even though French views about what constitutes immigrants’ successful incorporation into French society have changed over time, not much has changed in French efforts to realize this goal. In the case of Muslim immigrants from North Africa and elsewhere and their descendants—whether it be in the context of the Islamic headscarf affair of the late 1980s, the suburban unrest of the 1990s and early 2000s, or the more recent terrorist attacks in Paris and other cities—the response has been to promote social housing, public education, and other social aid services as a means of reducing their particularities and teaching them to become “French.” In doing so, France continues to treat ethno-cultural difference as a “problem” that needs to be managed and solved, all the while ignoring how the interconnected French republican and colonial projects have shaped this “problem.” By exploring how French officials and welfare experts in Marseille responded to North African immigration over an extended period of time, this dissertation has sought to add new perspectives to our understanding of this complex history.
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